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Abstract

Indigenous Micronesians have thrived in their home islands for thousands of years developing rich cultural traditions, including systems for managing their socio-cultural, political, and natural environments. Today these traditional systems sit alongside modern governmental cultural resource management offices, including historic preservation offices. One of the greatest challenges faced by historic preservation programs in Micronesia is finding the appropriate balance between local desires to manage their islands’ cultural heritage and modern concepts of cultural heritage policy and administration while contending with various internal and external political, economic, and social forces. Previous studies show that if Indigenous Islander culture and heritage are not adequately considered, damage to Indigenous social, cultural, and physical well being occurs. This in turn affects the health and well being of the larger community while also running contrary to the goals of historic preservation—those being primarily to preserve a sense of place, as well as a sense of community history and identity.

This thesis explores for the first time the extent to which Indigenous values are present in the management processes and public outputs of the Micronesian historic preservation offices (HPOs). Based on interviews with key officials in the HPO offices, as well as documentary analysis and participant observation, the main findings of this thesis are that the offices have a relatively strong presence of Indigenous Islander values in many ways—high percentages of Indigenous Islanders on their staff, offices striving to operate within island cultural contexts, and Islander-valued resources reflected in register listings. Additionally, these findings confront stereotypes about island productivity and efficacy.

However, Micronesian HPOs must carefully navigate through numerous challenges to ensure appropriate consideration of Indigenous Islander values within heritage operations.
A critical challenge to the incorporation of Indigenous values in island HPOs is that Islander Indigenous rights are not always recognized by external forces such as colonial administrations and funding sources. This lack of consideration was found to impact historic preservation efforts in areas ranging from community expectations to determinations of who drives the offices. Other challenges include issues such as funding shortages, competing island infrastructural priorities, and limited human resources. However, much potential exists in building upon current relationships with the United States National Park Service and other entities that can provide pathways through the shoals and currents of island historic preservation.
Preface

I grew up on Guam, an Oceanic island that is an unincorporated territory of the United States (US), in the 1960s and ’70s, a time when the term “Guamanian” was publicly applied to the Indigenous people of Guam while many from elsewhere spoke of “real” Chamorros and their culture as “long lost.” I was in high school and college (University of Guam) when I became aware of movements to strengthen public recognition of Guam Chamorros as the Indigenous people of the island who continue to practice their culture, which persevered through hundreds of years of missionization, colonization, US democratization, and militarization. I have watched the procession of these movements to the present and have observed their effects in revitalizing public celebration of Inafa’maolek/kostumbren CHamoru¹ (Chamorro culture) and in helping ensure its continuation.

Interest in this research topic developed during my seven years as a member of Guam’s Historic Preservation Review Board (which oversees both the Guam Historic Preservation Office and the Guam Preservation Trust). During that time, Guam community members, especially Chamorros, expressed concern that Indigenous heritage appeared to receive less attention than non-Indigenous heritage, or that Indigenous heritage was being preserved in foreign ways that distanced them from their heritage.

Furthermore, a trip to the 2004 US National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) conference, where I interacted with specialists and representatives from other US state Historic Preservation Offices (HPOs), made me realize that Micronesian offices were somewhat exceptional within the US National Park Service (NPS) state HPO system. In Micronesia’s HPOs Indigenous Micronesians comprise the ‘State’ Historic Preservation Officers and the majority of the staff. However, NTHP conference attendees appeared to be largely non-Indigenous members of their various state communities. This contrast prompted
me to contemplate the differences that might exist between HPOs run by Indigenous community members in their homelands and the other state-run HPOs.

Finally, I put out some informal feelers to see if exploring the degree to which Indigenous values were present in Micronesian historic preservation was a topic in which people were interested. This was a salient consideration for me inasmuch as serving community needs has long been an important driving force for my research efforts. The feedback I received validated the importance of assessing the presence of Indigenous values in island historic preservation and exploring ways to assure that presence. Further, US doctrine promotes that its citizens are part of the process of determining the principles and ideals of the nation and ensuring that they are lived up to. With those thoughts in mind, it is hoped that this research will be beneficial to the Guam, Northern Mariana Island, and Palau HPOs, the communities they serve, and supportive entities such as the NPS and others.
Disclaimer

Effort was made to verify the information and perspectives provided within this dissertation. Experts, colleagues, and friends generously provided consultations, answered emails, and engaged in conversations. However, the validity of this study’s data is mine alone as are any errors. This study’s assessments and views do not necessarily reflect those of the individuals, offices, or institutions that participated in this study or provided support during my research endeavor.
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Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

The United States (US) Unincorporated territory of Guam (Guåhan), the US Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI or CNMI), and the Republic of Palau (Belau or ROP) are island homelands located in western Micronesia. Ancestors voyaged to these islands 3000 or more years ago, paving the way for the rich Indigenous cultures and histories that continue to exist today.

Cultural and environmental conservation have long been part of Micronesian island societies (O’Neill, 2005, pp. 290-291). Such elements of society have been maintained and managed “through the daily activities of life” by Islanders “living them” (O’Neill, 2005, p. 291). This is explained in Guam’s state preservation plan (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007) which states, “Prior to Colonial times, historic preservation did not exist as the regulatory process known today, but was integrated in the traditions of everyday life; such as the passing down of stories, fishing, and canoe building skills, or caretaking of the land” (p. 25).

Of much shorter duration are the government-operated preservation and conservation programs within US-affiliated Micronesia. Historic preservation and historic preservation offices (HPOs) entered the region in the 1960s and ’70s through the US National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, introducing new concepts and associated sets of activities (Force, 1977, p. 5; King, 2006). These Micronesian HPOs sit alongside traditional systems of cultural resource management, sometimes working together while, at other times, finding themselves at odds with one another. In recognition of such situations, Victoria Lockwood (1993) notes that as “Western institutions, values, and consumer goods are increasingly incorporated into the cultural systems of Pacific Islanders, they must somehow be reconciled with islanders’ own values and understandings of the world” (pp. 14-15).
Further, Micronesian societies and political systems are currently at a crossroads, and community members are increasingly worried about sustaining their cultural resources—their traditions, languages, identities as Peoples, histories, tangible heritage, and environments—against the swelling tide of development, modernization, globalization, and other forces (O’Neill, 2005, p. xviii; e.g., O’Neill & Spennemann, 2006b, p. 1; Owen, 2011, pp. 185, 186 & 188). Historian Ian Campbell (1989) notes that, in the Pacific since 1950, there has been “an accelerated rate of social change far greater” than the previous hundreds of years of early European contact and colonial administration (p. 12).

Additionally, globalization, “however defined, concerns the global spread of mainly Anglo-American knowledge, values, and practices, rather than indigenous knowledge and wisdom” and as such, is “disempowering many Oceanic peoples” in the way that colonialism has (Thaman, 2003, p. 7). In fact, a report for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (ICETC, 1996, p. 16) states that,

People today have a dizzying feeling of being torn between globalization whose manifestations they can see and sometimes have to endure, and their search for roots, reference points and a sense of belonging.

To address these types of issues, UNESCO has been working on conventions such as that for the “‗protection and promotion‘ of cultural diversity,” responding to concerns “that ‘the processes of globalization...represent a challenge for cultural diversity, namely in view of risks of imbalances between rich and poor countries’” (Ayers, 2006, p. 569). The “values and images of Western mass culture” have been referred to as being “like some invasive weed” that is “threatening to choke out the world’s native flora” (Appiah, 2006). This point illustrates the susceptibility of Indigenous cultures if they are not adequately considered.

Insufficient consideration can result in dire consequences. Survival for many Indigenous peoples in modern times has been characterized as a “struggle” which many are “losing” (Rapadas et al., 2005, p. 166). Rapadas et al. also point out that many “suffer disproportionately in their own native land and in other places” (p. 166). Illustrating this is
their recent examination of the physical and social health of Indigenous Chamorros in their ancestral homeland of Guam. They state: “Chamoru families are experiencing overwhelming suffering” citing that, compared to other ethnic groups on the island, they “have the highest rates of diabetes, heart disease, strokes and overall poor health” and “are over represented in the prison system,” “have the most drug arrests, family violence arrests,” and “the most suicides overall” (p. 166). They conclude that,

忘却 taken together, and considering the context of Guam and its place in time and history, these findings tell a tragic story of a people and an island that is struggling to survive amidst rapid changes that have undermined historical and cultural foundations. (p. 166)

A similar observation exists in a recent US National Park Service (NPS) report:

Indigenous peoples the world over have suffered from rapid expansion of influence by a few cultures so powerful that they have risen to near absolute dominance. These powerful cultures offer changes purported to be benefits—modern medicines, education, jobs, communication, exposure to a wider world—that may also undermine fundamental beliefs, principles, and practices by which people have defined themselves and understood their places in the world. Rapid loss of cultural reference points sometimes leaves impacted people confused, disoriented, and uncertain of how to cope with the challenges and dilemmas of life. (NPCC, n.d., p. 8)

The report further points out that “the ennui” [lack of energy, focus, purpose, or direction] that may follow is often remedied by rediscovering and reviving respect for cultural traditions” (NPSCC, n.d., p. 8; emphasis added). Similarly, an NPS historian noted, “Micronesian youth need a cultural anchor to keep from drifting and running on a reef in a changing society” (Apple, 1972, p. 86).

Historic preservation expert Thomas F. King (2002) similarly notes that when a community’s values regarding historic preservation efforts are excluded, otherwise ignored, or can only be expressed “in terms with which the dominant culture is comfortable, we fuel frustration and anger” (p. xvii). Conversely, he states that when historic preservationists and others “accept and respect the legitimacy” of the values of cultural groups—be they Indigenous Peoples or sub-cultural groups—and help them to “maintain the integrity of
their cultures and communities in the face of assault by the forces of modernity,” then “we’re contributing in some tiny way to their ability to work peacefully and productively with other parts of society” as well as “contribute to a better world by trying to make government actions responsive” (King, 2002, p. xvii).

Part of the “dizzying feeling of being torn” for Islanders is the exposure to new types of development and foreign standards of what constitutes living well and comporting themselves and their government properly which are obtained from television, movies, and visitors as well as inter-governmental friendships and assistance programs. Additionally, a number of countries, including the US, have been working to further strengthen their presence in Guam, the NMI, and Palau. This includes federalization of the NMI; building up military facilities in various Mariana Islands; a potential population increase of some 80,000 in Guam; and possible military training exercises in Palau (e.g., Marsh, 2008; 2009; Marsh & Taitano, 2010; 2011; McPhetres, 2011; Shuster, 2009). In many ways, these situations will exacerbate what are already dramatically shifting island demographics. For example, Chamorros on Guam have become a plurality since World War II (WW II) (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 273), the NMI’s population may have dropped by as much as 29% in the last decade (McPhetres, 2011, p. 191), Palau has a sizeable foreign labor force (Alegado & Finin, 2000; OPS, 2005; Pierantozzi, 2000), and all three areas have been dealing with various emigration and diaspora population issues (Hezel, 1990; e.g., Munoz, “Chamorro migration to the US”). In each case, these changes and challenges significantly impact both the expectations of how Indigenous values figure in historic preservation activities and the HPOs’ abilities to carry them out.

Feeding into the issues outlined above is the reality that stereotypes exist regarding the lack of Micronesian government office efficacy and efficiency (e.g., Leibowitz, 1989, p. 5). Epeli Hau‘ofa (1993) has noted that certain stereotypes regarding “indigenous [Oceanic] cultures are traceable to the early years of interactions with Europeans,” continuing on to
have “a lasting effect on people’s views of their histories and traditions” (p. 3). This not only can create negative connotations about a People and their efforts but can become internalized, creating negative connotations by a People about themselves and their activities. The perception of these stereotypes as being “the case,” becomes one of the many challenges to Micronesian island historic preservation management. Stereotypes often occur when information is insufficient to provide an explanation for circumstances. Examining Indigenous island values provides an opportunity to explain why differences do and should exist between Island HPOs and those located within other cultural contexts. Providing such insight can have far reaching consequences.

Not unsurprisingly then, there has been some concern that outside values, inadvertently or otherwise, have gained ground over Indigenous values within Micronesian historic preservation programs – in the ways that the programs operate and in their program public outputs. For decades, in fact since the introduction of the formal concept of historic preservation by the US (Belt Collins Ltd., 2007, p. 25; King, 2006; NHPA, “U.S. Pub. L. 89-665: National Historic Preservation Act,” 1966; Parks Division Guam DPR et al., 1976, p. 23), Micronesian community members, heritage specialists, and others have discussed the imported system’s applicability in conserving island heritage according to Islander values and sensibilities. So, while Micronesians are noted to have been “taking control of their own historic preservation programmes, which manage archaeological and other historic work in [their] territory,” there are also discussions about the impact of outside values on island historic preservation. For example, archaeologist Paul Rainbird has assessed that the US NPS “supplies policy and training to the indigenous participants, thus effectively Americanizing their perceptions of the ‘proper’ way to deal with the past” (Rainbird, 2000, p. 159).

Island community members have begun asking themselves important questions such as: What is gained or lost with each decision when fusing or choosing between traditional
and modern methods of safeguarding and conserving Indigenous Islander cultural heritage? Are the appropriate persons/entities determining the significance of heritage? Is the appropriate significance being recognized? And thereby, are the cultural heritage management needs of the island community truly being served? (see similar types of queries in, Spennemann, 2003, p. 52). Ultimately, these lead to questioning the degree that Indigenous Islander values are present in HPOs and are driving office efforts.

These are additionally important considerations in that historic preservation is a means of managing cultural and historic resources not just as elements of a community’s heritage, but as foundational facets of their living culture and Indigenous Islander identity (Chapman, 1996, p. 4; Chapman & Lightner, 1996; Liston et al., 2011; Maddex, 1975; O’Neill, 2005; Poyer, 1992; Spennemann, 1992c, pp. 283-284). And, as a report written in cooperation with the NPS entitled, “Cultural conservation: The protection of cultural heritage in the United States” asserted to the 96th US Congress, “To endure[,] a group must pass on its distinguishing attributes from one generation to the next” (Loomis, 1983, p. 3).

Studies up to this point have examined numerous important concerns regarding historic preservation in the island areas under study—program overviews (Fitzpatrick & Kanai, 2001; Furey, 2006, pp. 625-637; Holyoak, 2001; John, 1992; Naone, 2011; Russell, 1983, 1998; Spennemann, 1992b; Torres, 2001); applicability of US-styled historic preservation to island situations (Apple, 1972; Chapman, 1996; King, 2006; Maddex, 1975; Parker, 1994; Rainbird, 1999); efficacy of programs (O’Neill, 2005; O’Neill & Spennemann, 2006a); program needs and recommendations (Ayers, 2006; Chapman & Lightner, 1996; Kihleng, 1996; D. R. Smith, 1990; 1997; Spennemann, 1992); colonial, tourist, WW II veteran, and local perceptions of historic preservation activities (Ballendorf, 2006; Krause, 1992; Murray, 2006; O’Neill & Spennemann, 2006b; Petersen, 1995; Poyer, 1992; Sayers & Spennemann, 2006; D. R. Smith, 1978; Spennemann, 2003; Spennemann et al., 2002); alternative goals and projects for island HPOs (Beardsley, 2006; Genz, 2011; Genz & Finney, 2006); training programs
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(Ayers, 2006; Ayers & Fitzpatrick, 2001; Burns, 1990; Descantes, 2001; Fitzpatrick & Ayers, 2001; Heather et al., 2000; Look & Spennemann, 1994; Spennemann & Look, 1993); repurposing and ownership of heritage (Spennemann, 1990; 2005; 2006a); and whether attention to island heritage is being subsumed by non-island heritage (Spennemann, 1992c, pp. 283-284).18

Islanders themselves have also addressed some of these issues. Two key early pieces are Katharine Kesolei’s (1977) paper, “Cultural conservation: Restrictions to freedom of inquiry, Palauan strains,” and Robert A. Underwood’s (1977) “Red, whitewash and blue: Painting over the Chamorro experience.”19 More recent pieces that tackle related issues have been written by, among others: former Palau Historic Preservation Officer Victoria N. Kanai, “Sustainable development from historic and cultural preservation perspective” (1996); former Guam HPO staff Annie Maria Flores, “Artifacts of our [ti] facts” (2001); Guam HPO Historian Toni Ramirez, “Historic preservation: Chamorro perspectives” (2002) and “Historical timelines of Guam Prehistory to today” (n.d.);20 Michael Lujan Bevacqua, “These may or may not be Americans...’: The patriotic myth and the highjacking of Chamorro history on Guam” (2005); Keith Camacho, “Cultures of commemoration: The politics of war, memory and history in the Mariana Islands” (2011; 2005); Palau HPO National Archaeologist Rita Olsudong, “Reconstructing the Indigenous political structure in the recent Prehistory of Palau, Micronesia” (1995) and “Cultural heritage and communities in Palau” (2006);21 former NMI HPO Historian Genevieve S. Cabrera and NMI HPO historic preservation technician Herman Tudela, “Conversations with i man-aniti: Interpretation of discoveries of the rock art in the Northern Mariana Islands” (2006); the Republic of the Marshall Islands HPO Historian Steve Titml, “Capacity building using social networking sites” (2011); and Anne Perez Hattori, “The politics of preservation: Historical memory and division in the Mariana Islands” (2006a) and “Teaching history through service learning at the University of Guam” (2011).
However, there has been no direct study regarding the degree to which Indigenous Islander values are present within Micronesian HPOs. The lack of research is not, in and of itself, a compelling reason to conduct a study (e.g., Boellstorff, 2010, p. 353). Rather, the steady concern with the degree of presence and health of Indigenous values in the Micronesian islands voiced by practitioners and community members alongside the growing amount of material being written by Islanders about these same concerns demonstrates the need to examine the actual situation at hand. The generated information can serve as baseline data for the island HPOs and their funding entities as they continue to refine their approach to meeting the cultural heritage management needs of their island communities.

Comparatively speaking, modern cultural heritage management is a relatively new field, beginning within the US sometime around 1816 (Tyler, 2000, p. 33). Though it began with an emphasis on “architecture as art and history as a series of events,” new concepts have been weaving their way into the practice over time (Stipe, 2003, pp. 23-24 & 29-30). Some of these incorporated concepts have been “new associative values—townscapes, vernacular and designed landscapes, marine resources, ethnic and racial history, and others” (Stipe, 2003, p. 29). However, Stipe also cautions that “architecture and history are still regarded by many as the bedrock associative values” (p. 29), and others assess that while much has been done to make historic preservation in the US more representative and responsive to community needs, those such as Kaufman (2004a; 2004b) recognize that there is still more to do.

The US NPS has a history of working to address issues to better meet the cultural heritage needs of the communities it serves (Kaufman, 2004b, “Background”). In fact, understandings of Micronesian concepts of land, culture, and heritage have contributed to changing the face of historic preservation in the US, feeding into the development of National Register Bulletin 38, which provides guidelines for “evaluating and documenting”
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Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) (King, 2006; Parker, 1987). The significance of TCPs are “derived from the role the property plays in a community’s historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices” (Parker & King, 1990; revised 1992; 1998, p. 1). However, 20 years after the concept of TCPs were implemented (King, 2003, p. 1), no property in Micronesia has been registered as such. This circumstance may be an indicator of some of the types of incongruities that exist between island HPOs and the US national historic preservation system.

This study is a timely one. It captures a historic period during which Guam was undergoing potentially intensive militarization, the US government was implementing the federalization of the NMI, and Palau had just formally entered the international cultural heritage arena by establishing a national commission to UNESCO. Each of these developments could significantly affect those island entities’ historic preservation efforts and the level of Indigenous values present in them.

Further, cultural heritage management as a field is currently burgeoning with new approaches and considerations. Regionally and internationally, there are movements to recognize and safeguard Indigenous rights (UN General Assembly, 2007), cultural rights (UNESCO, 1970), cultural heritage rights (Hodder, 2010), intangible cultural heritage (ICH) (UNESCO, 2003), documentary heritage via the Memory of the World program (Brandt et al., 1988), Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture (Secretariat of the Pacific Islands, Pacific Island Forum, & UNESCO Regional Office, 2002), and more. Some of these have potential for addressing Micronesia’s particular historic preservation situations. Further, some cultural heritage management leaders and entities seem receptive to expanding the horizons of what constitutes recognizing and conserving heritage.
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Thesis Aims

This study will explore the overt and underlying dynamics of three aspects of current Micronesian historic preservation theory and practice. First, whether non-Indigenous heritage properties are the dominant types of properties that the Island HPOs register. This is important as some have speculated that modern historic preservation practice in the study areas is dominated by grant funding from the US that is geared advertently or inadvertently to recognition of particular types of properties. Examining the island historic property registers will allow for exploration of whether and in what ways heritage that is of Indigenous value is or is not overlooked or excluded.

Second, whether and to what extent Indigenous epistemological and cosmological considerations related to cultural heritage management are present within island HPOs. This issue is especially critical, given the tendency for many practitioners to consider modern office practices or professional standards to be culture-neutral regardless of the culture within which they operate.22

And third, to explore the potential that can be gained from understanding the successes and challenges faced by Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs, and listening to historic preservation specialists and experts in related fields express their visions for the future of the offices. It was vital to connect and listen to experts on the ground to gather their perceptions of island HPO strengths and weaknesses and their visions for future HPO processes and efforts given island cultural contexts. This was particularly salient in that inter-personal connection and oral culture continue to be more powerful than the written word in many ways in Micronesia, and island policy is often developed at informal levels.

Contribution

This study aims to specifically provide an understanding of the presence of Indigenous values in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO landscapes based on a systematic examination
and evaluation. A secondary aim is to underscore the importance of ensuring that an appropriate amount of Islander cultural values exists within those landscapes. Identification of supports and challenges to those values and visions for their future in turn can enhance the prospects for strengthening their historic preservation programs. The findings will also be suitable to develop tools to address contemporary issues related to conserving Indigenous Islander heritage for both Micronesian HPOs and the entities that fund or otherwise support their heritage activities. In this manner, the findings can help the islands meet their historic preservation objectives and serve community needs.

Because conducting field research influences the very data being gathered (AnthroBase, “Reflexivity;” Babbie, 1992, p. 289), an estimated effect was that interest would be stimulated in the topic under study or that additional value would be applied to it. This leads to the possibility that increased attention given to the issues outlined above would then build into existing efforts to highlight and strengthen appropriate consideration and protection of Indigenous Micronesian cultural and historical resources in the midst of rapid modernization and globalization.

**Terminology**

This study draws on a number of key terms with specific yet, at times, contested meanings. These have been set out in Table 1 and have been addressed in detail in Appendix A.

**Selection of Study Areas**

Micronesia is a geographical area situated in the western central Pacific and is comprised of a range of islands and island cultural groups, now aggregated into a series of political entities (some nation states, some legislative entities of the US or the United Kingdom). Of these entities—Guam, the NMI, Palau, the FSM, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, and Kiribati—
three were selected because they possess a range of both similarities and differences that allow for fruitful comparison. For example, all three areas, Guam, the NMI, and Palau, share a range of island characteristics, historical experiences, and cultural features (see Figure 3). However, some, but not all of the entities share many particularities, while others, such as their three different political statuses, are island-specific. These conditions allow for various types of comparative analysis and have the potential to serve as control mechanisms while exploring and evaluating the impact of issues such as historical conditions and current political relationships.

---

1 Many of the islands that comprise the state of Yap in the FSM are also located in Western Micronesia. However, it is one of four state offices nested within the FSM national system of historic preservation. To sufficiently examine and discuss the richness of that multi-faceted system deserves more attention than would be possible given the time constraints of this thesis.
Shared history and culture can be teased apart to reveal meaningful differences, such as differences in the length of time a condition existed or the intensity with which it was applied. Conversely, closer examination of the island areas might reveal that, what at first sight appears to be a historical or cultural distinction between the island entities is, in reality, quite similar. If such similarities are found, patterns of Indigenous regard and treatment of heritage may be identified which could potentially allow for overarching observations that would be applicable to two or more areas.

**Thesis Approach**

Several approaches guided the formulation, conduct, writing, presentation, and analysis of this research. Specifically, because the researcher is an anthropologist, historian, and cultural heritage specialist who works in Micronesia, it has been important to conduct applied research in three dimensions. First, that the research investigate an issue of significant concern and impact to the communities of Micronesia. Second, that the research also serve as a venue in which Micronesian cultural and historical experts have the opportunity to speak and be heard. Third, that the research provide data that can potentially be used as tools by both western Micronesian HPOs, and the agencies that provide guidance and support for them, to forge a path towards meeting island community heritage needs. Contemporary research studies such as this one can be used to address these types of concerns by being more responsive to Islanders and their communities. If not, the ability of such studies to inform science, and directly or indirectly benefit Islanders and their communities, may be lost.

Vital to accomplishing these goals was being “competent” as defined by long-time anthropologist in Micronesia, Glenn Petersen (2005). According to Petersen, researcher

---

2 The formulation of this thesis incorporates elements from different fields while the analysis and discussion are often at the practical level. A summary is provided in the final chapter to allow the key findings to be more accessible to the general public.
competence involves, among other features, being a reliable “authority,” on knowing what is “useful and accurate” from both Islander and outsider perspectives. This is largely based on the types of relationships the researcher not only develops, but also maintains, within the community under study and with the data that has been gathered. Several elements strengthen these relationships—working with one or more families and island communities for a lengthy period of time; studying events and issues first hand; “intensive archival research;” “steady research;” “years of advocacy;” and knowledge of how to navigate through the “diversity of outlooks, opinions and desires” and the Micronesian social dynamics of hierarchy and equality, all the while being aware of “what unites people” (Petersen, 2005, pp. 313-315; emphasis in original). In this vein, it is critical to highlight that this researcher grew up in Micronesia, has conducted research in each of the island entities for many years, and has strong connections with individuals and extended families within each area. Activating all of these elements served as a guide for navigating through the island issues that Petersen outlined.

Movements in Pacific Islands/Oceanic Studies, Native Pacific Cultural Studies, and Social Justice have played key roles in guiding this research. Though these approaches have many attached meanings, the emphasis herein has been that exploration of issues be island- and Islander-centered, framed in and working towards ensuring appropriate consideration of Indigenous Islander values in island historic preservation endeavors (for discussion of the history of such movements see Diaz & Kauanui, 2001; Matsuda, 2006; Thaman, 2003; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). In fact, some in the heritage conservation field assert that “cultural heritage management should be an essential part of social policy,” conceiving it “as part of community and social services” (Spennemann, 2011, p. 15).

This study promotes the use of a research framework from Islander and/or local perspectives. These issues are addressed by Indigenous researchers such as Epeli Hau’ofa (1993), Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), David W. Gegeo (2001a; 2001b), David W. Gegeo and
Karen Watson-Gegeo (2001; 2002), Matt Matsuda (2006), Unaisi Nabobo-Baba (2006), Margaret Kovach (2009), Shawn Wilson (2008), and a growing number of others. As the audience of this study ranges from four distinct Micronesian Islander cultural groups (and sub-groups) to non-Islander historic preservation specialists and administrators, the study endeavors to strike a balance between their differing frames of reference with the main goal of developing a relevant body of knowledge useful to a wide range of readers.

As much as possible, this study became familiar with and utilized local sources of knowledge situated with members of the island communities or the written word. This practice highlights the expertise of local actors and their value in future studies. Utilizing local contributions allows those members to be recognized as actors in island issues and provides potential for them to be identified as part of the vanguard that should be involved in future related studies.

The strength of these approaches rests in enhancing this study’s ability to more effectively engage the needs of the communities under study. This research effort has attempted to speak to those representing each of these diverse communities in ways that will allow for, or inspire strengthened support of, historic preservation efforts in ways that are meaningful to the Peoples of Guam, the NMI, and Palau.

**Methods Used**

Field research was required to gather pertinent data related to historic preservation in Micronesia, as well as to afford access to archival materials only available in a limited number of locales (for such discussion see, Babbie, 1992, p. 286). In the field, three methods were used to gather the data for this research: examination of archival materials and other documentation, participant-observation, and interviews. These methods, details of which are presented in the applicable chapters of this study, provided both quantitative as well as qualitative data, which could be integrated to provide a meaningful research outcome.
Fieldwork consisted of four parts (Table 2). First, meeting and interviewing island historic preservation specialists and experts in related fields. Second, systematically assessing the files of cultural resources placed in local or national registers and in cultural resource inventories. This part also included reviewing other HPO products such as master plans, newsletters, publications, posters, websites, and the like. Third, spending time at the HPOs observing and participating in office functions. Fourth, gathering statistics about the island communities and acquiring a sense of the preservation environments by examining historic preservation laws, visiting organizations with like goals (e.g., humanities councils, Indigenous affairs offices, museums, and so forth), and encountering many of the island cultural resources.30

Table 2. Fieldwork Activity Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>5 Feb – 2 April 2007</td>
<td>Examine register nomination forms Participant-observation Interview31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>2 April – 4 June 2007</td>
<td>Examine register nomination forms Participant-observation Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>3 March – 20 April 2008</td>
<td>Examine register nomination forms Participant-observation Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>21 April – 22 June 2008</td>
<td>Examine gray literature collection at Micronesian Area Research Center (MARC), University of Guam (UOG) Provide preliminary fieldwork findings presentation to island community3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>23 July 2008 – 23 July 2012</td>
<td>Experience Micronesian historic preservation first hand32 Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 This presentation was entitled, "Guam, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau Historic Preservation Registers: Profiles and Issues." It was open to the public and provided on 18 June 2008 at the University of Guam's RFK Memorial Library.
In addition to the standard Charles Sturt University Ethics in Human Research approval (see p. xi), Palau was the one study area where a government permit was required to carry out research. The research permit took the form of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Palau HPO, in which it was asked how the research would be conducted, which agencies would be studied, and which people would be interviewed. The MOA called for the Palau HPO to review the research findings before they were published in the dissertation. Anecdotal evidence and community leader activity denotes that this has become an important consideration as many community members are increasingly aware of and sensitive to inaccurate information that has been published about Palau and its people by previous researchers (see, e.g., discussion in Tia Belau, 2009).

**Researcher Connections to Study Areas**

Given Petersen’s comments (see, “Thesis Approach,” p. 13) regarding the types of relationships the researcher develops and maintains with the community under study, it is prudent to furnish details regarding the researcher’s connections to the study areas.

This researcher’s familial roots in Micronesia date back to 1961, with this researcher becoming a member of Guam’s community several years thereafter. Researcher ties also include earning undergraduate and graduate degrees at the UOG and later teaching there as an adjunct professor. Seven years were also spent on the Guam Historic Preservation Review Board as a Member (1997-2004), and serving as the Vice-chair in the last year of membership. Other connections include being considered a resource for Guampedia and other local historical and cultural entities.

Being “from Guam” both worked for and against connecting with the communities in the NMI and Palau. On one hand, an understanding of regional culture, history, and other issues from an island perspective was advantageous during conversations and interviews. However, historically, there are certain stereotypes and tensions between the three
neighboring communities. Nevertheless, it was helpful to the researcher to also have family members who have been part of the NMI and Palau communities for over 20 years. Moreover, it was beneficial to know interviewee family members located in Guam, and to have mutual acquaintances.

In the course of conducting fieldwork, family or other relationships were traceable from the researcher to staff in island HPOs. While working as the Palau HPO Ethnographer for four years during the writing of this thesis, introductions often began with outlining familial ties to the Palauan community.

**Writing Style**

An important feature of this study is that it must be accessible to the island Peoples who are its main subjects. During the course of this research, Islanders stressed the importance of having access to the works of those who study in their islands. Although Smith (1978) noted 30 years ago that it should “now be standard practice” for researchers to provide data gathered to the communities studied (p. 13), unfortunately, it still does not always occur. To this end, this author has given several presentations within the region at various points in time in order to share this study’s findings and related material, and will be providing copies of this study to each island entity’s main libraries as well as to their HPOs.

Furthermore, these practices provide opportunities for community members to comment, critique, and correct research findings, analysis, and recommendations. They also fit within the island ethos of reciprocity (e.g., Hattori, “Culture of Guam;” Hau‘ofa, 1993, p. 12; McKnight, 1977, p. 8; Petersen, 2009, pp. 23 & 203; D. R. Smith, 1978, p. 11). In this study, it has also been important for the information within to be accessible so that it can be easily understood and not too jargonistic.
Thesis Structure

Three sections comprise the thesis. Section One provides pertinent background contexts and consists of two chapters. The first of these chapters will provide the reader with working knowledge of aspects of the socio-cultural and political contexts of Guam, the NMI, and Palau. It is further divided into two sections, the first of which provides general geographical and historical information, highlighting specific commonalities and differences between the subject areas. It then examines issues within the socio-cultural and political histories of the islands under study that are relevant to historic preservation efforts.

Issues necessary for further understanding the contexts within which western Micronesian historic preservation efforts exist are explored in Chapter Three. The chapter begins by establishing the legal and administrative foundations for their island HPOs. The second section then illuminates Micronesian epistemological and cosmological considerations as related to historic preservation. A case is made that these considerations are key to ensuring that island historic preservation efforts be responsive as well as relevant to their communities—thereby being impactful and effective. If the efforts are not successful in these realms, then it begs the questions as to why the heritage is being safeguarded and conserved and for whose benefit. These backdrops position the reader to better understand the data gathered, its implications, and its potential for future directions in historic preservation. Given that much of this material is scattered, exists as institutional or personal memory, or has been subject to certain perceptions for decades, this chapter is, in many ways, a set of findings unto itself—calling for careful unraveling and reweaving of information.

Section Two consists of three chapters that impart the core information gathered during the study, each utilizing different methodologies to gather specific types of data. To aid the reader, each of these chapters is prefaced by a section that outlines the
methodological approach employed for that particular set of data, and discusses the pertinent boundaries, challenges, and limitations to the study and those approaches.

The Island HPO historic property registers are systematically examined in Chapter Four. Profiles of the registers by island entity are provided as each island entity had quite different circumstances—whether a local register existed and whether they nominated properties to the US National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Using a concise definition of Indigenous values, this chapter explores the degree to which Indigenous values are present within Guam, NMI, and Palau historic property registers.

As there has been no study that has directly examined the degree of presence of Indigenous values in HPOs in Guam, the NMI, and Palau, it was important to observe the activities of these offices and their staff first hand. Thus, Chapter Five employs the participant-observation method. This method not only built on this researcher’s seven years of experience as a Historic Preservation Review Board Member in Guam but also upon the opportunity to work within another western Micronesian HPO for four years. HPO staffing patterns are first reviewed to introduce the actors and dynamics involved in office culture. Some of the findings in this chapter are the degrees and ways in which reciprocity, interdependence, and having a sense of obligation—core values of Indigenous Islander cultural ways of being—are nested within historic preservation in western Micronesia. A discussion of challenges to the presence of island values within Micronesian HPOs rounds out the exploration of office cultural contexts.

Building on the findings in Chapter Five, Chapter Six presents the views of various experts and key HPO staff and their perceptions of island historic preservation and the HPOs’ relationships to their main funding source, the NPS. The chapter then explores some of the issues related to the office in having to serve as a cultural broker of sorts. Also shared are visions for the future directions of the offices, especially in imagining or re-imagining offices that safeguard, promote, and conserve Indigenous Islander heritage. This chapter
also notes the ways in which community experts categorize cultural heritage and their efforts to manage that heritage.

Two chapters comprise Section Three. In this final section, Chapter Seven weaves together the sets of findings, comparing and contrasting them to further explore their underlying dynamics and implications. This allows for discussion of the issues found to be relevant and for recommendations to be made in building upon the strengths of particular historic preservation efforts and office structure. It also provides an ability to explore possibilities in overcoming some of the challenges to Indigenous values in historic preservation in the islands under study. It is these exercises that provide the necessary foundation for the final chapter, which provides a summary and key implications for the presence of Indigenous values in historic preservation in Micronesia resulting from this study, and possible directions for future research.
Section One

Background Contexts

Section One consists of two chapters that provide working knowledge of the areas under study. The first of these chapters presents an overview of the socio-cultural and political contexts of Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau, detailing specific commonalities and differences between the subject areas. General geographical and historical information is imparted first, while issues relevant to historic preservation efforts are then explored through time.

The following chapter presents the legal and administrative foundations for their island historic preservation offices (HPOs). Its second section discusses Micronesian epistemological and cosmological considerations as related to historic preservation.
Chapter Two

Socio-cultural and Political Landscapes

Each island entity and cultural group in Micronesia is a mixture of unique and overlapping histories, circumstances, and cultural traits. In order to explore the issues at hand for this study, it is important to understand these contexts especially as they relate to modern historic preservation. This chapter geographically locates the island entities under study. It introduces the socio-cultural and political histories of the Mariana and Palau archipelagos from the time of creation and known initial settlement according to island oral histories and other sources to the present, touching on Islander indigeneity, cultural identity, and foreign administrations and colonial relations. Islander connections to their heritage and key agents that have impacted those connections are then discussed, as is Islander advocacy for cultural perseverance.

Locating the Island Entities

The Peoples of the island areas under study consider their homelands to be the points of creation, centers of their universes, or situate them relative to other islands within voyaging routes. While contemporarily they continue to voyage between islands and elsewhere, international airports now also keep them closely connected to others in the region and around the world.

Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau are located in the mid-west portion of Oceania, or the “Blue Continent,” within the expanse labeled as “Micronesia” (Figure 1; see also discussion in Appendix A). Whereas traditional navigators and other Islanders have their own ways of thinking about and viewing their surrounds, in contemporary written text the region is often depicted as comprised of four main
archipelagos and the island of Nauru. The Mariana Islands are divided into two politically distinct island areas—the southernmost island, the United States (US) Unincorporated territory of Guam, and the US Commonwealth of the NMI. The Republic of Palau constitutes the westernmost archipelagic portion of the east–west trending Caroline Islands chain, while further to the east are the Marshall Islands and Kiribati. The island of Nauru is located to the southwest of the Marshall Islands.

Of these islands, Guam is the largest and most populated (Table 3) and serves as a regional hub in many ways. Palau and the NMI are secondary hubs of similar activities. In the NMI, Saipan is the largest and most populated island. For Palau, ten of its states are situated in Babeldaob Island, which constitutes Micronesia’s second largest land mass at 333km² (Karolle, 1993, p. 96). However, the vast majority of its population currently resides on the island of Koror, the island nation’s business center and former capitol.

The islands have both rainy and dry seasons, although some rainfall is common throughout the year. Temperatures are “warm and constant” with high levels of humidity (Karolle, 1993, p. 82). Tropical cyclones are not uncommon in the Mariana Islands as they often form in the Central Caroline Islands and “achieve damaging strength by the time they move westward” (Karolle, 1993, p. 84).

**Indigeneity and Cultural Identity**

Each culture has its own understanding of how it and the surrounding environment came to be (Denoon, 1997, p. 37). Chamorros recount that Puntan and Fu’una, a brother and sister with supernatural abilities, worked together to create the universe and the people within it (see Figure 2) (Driver, 1977, p. 21; García, 2004, p. 173; Hattori, “Puntan and Fu’una”). Palauans narrate the story of Latmikaik to provide the details of how their universe was transformed from being “completely empty” to a rich and vibrant archipelago (Malsol, 2000, pp. xi-xiv). The NMI Carolinians and Southwest Islanders of Palau, who trace their ances-
Figure 1. Map of the Pacific Islands in Oceania.
try to the Peoples of Micronesia’s Central Carolines (Alkire, 1984, p. 272; Tibbetts, 2002, pp. 11-12), focus more on the migration to and settlement of their current islands than on the creation narratives of the home islands.

It is within their currently occupied islands that they became Chamorro (also known as CHamoru or Taotao Tano’), Palauan (Rechad er a Belau), and Carolinian. Likewise, voyaging populations of Carolinians became uniquely NMI Carolinian (Repaghuluwisch) and Sonsorolese (Saori Dongosaro) and Tobian (Tsouri Hatohobei) of Palau’s Southwest Islands (SWI) (e.g., Cunningham, 1997, p. 13; McKnight, 1977, p. 8; R. A. Underwood, Pers. Comm., as cited in, Marsh-Kautz, 2002, p. 31; Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, p. 31).
Archaeologist Geoffrey Clark (2005) has evaluated the scientific understanding of the migration and settlement history of western Micronesia to be “in a state of flux” (p. 351) as there is still much investigative work to be conducted for more refined interpretations. Current scientific understanding is that Micronesian ancestors voyaged to their islands from Island Southeast Asia through varying routes, existing in their homelands for centuries, according to their particular circumstances. Current paleo-environmental dates suggest settlement in the Mariana Islands as early as 2350 BC\(^5\) (Athens & Ward, 2004; Athens et al., 2004) and relatively the same time frame for Palau (Athens & Ward, 2005; Clark et al., 2006).

According to these models, Carolinian ancestors traveled a different route to their islands than did the Chamorro and Palauan ancestors. The latter two groups are thought to have voyaged eastward from Island Southeast Asia, perhaps via some other island region before reaching the Mariana and Palau archipelagos. Carolinian ancestors, however, entered eastern Micronesia at later dates from eastern Melanesia, and then headed westward (Irwin, 1992, pp. 118-119).

Islanders from the Central Carolines developed a pre-European contact voyaging/trading route to the Mariana Islands still known today as *metawal wool* (Farrell, 1991, p. 199; W. Flood, 2002, p. 48). At least one Carolinian-type artifact, a turtle shell ornament, has been found in the Mariana Islands according to an NMI Historic Preservation Office (HPO) staff member, potentially attesting to this. Although subject to some debate, Carolinian settlement (as opposed to contact) of the NMI is generally attributed as occurring in 1815. Chiefs Aghurubw and Ngúschúl led the expedition, stopping by Guam to ask permission from Spanish authorities to move to the Spanish administration-emptied island of Saipan following a typhoon that had ravaged their home atolls (Alkire, 1984, pp. 278-279; Farrell, 1991, pp. 199-201; Olopai & Flinn, 2005, pp. 11-12). Later, Carolinians from various atolls followed this initial migration to the NMI (D’Arcy, 2001; Farrell, 1991, p. 201).
Figure 2. Fouha Bay, Guam (locally and nationally registered site: 66-02-0128), the “cradle of creation” in Guam Chamorro oral tradition.\textsuperscript{56} (Taitingfong & Marsh, “Fouha Bay;” photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)

Palau’s Sonsorol and Tobi (Hatohobei) states,\textsuperscript{57} comprised of islands of the same name, and Fana, Merrir, Bul (Pulo Anna), and Helen Reef (Hotsarihie), represent the westernmost Micronesian islands that Carolinian ancestors settled and colonized (for discussion of movement outside Micronesia, see, Lessa, 1978). Oral narratives and archaeological investigations of Palau’s SWI indicate that they colonized the various islands between 150 and 300 years ago to perhaps as early as 1,000 ago\textsuperscript{58} (Hunter-Anderson, 2000, p. 37; Petrosian-Husa et al., 2003, p. 3; Tibbetts, 2002, pp. 11-13).

Each of the island entities flourished with rich, vibrant cultures that succeeded for hundreds or thousands of years. This was evident in the oral traditions and histories that each culture transmitted over the generations and shared with early European explorers, much of which continues to this day. It is also discernable in the tangible and intangible heritage the island settlers left behind for their descendants.
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Such heritage informs us that the ancestors of today’s Chamorros went through what has been categorized as five distinguishable cultural sequences—each lasting hundreds of years (Table 4). During these periods, pottery making, tool crafting and usage, stonework practices, and other cultural traits changed, evolved, or were abandoned (e.g., Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, pp. 15-16). Palauan ancestral activity, likewise, had been classified into five cultural sequences (Table 4) in which ancestors both settled and re-settled different parts of Palau and constructed large terraces, stone pathways, culvert systems, platforms, docks, bridges, defensive walls, wells, and bathing pools. NMI Carolinians and the Peoples of Sonsorol and Hatohobei (Palauan Southwest Islanders) also have reminders such as settler landing sites; place names that carry deep significance; traditional grounds for housing chief meeting structures or women’s menstrual huts; and coral walls, alignments, and house posts.

Table 4. Early Cultural Sequences According to Island HPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Pre-Latte Period</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Colonization Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 1687 BC</td>
<td>ca 1800 BC – AD 1668</td>
<td>ca 2350 BC – 1250 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Pre-Latte Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD [1] – AD 800</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca 1250 BC – 450 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latte Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 800 – 1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca 450 BC – AD 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Latte Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 1300 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca AD 750 – 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Latte/Early Historic Period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stonework Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 1500 – 1700</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca AD 1250 – 1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

The extant tangible and intangible heritage associated with the physical landscape, in daily language, and in cultural practices shape who Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders are today. For example, on Guam, numerous pre-European contact names of villages have survived, several of which relate to the Chamorro
creation narrative that land was created from the body of Puntan. The village name Barrigåda, for instance, means the “side of the stomach” (Clement, “Barrigada”). Chamorros of the NMI note that they fish, hunt, and gather wild foods in the same areas their ancestors did, following in their footsteps. Chamorros regularly encounter reminders from the past: pictographs in caves, lusong (mortars), acho’ atupat (slingshot hunting weapons) on the ground, and pottery sherds along the beach. Palauans are literally surrounded by earthworks and a proliferation of works made of stone. These not only speak of ancestral accomplishments and engineering skills, but also are markers that impart messages of movement through Palau, status, relationships, and more (see, Parmentier, 1987 for such discussion). Thus in many ways, Palau’s heritage serves as mnemonic devices for present generations. Stephen Murray (2006) provides an example of some of the roles they play in his discussion of the destruction World War II (WW II) wrought upon Peleliu State:

landscape, olangch [markers], and memory served the functions largely performed by books, archives, and museums in historically literate societies. The devastation visited by the war upon the land and five native villages of Peleliu, the destruction of reefs, terrain, landmarks, and human objects, compares with the destruction of another society’s libraries, museums, universities, and all other institutional stores of memory, knowledge, and history. (pp. 35-37)

Chamorros, upon settling into their archipelago, forged one culture and language (Hunter-Anderson & Butler, 1995, p. 16), though travelers were assimilated from time to time, and ancient Chamorros in all probability would have identified themselves by clan, village, or some other grouping (e.g., Kiste, 1999, p. 434). The same types of statements hold true for Palauans as well although sub-regional differences exist (Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, pp. 35-48). Various Carolinian groups in the NMI and Palau each have distinct migration stories as to how they arrived and settled. While there is common recognition of their individual migration histories and affinities, there is also some tendency for other community members to gloss over these differences and to refer to those distinctive
populations generally as “Carolinians” for the NMI or “Southwest Islanders” for Palau (Alkire, 1977, p. 13; Nero, “Culture of Palau”).

During pre-European and early European contact periods the Peoples of western Micronesia traveled and traded amongst themselves and with Peoples in Island Southeast Asia and other islands in Micronesia (e.g., see Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, p. 60). For Palau, there was interaction with Islanders in Melanesia as well (Gregory & Osborne, 1979; Knecht et al., 2004, p. 44). Additionally, there have been occasional interactions with Peoples from Japan and China (see discussion in Higuchi, 1997, pp. 142-144; R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 33). At times this led to additions to the island communities. For example, following a shipwreck in the 1600s, a Chinese from the Philippines, Choco, started a family line, which can still be found in Guam’s south (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 33). Also in Guam, Pedro Calonsor, a Christian Visayan Filipino and his two-year-old Chamorro daughter greeted visiting Europeans in 1668 (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 46). Soogle, a Malayan sailor abandoned by a Chinese junk in the 1700s, who settled and likely married into Palauan society, facilitated communication between Palauans and visiting Englishmen (Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, p. 69).

For centuries then, Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders not only continued the traditions they arrived with but also shaped their unique cultural lifeways by effectively assimilating, adopting, and adapting in the process of responding to their environments and other conditions/situations.

Recognition of indigeneity was nested and expressed in different ways due to historical differences. While Chamorros are indigenous to the Mariana Islands (Cunningham, 1997, p. 11; R. A. Underwood, 1983a, p. 3), Guam and the NMI diverge inasmuch as the NMI formally recognizes Carolinians as a second Indigenous group owing to differing histories (see, NMI Constitution, Articles: XII, §4; XIII, §23). Mainland Palauans (descendants of the Peoples who settled the islands/island groups of Kayangel Atoll, Babeldaob, Koror, Peleliu, and Angaur) and Palauan Southwest Islanders are each
considered indigenous to their respective islands/island groupings. Both NMI Carolinians and Palauan Southwest Islanders constitute the smaller of the Indigenous populations in their respective island homelands (see Table 3). Vying for consideration between the Indigenous groups has been part of those island entities’ community dynamics, although during the study, community members stated that those relationships are improving.

Administratively, Guam has a Department of Chamorro Affairs, the NMI has both an Indigenous Affairs Office and a Carolinian Affairs Office, while to date Palau has not developed such an entity. Indigenous rights and issues were addressed in local legislation, within which the term “Indigenous” and like terms were used and Guam’s definition for “Chamorro” was established. However, in the case of the NMI and Palau constitutions, terminology such as “Northern Mariana Descent” and “Palauan ancestry” were used. Alternately, the 1950 Organic Act of Guam, the territory’s organizing statute, only referred to the “inhabitants of the island of Guam” who were Spanish subjects at the time of the US takeover of the island (over 99% of which were Chamorro; J. H. Underwood, 1973, p. 30).

Formal recognition of traditional languages serves as another indicator of indigeneity. Guam and the NMI recognized the Chamorro language, alongside English, as an official administrative language (1 GCA §706), with the NMI also recognizing a third language—Carolinian (CNMI Constitution, Article XII, §3). The Constitution of Palau recognized the “Palauan traditional languages” (emphasis added) as the national languages, while Palauan and English are both official languages (ROP Constitution, Article XIII, §1).

Foreign Administrations and Colonial Relations

Islander ways of life “changed significantly” in response to foreign administrations and colonial relations (Alkire, 1977, p. 3) (see Figure 3). Some characterize this impact more starkly (e.g., Asang, 2004, p. 134). For example, Rapadas et al. (2005) state that, “traditional Chamoru culture on Guam has been under ‘siege’” from “the beginning of post-European
“contact” and that, “[t]he Spanish, Japanese, and the United States at one time or another, deliberate or not, have created and instituted policies that amounted to cultural genocide.” (p. 149)

Figure 3. Foreign administrations, colonial relations, and political statuses of the three study areas.

Chamorros of the Mariana Islands had what has often been referred to as the “dubious distinction” of being the first Pacific Islanders to experience events such as encountering Europeans—Magellan and his crew as they crossed the ocean in 1521 (R. A. Underwood, 1983a, p. 3). This encounter marked the beginning of somewhat regular Pacific crossings, which resulted in interaction with, and sometimes integration of, deserters, beachcombers, priests, shipwreck survivors, and others to the archipelago. This traffic culminated in Father Diego Luis de San Vitores establishing the Pacific’s first Catholic mission in Guam in 1668 (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 47).

Certain changes were set in motion with this widening of the Chamorros’ trading network, including European names for the archipelago and its composite islands, desire for
contact” and that, “[t]he Spanish, Japanese, and the United States at one time or another, deliberate or not, have created and instituted policies that amounted to cultural genocide.” (p. 149)

Chamorros of the Mariana Islands had what has often been referred to as the “dubious distinction” of being the first Pacific Islanders to experience events such as encountering Europeans—Magellan and his crew as they crossed the ocean in 1521 (R. A. Underwood, 1983a, p. 3). This encounter marked the beginning of somewhat regular Pacific crossings, which resulted in interaction with, and sometimes integration of, deserters, beachcombers, priests, shipwreck survivors, and others to the archipelago. This traffic culminated in Father Diego Luis de San Vitores establishing the Pacific’s first Catholic mission in Guam in 1668 (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 47).

Certain changes were set in motion with this widening of the Chamorros’ trading network, including European names for the archipelago and its composite islands, desire for
new trade goods especially iron, and a likely decline in population (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 8; Shell, 2001). Such changes intensified over time as the Spanish crown formally claimed ownership of the islands. Representatives of Spain emptied out islands, consolidating most Chamorros into a handful of Catholic church-centered villages on Guam while many Chamorros defended themselves against these impositions. Early Spanish history on Guam tells stories of disruption, disease, warfare, and the like that caused the Chamorro population to suffer near extermination—plunging from an estimated 24,000 to 40,000 or more down to some 1,300 by 1786 (Shell, 1999; J. H. Underwood, 1973, pp. 12-16 & 18-20). Spain established a formal colonial government and ruled the Mariana Islands for over 200 years, until 1898 when they lost the Spanish-American war.

Palau and the rest of Micronesia had very different relationships with Spain. Although Spain theoretically claimed Micronesia as early as 1529 (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 12), in reality, its administration and church had no real presence or direct impact outside of the Mariana Islands until 1885 (Alkire, 1977, p. 26; Hezel, 1995, p. 3). Active Spanish presence in Palau lasted a mere 14 or so years and consisted of a handful of individuals. Certainly, this helps to explain the uneven presence of tangible and intangible Spanish heritage in the Marianas (especially in Guam which was the Spanish administrative center) compared to its virtual non-existence in the rest of Micronesia (see Galván, 1998, pp. 65-126).

At the conclusion of the Spanish-American war in 1898, colonial powers divided up the Chamorro homeland—separating Chamorros as a People. As a concession for losing the war, Spain ceded Guam to the US. Shortly thereafter, the northern Mariana Islands, along with Palau and the rest of Spanish-held Micronesia were sold to Imperial Germany. This was a time when some Chamorro and Carolinian families on Guam opted to settle/re-settle in the northern Mariana Islands (see Hattori, 2006b; Olopai & Flinn, 2005, p. 10; Spennemann, 1999; 2007b). For the next 40 years, Chamorros were governed by different colonial administrations, educated in different languages, exposed to different cultural
influences, and eventually found themselves associated with enemy forces on opposite sides of a war not of their own making.

Each of these actions by Spanish, German, American, and later Japanese colonizers occurred without consultation with the Islanders. Germany’s reign over these islands was relatively short, some 14 years (Spennemann, 1999; 2007b). At the beginning of World War I (1914), Japan assumed control of the German-held Micronesian Islands. Although officially acting as a trustee of the islands for the League of Nations (Higuchi, 1995, p. 87; Purcell, 1976, p. 190), the Empire of Japan maintained an effective colonial presence for over 30 years, until the end of WW II in 1945. Japan’s colonial reign differed notably from the Spanish, German, or the US in that each of the latter countries maintained a relatively small presence in the islands. However, under Japan’s reign, Micronesians eventually found themselves outnumbered (Hezel, 1995, p. 190).

During WW II, Guam was captured and occupied by Japanese forces for nearly three years. In one sense, Chamorros from Guam and the NMI were politically reunited. However, in reality, Chamorros from Saipan were sent to Guam to help the Japanese occupy and administer the Guam Chamorros. It has been said by some that the role of Saipan Chamorros in this often brutal enemy occupation was a more painful experience and harder for Guam Chamorros to absolve than the roles played by the Japanese. This brief period in Chamorro history, along with other factors, has had long-term effects on the cultural cohesiveness of Chamorros (R. F. Rogers, 1995, pp. 249-250).

WW II affected these populations differently. For Guam the coming of US troops was a welcome “re-invasion” by those with whom they had spent the last 45 years. For other island entities, such as the NMI and Palau, the coming of US troops represented an enemy invasion by those linguistically, culturally, physically, and otherwise dissimilar to former colonial representatives.
Following the end of WW II, the United Nations (UN) placed all Micronesian islands of the former Japanese-administered League of Nations Mandate under a US administered strategic trusteeship known as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI or TT). In a sense, all three island entities became part of the US “family.” However, the stipulations of the Trusteeship Agreement enshrined Islanders’ rights, reinforcing real cultural and political differences and consolidating their separate identities. This in turn led to separate paths being taken in terms of their relationships with the US. Victoria Lockwood (1993) states that, “[t]he decolonization of many Pacific Islands societies has been one of the most important transformations sweeping the region in recent decades” (p. 9) and indeed, this period of time transformed Micronesia in many ways.

The trusteeship required the US to, among other obligations,

foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and shall promote the development of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; and to this end shall give to the inhabitants of the trust territory a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the territory; shall develop their participation in government; and give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants in providing a system of law for the territory; and shall take other appropriate measures toward these ends. (“Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands,” 18 July 1947, Article 6(1); emphasis added)

While TTPI entities such as Palau and the northern Mariana Islands were thus set on the long path to possible independence, Guam returned to being a military-governed US possession with Guam Chamorros remaining US wards (Hattori, 1996, p. 60; R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 214). Julian Aguon (2012) partly explains how neighboring islands under oversight by the same nation embarked upon different paths by noting that the UN Charter,

did not provide a universal regime of decolonization. Instead, it recognized ‘two categories of subjugated peoples to whom two different regimes applied.’ The first category, dealt with under Chapter XI, was denominated ‘non-self-governing territories’ and included the colonial possessions of Western states. At base, Chapter XI requires colonial rulers, or Administering Powers, to assume a ‘sacred trust’ obligation to promote the welfare of the peoples they administered. The second category was denominated ‘trust
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territories’ and was dealt with under Chapters XII and XIII. Trust territories referred to peoples and places previously subjugated by the defeated Axis Powers, and they alone were explicitly expected to evolve, under an administering state selected by the United Nations, toward independence. (p. 51)

Around the same time, in 1946, Guam was placed on the UN list of Non-Self-Governing Territories (J. Aguon, 2009; UN, “International Week of Solidarity”). This meant that the US was to report annually to the UN regarding the island’s status (R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 208). Furthermore, the US had an obligation to assist the Peoples of its territories (including Guam) to freely self-determine new political statuses (J. Aguon, 2009). However, the US did not provide Guam the same opportunities to consider and negotiate its postwar political status that the other TTPI Micronesian islands were provided, and today, its political status is considered “unresolved” (Ada & Bettis, 1996, pp. 128-135; Petersen, 2004, p. 45; Stayman, 2009, p. 9). Guam Chamorros were granted limited US citizenship in 1950 and limited self-government in 1968 (Ada & Bettis, 1996, pp. 128-131; Hattori, 1996). At present, Guam is an unincorporated territory of the US with the degree of incorporation, the grant of citizenship, and the application of the US Constitution each determined by the US Congress (within which Guam has only limited representation with no real voting power) (Aguon, 2009; 2012, p. 67; R. A. Underwood, 2006, p. 7). As of 2012, the UN continues to consider Guam one of the handful of remaining “ Territories to Which the Declaration on Decolonization Continues to Apply” (UN, 2008b) and the island’s People continue to petition the US for self-determination (Aguon, 2009). In recognition of this, the Obama administration agreed to match local funding for “decolonization efforts” (News Release, 20 June 2011).

The northern Mariana Islands perceived advantages to Guam’s relationship with the US but, after a failed attempt at reunification with Guam, sought a superior one for their own situation (Farrell, 1991, pp. 520-623; R. A. Underwood, 2006, pp. 10-11). Negotiations with the US culminated in a commonwealth status in 1986 that appeared to give the NMI
more authority in matters relating to immigration, labor laws, land rights, and other matters (R. A. Underwood, 2006, p. 11). In subsequent years, however, many of these prerogatives have been eroded with increasing US federalization in these areas (e.g., Aguon, 2012, p. 54; McPhetres, 2010, pp. 145-147; 2011, pp. 191-193).


As noted in Table 3, island demographics are changing. While Indigenous Islander populations constitute a plurality in Guam and the NMI (if the NMI Chamorros and Carolinians are counted as the total Indigenous population) and a majority in Palau, other ethnic populations have increased over the years, especially Filipinos, who constitute the second largest ethnic group in each island entity. Other ethnic groups, though numerically a smaller presence, are also impacting the islands in their own ways. Public and private conversations heard over the years attest that Indigenous Islander populations are concerned about being outnumbered, losing socio-political control, and culturally surviving as Peoples in their homelands. These are important considerations in and of themselves as well as being factors that can impact historic preservation efforts.

Guam is considered the most developed island entity in Micronesia with the strongest economy, followed by the NMI and Palau (Table 5). It is also considered the most westernized (Owen, 2011, p. 186). The economies of each area rely heavily on tourism. For example, the UN’s Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 2007 “placed Palau as the highest tourism earning country in the Asia-Pacific region in terms of contribution to Gross Domestic Product” (UN, 2008a; Ria, 2008). Various entities within the islands’ communities and the National Park Service (NPS) have encouraged utilizing cultural and historic resources to economically benefit the areas under study, especially as they relate to tourism.
Table 5. Select Guam, NMI, and Palau Economic and Development Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political entity</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Gross Domestic Product</th>
<th>Visitor arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>159,358</td>
<td>$4,100,000,000</td>
<td>1,210,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>53,883</td>
<td>$1,073,000,000</td>
<td>529,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>21,032</td>
<td>$142,461,000</td>
<td>86,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Islander Connection to Heritage

Two sets of dynamics are explored here. Key types of change and change agents that have challenged and changed Islander connection to heritage are identified and briefly discussed. In recognition of the complexity of such dynamics, and important in further creating an understanding of the cultural contexts within which island HPOs exist, advocacy for cultural perseverance comprises the final portion of this backdrop chapter.

Change and Change Agents

Over the centuries, profound and diverse changes have occurred in the Micronesian islands (e.g., Hezel, 2001). This section will be limited to briefly outlining a number of the change agents pertinent to this study. Some of these agents have been demographic changes, a cash economy, formal education systems, religious entities and the religions they imported, social science research, and a range of bilateral development initiatives. Noticeable change has also been generated by foreign government and administrative systems—the forms of colonialism they imposed, the modern island governments they have encouraged, and the current relationships these governments have with the western Micronesian islands. In general, development and globalization have caused discernable change as well. Each of these has impacted Islander epistemologies, connections to the land, and transmission of traditional knowledge, which subsequently impact historic preservation activities.

One of the first changes that Islanders in Micronesia contended with from contact with Europeans were demographic ones—heavy population loss due to introduced diseases and warfare in some cases, influxes of different Peoples to island communities, and outflows of
Islanders moving elsewhere (e.g., Hezel, 1995, pp. 111 & 116; R. A. Underwood, 1983a, pp. 3-7). These changes altered island social structure and disrupted a certain amount of knowledge transmission from one generation to the next (e.g., Hezel, 1995, p. 59). The increased presence of others on each of these island entities increased the presence of other views about heritage—how it is interpreted, which should be more predominant in the public setting, and why certain heritage should receive attention. As has been discussed for Guam, heritage is then a series of contested sites where community factions struggle against one another (R. A. Underwood, 1977).

Islander connection to land is a very strong sentiment that impacts Micronesian life in political, economic, and cultural ways. It is attached to one’s sustenance, genealogy, standing in the community, and connection to other kin who may live, visit, feed from, or work on that same land (Petersen, 2009, pp. 2 & 22; Phillips, 1996, pp. 14-15). Former governor of Guam, Ricardo J. Bordallo, expressed Indigenous Islander connection to land this way (as cited in Phillips, 1996): “This land, tiny as it is, belongs to us just as surely, just as inseparably, as we belong to it. No tragedy of history or declaration of conquest, no legalistic double-talk can change that fact” (p. 2; emphasis added). Hattori (1996) illustrates the centrality of concern regarding land within Chamorro views:

Although issues such as discriminatory practices and unsatisfied political desires for U.S. citizenship and civil government plagued [Guam] Chamorros, military land grabbing was the critical concern of the postwar Chamorro population. The appropriation of land by the military touched Chamorro lives unlike any other imposition of the U.S. government. (p. 60; emphasis added)

Colonial authorities introduced the concept of individual land ownership, changing much of the traditional island concept of clan land managed by the head(s) of the family and other customary considerations (Crocombe, 1987, pp. 14-18). Additionally, as Micronesians were moved about by external forces, suffered devastation from WW II, or migrated elsewhere, there has been a disconnect from land (and the heritage upon it). For some, this
has meant loss of associations with ancestral burials and understanding family connection to
the land. For the People of Peleliu State, Palau, Stephen Murray (2006) has described such
loss this way: “This sense of disorientation, of being unable to locate home, village, and
burial sites, caused particular anguish for a people whose former lives and sense of identity
were so intimately connected to place” (p. 269).

The introduced cash economy, furthermore, has changed much of how island society
operates and values its heritage. Stories of proposed foreign development—often large scale,
multi-million or multi-billion dollar developments—has challenged traditional attachments
to land and land’s function within island societies. The temptation of monetary gain affects
people in other ways as well. Island heritage has been offered for sale to personal collectors
and museums and can at times be found for sale on the Internet at sites such as eBay. These
activities are generally not allowable according to historic preservation legislation in the
islands under study (19 PNC, Chp. 1, Sub-chapter 6, §182; CNMI HPA [1982] §5g & 11; GCA
Chp. 76).

Two considerations distinguished the three island entities from each other: the rules of
who can own land and who owns island heritage. In Guam, ancient Chamorro and other
heritage is sold along with the land. Non-Chamorros can own land and thereby the ancient
pottery sherds, latte (house columns of stone), and other heritage located within it. In the
NMI, land ownership is limited to people of NMI descent; however, a source of heavy
public debate has been whether or not to open land ownership to others (McPhetres, 2011, p.
152). The NMI HPO staff stated that all tangible artifacts, however, are recognized as
heritage belonging to the People of the NMI, held in trust by the government (CNMI HPA
[1982] § 9 & 11). Similar to the NMI, in Palau only Indigenous Palauans, Palau citizens, can
own land. However, in both the NMI and Palau, long-term leases (which can be some 50 to
99 years long) are allowable and circumvent this limitation. Heritage on Palauan land
belongs to or is controlled by the individual, family, group, or state that owns the land or
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holds it in trust. Anecdotal evidence in each island area suggests that the question of whether to follow customary traditions or Western-type laws regarding the ownership, sharing, or control of land and its related heritage have become matters taken up legally in the island court systems.

Introduced education has been one of the strongest challenges to customary behavior, valuation, and perception (A. Flores, 2006; Soalablai, 1996, p. 19; Useem, 1950). The burgeoning study of Indigenous epistemologies relates directly to this concern, with scholars such as D. W. Gegeo (2001b), D. W. Gegeo and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo (2001), Konai Thaman (2003), and Max Quanchi (2004) arguing that the prevalence and promotion of non-Indigenous languages and largely imported education systems, foreign instructors, and another culture’s textbooks, intentionally or not, are hegemonic devices that both privilege and embed external epistemological concepts into an island society’s consciousness (for an example of this in Micronesia, see Soalablai, 1996, p. 21). This includes embedding other ways of perceiving and valuing island actors, institutions, culture, and heritage. Those external perceptions and values can become what are thought to be “proper” or “normal” while customary island perceptions and values may be considered “backward,” “superstitious,” of less importance, not based in “reality” or “fact,” or as “incompetent” (Gegeo, 2001b, p. 181; see also, R. A. Underwood, 1983b; 1983c). Some in Micronesia have expressed concern that, formally, certain cultural resources may not even be recognized as “heritage” at all because they do not neatly fit into the foreign-introduced definitions (though some are working to expand this). This may feed into why only a relatively small number of surveyed people in Guam thought that their culture could “Definitely” be preserved (O’Neill, 2005, p. 60).

Related to this are the perceptions and values brought to the islands by introduced religions. Particular aspects of tangible and intangible Islander heritage have been challenged by religious representatives, such as the burning of guma uritao (Chamorro
bachelors’ houses) and limiting the “number of feasts that could be held” in Palau (Bevacqua, “Transmission of Christianity;” PSECC, 1994, p. 9; Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, pp. 123-124). From these encounters, Islanders have been left with questions: Are certain island heritage sites sacred? Does one continue to recognize the existence of ancestral spirits and ask the customary permission to enter an ancient Indigenous site? Should one fear ancestral burials or heritage on one’s land? All are important questions and all difficult to answer. Even Islanders who have pondered these questions in depth are not always sure how to answer them.

This study proffers that the presence of anthropologists and certain other researchers as well as of Peace Corps Volunteers and volunteers from similar entities such as the Japan International Cooperation Agency and the Taiwan Technical Mission, have in many ways validated island Peoples, their cultures, and their values (see, e.g., Kluge, 1991, p. 18) by listening to Micronesians, documenting their cultural practices, and at times serving as their advocates (e.g., R.A. Underwood, Pers. Comm., as cited in Marsh-Kautz, 2002, p. 57). Further, some of these anthropologists and volunteers spread liberal ideas and, for at least some, their work “was [seen and perpetuated as] largely committed to an anti-colonialist perspective” (Petersen, 2005, p. 310).4

This presence and set of activities occurred more within the rest of US-affiliated Micronesia than in the Mariana Islands, including Saipan, the seat of the TTPI administration (Diaz, 1993; 1995; Kiste, 1999, pp. 444-445).4 This resulted in Islander heritage becoming nested within Guam, the NMI, and Palau in very different ways.5 This resulted in Islander heritage becoming nested within Guam, the NMI, and Palau in very different ways.85 Researchers and others have frequently assessed the absence of “authentic” Indigenous culture in the Mariana Islands while celebrating its vitality in other Micronesian islands such

---

4 In other instances, anthropologists have been viewed more critically as paving the way for ‘Americanization’ of the area in general and increased construction of US military and hotel development projects (see some discussion in Guam “Bill 1-31,” 2011; Rainbird, 2004, pp. 22 & 31-36).
as Palau (Diaz, 1995; Petersen, 2009, p. 218; R. A. Underwood, 1983a, p. 4)—assessments that many continue. Such activities directly influenced how these same island societies view their respective cultures and set expectations for the work of their HPOs.

As noted earlier, Guam, the NMI, and Palau have overlapping, yet distinctive island cultures, colonial experiences, and political relationships with the US. Their modern governments reflect these differences, with Guam and the NMI being incorporated more so (but not fully) into the US system with no overt reference to their traditional government systems. Conversely, Palau is an independent republic that visibly works to balance traditional and modern political systems. For example, a national Council of Chiefs (Rubekul a Belau) advises the President while state governments provide formal recognition of the roles of their traditional chiefs. These modern government systems and relationships with the US directly and indirectly impact the island Peoples, their cultures, and their interaction with the land/homeland and heritage. For instance, the definitions of Chamorros and Carolinians in Guam and the NMI are not based upon racial, ethnic, or cultural definitions. And, reflective of US sensibilities on equality, government activities related to those Indigenous populations are scrutinized for any aspect that may be considered privileged or discriminatory within the larger populations. For Palau, a strong issue has been what level and type of authority and roles should be in the domains of government agencies versus traditional titleholders (male chiefs and female counterparts). These examples speak to HPOs being a cultural broker of sorts, responding to and balancing varied community groups’ perceptions of appropriate HPO roles, functions, and work. Modern political status also influences access to cultural heritage funding and other support. While Guam and the NMI had more access to domestic US programs, Palau had more opportunity to directly participate in regional and international programs such as those offered by the UN.

Increased globalization is a double-edged sword—it exacerbates the issues discussed above, but at the same time can promote appreciation of a culture’s uniqueness. Island
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Historic preservation specialists have often stated that maintenance of cultural heritage become secondary considerations or non-considerations as the traditional functions and the familial and societal structures which used to maintain the cultural heritage (tangible and intangible) shift and change due to the demands and desires of modern life.

**Advocacy for Cultural Perseverance**

Numerous examples exist of Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders defending against colonial impositions and other outside forces; forms of cultural defense ranged from the passive to the subversive, overt, and violent. Islanders employed outsiders as a means to meet local goals (e.g., Bevacqua, “Châmpada;” Nero, 1987, pp. 50 & 53; 1989, p. 122; Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, pp. 74-76). Islanders continued to primarily follow local leaders (e.g., Madrid, 2006, p. 10), and took other direct actions such as burning churches, staging military attacks against colonial forces, and in at least one case, even assassinating a colonial administrator (see, e.g., R. F. Rogers, 1995, pp. 58-87).

Over the years, Islanders have utilized the colonial institutions, rules, and regulations to meet their causes. They successfully used island courts against their colonial masters (e.g., Madrid, 2006, pp. 123-124). Petitions were formulated (Hattori, 1996, pp. 58-59). A walk out of an advisory body constructed by colonial authorities was staged (Hattori, 1995; 1996). And, eventually, they each worked to negotiate new modern political statuses, some successfully, some still in negotiation (Ada & Bettis, 1996; Farrell, 1991, pp. 520-623; Marsh & Taitano, 2012, p. 147; Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, pp. 242-287).

Perhaps most relevant here is the persistence of language, customs, and cultural values for all cultural groups explored in this thesis. This is in the face of decades or centuries of colonial and military governments that at times discouraged, denigrated, or banned public usage of island Indigenous languages and certain customary practices (e.g., Bevacqua, 2010; R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 140). Despite this, one can still hear *Chamoru*, Carolinian, *tekoï er a*
Belau (Palauan), and Ramari Dongosaro (Sonsorolese) and Ramari Hatohobei (Tobian) spoken in their homelands. \(^{90}\) Daily and ceremonial customs are still a very visible part of island life and certainly, underlying this behavior is the continuation of core cultural values (see, e.g., Diaz, 1994; Nero et al., 2000; R. A. Underwood, n.d.).

There has been the continuance of self-identification as *Taotao tano’*, *Repaghuluwósch*, *Rechad er Belau*, *Saori Dongosaro*, and *Tsouri Hatohobei*. \(^{91}\) For example, a Chamorro-Spanish history expert notes that in his estimation, despite Chamorros adapting and adopting many Spanish characteristics over time, there was always a sense and pride of being Chamorro and that for the most part they were not attempting to become Spanish *per se*, but improving their standing within the Chamorro system of rank and status (C. Madrid, Pers. Comm., 24 Feb 2006). This type of behavior likely holds true for all groups examined here. Of the groups discussed, thus far, Chamorros have had to deal with the greatest challenge to their continued existence as a People and culture inasmuch as, for decades, people have publicly assessed that neither to continue to exist. Chamorro rights advocate Robert A. Underwood (n.d.) provides an example:

> When the Americans first arrived on the scene, they found a people whose self-image had been limited by colonial rule. But more than that, the Americans found a group of Pacific Islanders who were fully clothed, farmed rather successfully, and were already Christians. The conclusions were rather predictable. They weren’t Pacific Islanders at all but rather an admixture of Mexicans, Spanish and Filipinos who just happened to speak Chamorro. \(^{92}\) (p. 10)

An important part of this discussion however, is that while Islanders did successfully resist and adapt—to Chamorroize, Carolinianize, Palauanize, and so forth, one must consider the balance of power. Though core elements of a culture may resist or survive, large portions of its socio-cultural, political, and other elements may suffer. Colonial discourse can become “incorporated and internalized within the colonized such that colonial interests and motives become embedded in or embraced by the colonized” (Kushima, 2001,
This, in part, is what this thesis attempts to explore. To what degree are Indigenous concepts of heritage and other values present and actualized given the history of colonial forces and modern situations?
Chapter Three
Contextualizing Micronesian Historic Preservation

Providing the socio-cultural and political contexts of the islands under study provides a foundational understanding of some of the pertinent issues related to historic preservation and their evolution over time. This chapter continues to build on this contextual understanding of salient issues in Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau. It is comprised of two parts. The first section provides a brief overview of the development of historic preservation offices (HPOs) in those islands. The second section explores some of the underlying Islander ways of thinking about and approaching conservation efforts such as historic preservation. These stories provide insight into the ways in which the HPOs under study differ from those found elsewhere and from one another as well. Each section helps provide the lay of the land, so to speak, for the issues discussed in subsequent chapters.

Overview of Historic Preservation in the Mariana Islands and Palau

This section provides a roadmap for understanding key issues concerning historic preservation in Guam, the NMI, and Palau. The setting is first established by outlining the initial stages of those islands’ modern historic preservation efforts as mandated by the US National Park Service (NPS) and local historic preservation statutes. Overviews of their HPO structure and personnel comprise the last elements shared.

The Introduction of Modern Historic Preservation in the Islands

Over the centuries, Micronesians have developed, refined, and practiced their own particular forms of managing resources—cultural, environmental, and otherwise. As O’Neill (2005) points out, “the fundamentals were different and the processes by which they
occurred were also different" from contemporary methods (p. 291) (see Figure 4). As a Guam HPO report notes, methodology and activities were integrated into “the traditions of everyday life,” for example by “the passing down of stories, fishing...and canoe building skills, or caretaking of the land” (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, p. 25; O’Neill, 2005, p. 291).

However, in the 1960s and ‘70s, modern historic preservation entered Micronesia as a formal concept and institution (Force, 1977, p. 5; King, 2006) (Table 6). In 1966, the United States (US), building upon prior legislation, enacted the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The NHPA, provided for NPS [the US National Park Service] to give matching grants to ‘states’ to support preservation activities, established an ‘Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’ to advise the President and Congress on historic preservation matters, and at Section 106 required agencies of the U.S. government to ‘take into account’ the effects of their actions on historic properties. (King, 2006, p. 505)

Though “states” at that time included domestic entities such as American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico (NHPA, 1966, US Pub. L. No. 89-665), it was not until 1974 that the Act was amended to include the TTPI areas (King, 2006, p. 505).

In response to the enactment of the NHPA, in 1966, “the Governor of Guam designated Paul B. Souder, Director of Tourism, as the First State Liaison Officer for Historic Preservation” (Parks Division—DPR et al., 1976, p. 23). The island established a formal HPO in the ‘70s, supported by federal and local funds (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, p. 25).

After the 1974 amendment, the TTPI government likewise created an office to carry out historic preservation activities across the territory (King, 2006, pp. 505-506; Parker, 1987, p. 17) (see Appendix B for organizational chart). Regarding this early work, NPS Archaeologist Rudo (2001) notes,
Figure 4. Traditional management practices exert an interest that transcends time and have made their way into numerous publications over the years as evidenced by the above page from Willard Price’s 1966 book.

While the photograph was taken in about 1938, it is presented to the reader as contemporary with the book they are reading (Price, 1966, following p. 84).
Table 6. HPO History of Micronesian Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political entities</th>
<th>Political status</th>
<th>Year political status in effect</th>
<th>Year HPO formally est’d</th>
<th>Department/Agency HPO</th>
<th>No. of HPO branches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Independent, Compact of Free Association with US</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1988&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Division of Archives and Historic Preservation (national HPO)</td>
<td>1 national office, 4 state offices&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>US Unincorporated territory</td>
<td>1901&lt;sup&gt;97&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1974&lt;sup&gt;98&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Historic Resources Division (HRD), Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 territorial office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Independent republic, Full Member of the UK Commonwealth</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Independent republic, Special Member of the UK Commonwealth</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a&lt;sup&gt;101&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>US Commonwealth</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1982&lt;sup&gt;102&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Division of Historic Preservation, Department of Community and Cultural Affairs (DCCA)</td>
<td>1 commonwealth office, 2 island district offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>Independent republic, Compact of Free Association with US</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1991&lt;sup&gt;103&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior and Outer Island Affairs</td>
<td>1 national office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>Independent republic, Compact of Free Association with US</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1978&lt;sup&gt;104&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Bureau of Arts and Culture/Palau HPO, Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>1 national office; the 16 states may each have a historical and cultural commission or like entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTPI</td>
<td>Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, US-administered UN trusteeship</td>
<td>1947 – 1994&lt;sup&gt;105&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1974 or shortly thereafter&lt;sup&gt;106&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>HPO in Saipan (TTPI administrative center) with historic preservation committees in island districts</td>
<td>1 administrative center office, 5 island district offices&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TTPI Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service nominated 33 sites to the U.S. National Register of Historic Places, five of which were listed as U.S. National Historic Landmarks. Most of these properties, like the German-era deBrum House on Likiep Atoll in the Marshall Islands and the Japanese Artillery Road on Pohnpei in the FSM, represent colonial history. There are notable exceptions though; for example, the megalithic residential complex of Leluh on Kosrae and the carved stone monoliths of Melekeok in Palau. (p. 5)

Owing to the requirements for professional expertise (e.g., archaeologists), heads of the program recognized that Micronesians were not completely in charge of their programs. To counteract this situation, two key conditions were emplaced: that Micronesians largely comprise district historic preservation committees and that contracted professionals work closely with Micronesian communities. Additionally, recognizing that contracted professionals were “doing the work that they thought was necessary, not what Micronesians wanted done,” the former TTPI ‘State’ Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Thomas F. King remarked that something “had to change” (King, 2006, p. 508; emphasis in original). The TTPI SHPO proposed,

that the contributed services of traditional cultural experts—usually elders—should be valued at the same rate as PhD archaeologists. This took some NPS archaeologists rather aback, but it made perfectly good sense to Steve Newman [‘then the head of the NPS historic preservation grants program’], and we put the system into place. This helped the local committees break loose NPS grant funds to support things other than the archaeological research and historical documentation that scholars were interested in (King, 2006, pp. 507 & 508; emphasis in original).

Another significant difference between the development of the Micronesian HPO programs has been the way in which the US has viewed its responsibility toward assisting the offices. Following the approval of the Compacts of Free Association, freely associated state (FAS) HPOs were established “differently from the beginning due to factors that addressed the FAS as independent countries—and assisting them to develop self-sufficient programs” (P. Falk-Creech, Pers. Comm., 9 March 2009). NPS official, Patricia Parker (1994), notes that when a resources study\textsuperscript{107} was conducted for Palau and other FAS entities, there was concerted effort to “ensure that the study was truly Micronesian, and of maximum
usefulness to the Micronesian governments,” and that from the research, “the United States and the Micronesian governments can realize the goal of balancing tradition and change through preservation programs that protect and enhance Micronesian cultural traditions” (pp. v & ix; emphasis added). As these islands achieved their newly negotiated political statuses (commonwealth or independence), they each developed their independent HPOs. Though other surveys with their own frameworks and goals to identify resources did occur in Guam and NMI over the years, Guam and the NMI were not included in this particular resource study.

For the purposes of administering the NHPA, the political entities derived from the former TTPI each also became considered a ‘state’ along with the 50 states of the US and other US insular areas (NPS, 2007, p. 1-1; NHPA, Title III, § 301, No. 2). Typically, a state with an approved historic preservation program becomes eligible for grants-in-aid from the US Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) which the NPS administers. Around 1979, the usual matching funds required for these grants were waived for Micronesian entities (King, 2006, p. 515; see, 1 NHPA, § 101(e)6(A)). Matching funds are also not required for Guam and the NMI (Tucker, 2011; 2012). As King (2006) reveals, “Up until that point, TTPI areas were not really able to participate in the historic preservation program in a meaningful way as they did not know how to or have the means to match funds” (p. 506).

As spelled out in US 36 CFR Part 61, the Procedures for State, Tribal, and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs, SHPOs are required to have a minimum set of professional staff that meet the US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards (in addition to technical staff). These standards require bachelors’ or relevant professional degrees as well as substantive experience (NPS, “Professional Qualifications Standards”). Each office under study was staffed with an archaeologist and a historian, while the requirement for an architectural historian was waived (e.g., THPS, 1978, p. 1; Zotomayor, 2011). Palau, which had an Oral History and Ethnography Section, was additionally staffed with a cultural
anthropologist/ethnographer who worked closely with the staff historian. If vacated, the professional positions “must” be filled in a “timely manner” (US 36 CFR 61.4(e)(3)).

The NPS grant for Micronesian HPOs requires that each must conduct an annual in-house survey.\textsuperscript{110} For Guam and the NMI, the office must also nominate at least one cultural resource annually to the US National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).\textsuperscript{111} Though Palau had resources registered into the NRHP during the TTPI administration, as an independent nation it developed its own national register to which it nominates resources. Each year, the Survey and Inventory/Archaeology Section and the Oral History and Ethnography Section of the Palau HPO coordinate an in-house state survey.\textsuperscript{112} The number of nominations submitted for consideration into the Palau (National) Register of Historic Places (PRHP) is determined internally with NPS approval.

Unlike Guam and the NMI, the Palau government operates a second tier of historic preservation programs within a state. Palau recognizes and encourages the 16 states within its nation to develop historic preservation boards, laws, and programs (19 PNC, Sub-chapter III, § 131). During fieldwork, 13 of its states had been recognized by the Palau HPO as having developed historic preservation laws according to a compiled listing posted in-house.\textsuperscript{113}

Each HPO is meant to plan and administer a state-wide historic preservation plan. For NPS purposes, office priorities are to identify, survey, maintain, register, protect, and promote cultural resources, as well as serve as the state’s regulatory agency for historic preservation issues. However, the individual governing statutes of Micronesian HPOs reveal that they are driven by other, locally set mandates as well. The NPS evaluates historic preservation programs for “consistency” with the US National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA § 2, Title 1, § 101(b)2(C)).

American Samoa and US-affiliated Micronesia fall under the oversight of the NPS’s Pacific West Region. Entities in this office’s purview are: the Unincorporated territory of
American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Guam, the NMI, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), and Palau. An American Samoa and Micronesia Program Officer is situated in this office (P. Falk-Creech, Pers. Comm., 9 March 2009).

The Historic Preservation Statutes of Guam, the NMI, and Palau

Guam’s enabling statute enacted in 1969 (Pub. L. 10-68), is now found in Chapter 76 of the Guam Code Annotated (GCA) (Guam HPO, see Figure 5). Originally, one of its articles called for the creation of a Guam Institute of Spanish-Chamorro Culture but that article was repealed. Nonetheless, the article reflects the thinking in Guam at the time historic preservation was taking its initial foothold in the island socialscape.\textsuperscript{114} Since that time, additional clarifications of Guam’s historical preservation statutes have come in the form of at least two Executive Orders from the island’s governors, two public laws, and the issuance of general guidelines from Guam’s HPO. Much of the focus of these later documents serves to provide guidelines on dealing with human remains, an issue that surfaced especially in the 1980s during the construction of hotels for Guam’s burgeoning tourism industry in an area that is rich in ancient heritage.\textsuperscript{115} Tangible cultural heritage in Guam legally belongs to the landowner, though according to Guam HPO staff, it may not be sold on- or off-island, as such.

Although treatment of ancient Chamorro human remains has been a contentious issue among some of Guam’s Chamorro Indigenous groups since at least the 1980s, this matter has not become significant in the other two study areas where Indigenous rights advocacy and human remains disturbance have generally not been as inflammatory. This contentiousness on Guam demonstrates the inhabitants’ awareness of the stakes to them as a People. During this project’s fieldwork, two protests against disturbances of the sites of ancient Chamorro human remains, or “ancestral cemeteries,” as one Guam HPO staff member labeled them, occurred (see Figure 6). These protests were lodged against, firstly, a
condominium development project at Gogkña (Gun) Beach and, secondly, the Guam Hotel Okura expansion project (Martinez, 2007a; 2007b). The fact that ancient Chamorro burial treatment has remained controversial for decades, coupled with the fact that the burial treatment guidelines have been revisited and restated time and again, further illustrates the extent to which this issue remains unresolved. In fact, in 2011, a bill was introduced to alter substantially the procedures for dealing with human remains, especially ancestral Chamorro remains (Guam “Bill 1-31,” 2011).

Another feature that differentiates Guam’s historic preservation community from the rest of Micronesia is the existence of the Inangokkon Inadahi Guåhan, the Guam Preservation Trust (GPT). The GPT was created in 1990 by Guam Public Law 20-151. Although the GPT is a government-created, government-fee-funded organization, it was created to be a semi-autonomous non-profit public corporation. It does not regulate historic preservation activity (that was placed under the control of the Guam HPO), but rather it was created to support historic preservation-related activities for the good of the community (Inangokkon Inadahi Guåhan—GPT, “About us”). The office primarily undertakes self-determined capital improvement projects, and also awards grants to proposals that meet set criteria and gain Guam Historic Preservation Review Board approval.

In the NMI, the HPO (Figure 7) was created by Public Law 3-39, known as the Commonwealth Historic Preservation Act of 1982 (for a brief overview, see Furey, 2006, p. 625). The law has been twice amended since it was enacted. One amendment increased the size of the office’s review board to comply with federal grant requirements and increased the penalty for violations (CNMI DHP, 1997a). The other dealt with the issue of human remains. Additionally, a former NMI historic preservation board member and delegate in the NMI House of Representatives introduced legislation in the NMI Congress to further strengthen the Act (see, “A bill for an Act to amend and add certain Commonwealth Code provisions respecting the Historic Preservation Office, and for other purposes,” 28 July
In 2007, it had passed the House and was awaiting Senate consideration (D. M. Camacho, Pers. Comm., 3 June 2007; Erediano, 2007).

Differing from the circumstances in Guam, NMI HPO staff state that tangible cultural heritage in the NMI belongs to the People of the NMI while in trust by the NMI government, and is not allowed to be removed, taken, destroyed, disturbed, displaced, or disfigured without a permit (CNMI HPA, § 11). To provide more guidance in regards to treatment of human remains, NMI HPO issued and adopted “Standards for the Treatment of Human Remains” which provides for ancient Chamorro remains to be left in situ when feasible, Carolinian remains to be turned over to the Office of Carolinian Affairs, foreign World War II (WW II) remains to be repatriated, and NMI remains held in museums around the world to be repatriated (Russell, 2001).

In Palau, the enabling provisions of its HPO (see Figure 9) are found in Title 19 of the Palau National Code Annotated (PNC). Title 19 also includes provisions concerning “Preservation activities by the States,” the “Palau Museum,” the “Palau National Archives,” and a “Palau Lagoon Monument.” Since Title 19 does not specifically address issues regarding human remains, efforts to amend and update Title 19 had occurred and were awaiting action as of 2012. The Palau HPO encourages families to bury their members in the customary way (on family land within traditional stone burial platforms immediately adjacent to the house) as a way to keep people connected to the land and valuing the heritage within it.

Title 19 states that historic sites and artifacts are not allowed to be replicated and passed off as original or sold. Building on earlier efforts, the Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs and the Palau HPO have led the way in also protecting and conserving intangible heritage by efforts such as holding a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) National Workshop in 2010 as well as ratifying the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH, and co-
Figure 5. The building within which the Guam DPR, including the Guam HPO, is located. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2012.)

Figure 6. Gogkña (Gun) Beach after unauthorized bulldozing of the ancient Chamorro site. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)
Figure 7. NMI HPO is housed within an historic Japanese administration building. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)

Figure 8. John Songsong Castro, Jr., NMI HPO technician, provides a presentation to elementary school children. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)
hosting a national workshop regarding Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture in 2011. In fact, Title 19 refers to the potential of establishing “Intangible cultural property” registries.

Table 7 presents a comparative analysis of the guiding legislation that has been written for the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs. All statutes affirm the precious value of island cultural resources. They also call for government interagency support and cooperation on behalf of historic preservation. Each area’s legislation acknowledges some of the threats to island cultural resources—for example, removal and physical island development—with Guam and Palau noting the threats of “social development” and “increasing foreign contact and interaction,” respectively. In particular, the Palau statute expresses concern that “[a]bsent a thorough and workable plan of historical and cultural preservation and education, the history and culture of Palau are threatened with extinction” (emphasis added). All offices
have been tasked with surveying their area’s cultural resources. Guam and the NMI, understandably, discussed particular issues in relation to the US.

### Table 7. Select Features Recognized in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO Governing Statutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statute feature</th>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of cultural resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Directly address) tangible heritage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Directly address) intangible heritage(^{120})</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for inter-agency support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-level gov’t historic preservation roles</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living National Treasures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to acquire heritage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish local register</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US/Federal relationship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPO to serve as depository</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although all three areas allude to heritage beyond the tangible, Palau’s Historical and Cultural Preservation Act specifically defines and discusses preserving “intangible heritage.” The Act is also the only one to recognize the concept of a “Living National Treasure,” defined by them as “an individual especially skilled or knowledgeable in the arts, customs, traditions, folklore or history of the Republic.” However, the Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities Agency has recognized Chamorro Masters of Folk and Traditional Arts (5 GCA Chapter 85A) while the NMI may also have similar programs.

Furthermore, Guam, the NMI, and Palau have structured their HPOs differently and the three offices sit within a distinct government department or ministry. In Guam, the HRD carries out the tasks of the HPO and is housed within the DPR. In the NMI, the office exists as the Division of Historic Preservation under the DCCA.\(^{121}\) In Palau, what had in earlier days been the Division of Cultural Affairs has more recently evolved into a Bureau of Arts
and Culture (BAC) under the Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs. The BAC implements the nation’s HPO duties.122

**HPO Structure**

Guam’s HPO “manages six NPS-approved program areas”—administration, planning, review and compliance, survey and inventory, Guam and National Register, and other/outreach/public education. At the time of fieldwork in 2007, there were nine staff positions. The Director of the Guam Historic Resources Division has often served as SHPO (or Guam Historic Preservation Officer (GHPO)), though at times the responsibility has sat with the Director of the DPR. The Historian’s primary responsibilities were to work with the Guam and national registers and outreach/public education. The State Archaeologist oversaw two historic preservation specialists and one archaeological technician. These four were primarily responsible for the review and compliance and survey and inventory work. Finally, the office had two program coordinators, one of whom served as a grants coordinator while the other was responsible for office grant compliance. At the time of this study’s fieldwork, staff stated that there was some flexibility in working within and outside these areas to fulfill program requirements. In March 2007, the office’s first Deputy SHPO had just come on board123 and a second archaeologist was working in the office part time, while the planning position was vacant. The HPO also added a librarian to organize its holdings. As of 2012, the office was working to augment its staff in order to handle proposed militarization efforts in Guam.

Ten members were to comprise the Guam Historic Preservation Review Board representing five fields of expertise—archaeology, architecture, Chamorro culture, history, and planning. After appointment by the governor for a four-year term, Board members must obtain legislative approval (Guam Pub. L. No. 20-151). Guam has one review board that oversees both the Guam HPO and the GPT.
The NMI program is the only one of the three studied that has branch offices, with the main office on the island of Saipan and two branch offices located in Tinian and Rota. The NMI government funds the personnel of the local branches. At the time of fieldwork in 2007, each branch office consisted of an Historic Preservation Coordinator who supervised two staff supplied by the mayoral offices. The central office contained the SHPO, Historian, Grants Manager, and Archaeologist. Also within this office was a Review and Compliance Section. Additionally, six historic preservation specialists, technicians, and archaeological field technicians worked closely with the Archaeologist to perform monitor, survey, and inventory work. During this study’s period of fieldwork, most staff in the office rotated their duties to provide various types of public education and outreach. While observing the office, the historian position and one archaeology technician position were vacant, the former of which was being filled on a contractual basis by the NMI’s former Deputy SHPO. Of the three island entities, the NMI supplied the greatest number of locally supported personnel (Table 8). However, in the ensuing four years of study, the NMI HPO lost a number of staff members that were not immediately replaced owing to an economic recession, government cash crisis, and other issues (Zotomayor, 2011).

Table 8. Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO Staff by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island entity</th>
<th>Locally funded</th>
<th>Locally/Federally funded</th>
<th>Federally funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>7 (plus 4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine members were to comprise the NMI’s Historic Preservation Review Board with at least one member from each of the three main islands (CNMI Pub. L. No. 10-71). The NMI was the only area under study that had “experts” from outside the political entity to serve on their review board. This pattern perhaps harks back to the Trust Territory times when
experts were shared across cultural, geographical, and other divides. One Board member surmised that it was because there had not originally been many formally educated experts on-island. Members served four-year terms (CNMI Pub. L. No. 3-39).

As an independent nation, Palau’s HPO diverges in significant ways from the other two HPOs. The NHPA states that the goal of US assistance,

shall be to establish historic and cultural preservation programs that meet the unique needs of each Micronesian State so that at the termination of the compacts the programs shall be firmly established. The Secretary may waive or modify the requirements of this section to conform to the cultural setting of those nations (1 NHPA, § 101(e)(6)(A); emphasis added).

Palau’s HPO is a national government office. However, Palau’s 16 states are also developing their own systems of historic preservation and, in fact, one of the office’s goals in its 2009-2015 strategic plan was to assist states in this development (BAC, 2009). The Palau HPO was divided into five sections—Administration, Oral History and Ethnography, Public Education, Register and Research Library, and Survey and Inventory/Archaeology. It is the only office of the three entities that has a section that focuses specifically on oral history and ethnography and employs a cultural anthropologist/ethnographer to further this goal (although this is the case for other freely associated states within Micronesia).

Furthermore, Palau’s advisory bodies are formulated on different principles than the other two island communities. While members of the Palau Historical and Cultural Advisory Board are selected for their expertise, they are also selected so that each of Palau’s 16 states is represented. Board members are nominated by their respective state governor and confirmed by the nation’s President. All but one were traditional titleholders during the period of initial fieldwork in 2008,125 and most of the Board’s members have served numerous terms. A second advisory-type group also exists, the Klobak er a Ibetel a Cherechar (the Society of Historians). Again, as is culturally important in Palau, one member per state comprises this body. In this case, however, they hold lifetime appointments (BAC, 2012). These members have been further recognized as Living National Treasures at times
This structure allows for the NPS requirement of public input (U.S. 36 CFR Ch.1, 61.4.b.3) but is defined in accordance with the traditional Palauan cultural setting, one in which titleholders and other knowledgeable elders have the credibility, authority, and responsibility to speak and make decisions for the state-specific communities they represent (Asang, 2004, p. 105; Kesolei, 1977).

**Traditional Island Ways of Thinking about and Approaching Conservation**

**Indigenous Epistemological, Cosmological, and Other Considerations**

As a means of laying down the foundation for understanding Micronesian Indigenous values, this section first defines epistemology and cosmology. It then explores Indigenous Micronesian epistemological and cosmological considerations regarding cultural resources and historic preservation. These understandings serve as a platform to identify and discuss Indigenous Micronesian cultural perseverance within HPOs in subsequent chapters.

Epistemological and cosmological considerations were examined from Micronesian and select non-Micronesian viewpoints. There are many influential foreign forces in the islands under study, originating from countries such as Australia, China, Japan, Taiwan (Republic of China), and the US. However, this study restricted itself to examining Western or Anglo-US considerations, since the US founded the Micronesian HPOs and has long been the primary provider of funding. This narrow focus was further considered salient inasmuch as globalization, an increasing force in Micronesia, “however defined, concerns the global spread of mainly Anglo-American knowledge, values, and practices” (Thaman, 2003, p. 7).

---

5 Further, in Micronesia, other forms of public input can be both inappropriate and not meet the intended goals. For example, Patricia Parker (1987) describes public hearings held in a part of Micronesia concerning potential impact to a culturally valued geographic feature: “many people...were literally unable to speak because people of higher status...were present” which “created the [erroneous] impression...that they were not very concerned about such effects” (p. 18).
Epistemology and Cosmology

Epistemology is described as the “study of knowledge and justified belief” (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “Epistemology”) and as “the study of or rules for how we understand the world and what constitutes a valid explanation” (AnthroBase, “Epistemology”), while cosmology is defined as “the study of the nature and origin of the universe, or a theory about it” (Cambridge Dictionary, “Cosmology”). In Pacific Studies and related fields, the terms are often used to identify a particular People’s way of viewing, understanding, knowing, and interacting with the universe and elements within it (see, e.g., Baldacchino, 2008; Bevacqua, “Mo'na;” Fahim & Helmer, 1980; Quanchi, 2004). The growing field of Pacific epistemologies recognizes that Indigenous Islander populations construct and think of their universe, environment, and society, in distinctive ways (e.g., Hau'ofa, 1993; 1998). This study briefly discusses Indigenous Islander perspectives relative to historic preservation issues, although it is beyond the purview of this thesis to explore how or why these constructions or ways of thinking are in place.

Epistemology and Cosmology Considerations Related to Micronesian Historic Preservation

Epistemological, cosmological, and other considerations relate to cultural heritage management in many and varied ways. This is increasingly recognized by those within the US NPS and other entities that support conservation activities. This study aims to contribute to the trend of aligning historic preservation practices to a heightened responsiveness to communities and their epistemologies, providing fodder for the “continually maturing concepts of what constitute cultural resources” and how to document and manage them (NPSCC, n.d., p. 3; Shull, 2001, p. 44).

In this vein, an essential part of this study requires providing the reader with an understanding of Chamorro, Carolinian, Palauan, and Palauan Southwest Islander points of view relevant to historic preservation. Generally speaking, Western/Anglo-US viewing,
understanding, knowing, and interacting with the universe and elements within it differ substantially from those of Indigenous Peoples, including Micronesians and other Pacific Islanders (Hau‘ofa, 1993; Thaman, 2003; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999); though this is not to imply that the ways of thinking are polar opposites. Specifically discussed here are differences in ways of viewing and valuing tangible and intangible aspects of culture, oral history and scientific research and data, natural and built resources, and the function of historic preservation in society.

“Historic Preservation does not always mean the same thing to everybody” (Chapman and Lightner, 1996, p. 11), and Western/Anglo-US Peoples tend to view cultural resources, historic preservation issues, and the proper way to conduct historic preservation work, in particular ways. Director of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, William Chapman, along with then graduate student Delta Lightner (1996) noted:

In the European and North American experience, preservation (or conservation as it is known in Europe) efforts are directed principally at the built environment: historic houses, cities, and more recently, landscapes. Building upon a tradition rooted in conservation of artistic works and bound up as a concept of the primacy of the artifact, Western preservation concerns have generally overlooked issues of process, continuity, tradition, and other more ‘intangible’ features of cultural life. (p. 11)

Jon O’Neill (2005) agrees with this assessment, stating that,

‘western-style’ heritage management has historically displayed a bias towards tangible, material, physical objects. Considerable emphasis has been placed upon preserving buildings and other constructs—houses, castles and other buildings, weapons, tools and machinery, etc. Consequently, elements of heritage that other societies may consider important have not always been well preserved nor even acknowledged as heritage. (p. 49; emphasis added)

This was noted years earlier as well by cultural anthropologist and Chief of the American Indian Affairs Office, NPS, Patricia Parker (1987), who stated, “Traditional history in Micronesia ascribes value to things that might not normally be recognized by Euro-Americans as historic properties” (p. 17).
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These differences are recognized and even advocated for by some within the NPS (O’Neill, 2005, p. 249; e.g., Apple, 1972; Parker, 1994), though NPS policies and guidelines may not be as readily supportive (see similar discussion in King, 2009a, p. 92). Additionally O’Neill (2005) notes, “[t]he NPS frequently finds itself caught between the demands of Washington and the aspirations of the Micronesian offices” (p. 309).

In contrast to the Anglo-US focus on tangible cultural resources, an NPS official noted:

Micronesians as a whole are less interested in their historic properties than in preserving the integrity of their traditional cultural systems. To the extent that historic properties are important to these systems, they are important to Micronesians. Those that do not figure in their traditional systems are not likely to be of great concern, however interesting they may be to archeologists and other scholars from outside the islands (Parker, 1987, p. 17).

Nearly two decades after Parker’s article, O’Neill (2005) finds that this characteristic still holds true in contemporary times. In his study to explore whether “the processes for managing Historic Preservation in Micronesia satisfy evolving preferences of Micronesian Peoples for the preservation of their heritage in ways they consider culturally appropriate” (online questionnaire introduction as available in p. 33) “show[ed] Micronesian cultures clearly regard their non-tangible heritage as significantly more important than any tangible heritage.” He therefore concludes, “[t]his illustrates an attitudinal difference that originates from deep within their cultures and is fundamental to their perception of the value of heritage” (O’Neill, 2005, p. xviii). As such, Micronesians consider such intangible aspects as their traditional knowledge, oral histories, customs, lifeways, languages, chants, dances, and the like, as well as the processes of transmission of these elements, as constituting valued cultural resources.

According to Thomas F. King (2006), author of US historic preservation texts and pioneer in Micronesian historic preservation development, within Micronesia:

Preserving historic places, cultural places, cannot be isolated from the rest of culture. The only way preserving historic places made sense to traditional Micronesian people was as part of an overall program of cultural preservation. (p. 511)
Indeed, through working first hand in historic preservation offices in Micronesia, this researcher found that documenting and preserving tangible heritage is considered fragmentary at best without the intangible aspects related to it, including its Indigenous name and the layers of meaning behind it; its oral histories; its roles; its functions; people’s recollections and perceptions of it; the associated chants, dances, rituals, and performances; and people’s continuing ability to recall, transmit, and act upon these intangible aspects. Unlike Guam and the NMI, Palau is supported by NPS to document and conserve such intangible facets of its cultural heritage as primary work. Further, this researcher would certainly argue that conserving the related intangible aspects of heritage in ways that are meaningful within Indigenous culture can promote preservation on a grander scale, viewing cultural resources in their tangible and intangible forms. Additionally, such an approach will draw more participation and support from the community itself.

Another difference is noted by archaeologists Darby Stapp & Michael Burney (2002). In historic preservation, Indigenous Peoples such as Native Americans put “a great emphasis on oral histories and traditional beliefs” while Western/Euro-Americans place “a strong emphasis on scientific research and data” (Kluth, 1996, p. 30 as cited in Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 52). Palau HPO’s Archaeological Surveyor made a similar distinction, explaining that, in his experience, Indigenous archaeologists more readily theorize about findings by looking within the culture and oral narratives than do those from non-Indigenous cultures (C. T. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 17 Feb. 2011).

Cultural resources for Indigenous Peoples such as Micronesians can include natural resources—such as caves; trees; sources for raw materials; and hunting, fishing, and gathering areas—as well as spiritual, supernatural and powerful places and landscapes.

---

7 Of particular importance in this reference is the assertion that, “Neither is wrong,” but certainly different.
(Parker, 1987; Poyer, 1992; Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 5). Some of the feeling of the power of sites is connected to the islands as homelands, places where ancestors thrived for thousands of years and became uniquely Chamorro, NMI Carolinian, Palauan, or Palauan Southwest Islander.

Cultural resource identification and nomination forms in the Micronesian offices under study largely mirror the forms developed for the NRHP. The Palau register nomination form, however, has one significant difference; it includes an additional criteria for inclusion into the register, that cultural resources are also recognized as significant if “associated with lyrics, folklores, and traditions significant in Palauan culture” (PDCA, n.d., p. 2). Guam has a local register, which also incorporates at least one locally sensitive difference: that heritage need only be 25 years old to qualify as historically significant (versus the 50-year requirement for the NRHP). This lessening of the age requirement recognizes both the WW II (1944) and Typhoon Karen (1962) destruction of Guam’s structures, as well as the harsh effects of tropical climate on material objects.

With regard to Guam and the NMI, O’Neill and Spennemann (2006a) state that “[h]istoric preservation management processes, functions and attitudes” are “much more closely oriented to U.S. mainland states than are those of the FAS” (p. 581). Their research (2006) cites an interview with Mark Rudo, an NPS archaeologist:

Guam and the CNMI are much more assimilated to sort of mainland U.S. values. They are much more integrated into the U.S. style of capitalist economy whereas the Micronesian nations either haven’t made that transition yet or are only starting to. (p. 581)

Though this may appear to be true in many ways, there is nonetheless interest in Guam and the NMI among the community and HPO staff for their HPOs to be more reflective of

---

8 This is not to say that nomination forms to other registers such as the NRHP could not accommodate these types of associations though this category does not exist in the same fashion.
Indigenous values. However, the socio-political situations of those islands are complex, with a variety of political, economic, and other considerations.

One of the differences between a non-Indigenous cultural resource management program and an Indigenous one is in the relevance of cultural resources that are “essential” “to native Peoples and their ancestral way of life” and the “places and resources for the roles these play in contemporary and future [Indigenous] culture” (Stapp & Burney, 2002, pp. xiv & 2). In this same vein, a consistently promoted HPO public message in Palau is that cultural heritage is important to protect, promote, and conserve for Palauans today, and in the future.

King (2006) voices similar sentiments, with assertions that Micronesians are not interested in cultural resources as “esoteric monuments set apart from their daily lives.” King emphasizes:

> On the contrary, it was their place in people’s daily lives, and in their beliefs about themselves, their ancestors, and their environment, that made such places important. In order to work for Micronesia, any historic preservation program had to be grounded in the same values, the same relationships. (p. 511)

He further points out:

> What made historic places historic in Micronesian terms was not—or was only in a minor way—what Euroamerican history said about them, or what Euroamerican archaeologists could learn from them. It was how they worked in traditional culture, how they informed and maintained traditional identity. Historic places could not be dealt with in isolation; they had to be understood, interpreted, and managed as integral parts of ongoing cultural life. (p. 511)

This chapter has shown some of the key ways that Micronesian ways of thinking and conceiving of historic preservation vary significantly from those of Western/Euro-Americans. Though desire exists in all three offices to better document and conserve intangible cultural resources, particular NPS grant restrictions currently do not readily support such activities (O’Neill, 2005, pp. 248-250).
Further, far from adopting a common approach, the US federal government has been inconsistent in its interactions with the Indigenous Peoples within its borders (see d’Errico, “Sovereignty;” King, 2002, p. 101). One notable example of this inconsistency within the arena of cultural resource management is the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). The Act is meant to “address the rights” of Native Americans to ancestral “human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony” but applies only to select native Peoples within US borders (Aguon, 2009, p. 2; see also, Duryea Jr., 2010, pp. 9-10; NPS, “Appendix R: NAGPRA Compliance”). The Act applies to lineal descendants, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, and Alaska Native villages. Significantly, left out of its purview are the Chamorros as well as NMI Carolinians (Aguon, 2009, footnote 16; R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 13 Nov. 2007; Rainbird, 2000, p. 154) although they are recognized as native Peoples within the US system at other times, such as being eligible to receive Assistance for Native Americans.9,10

Exclusion from NAGPRA demonstrates that while certain recognitions, rights, and allowances have been provided to native Peoples both under the US flag and in nations freely associated with the US, some are denied to Chamorros and NMI Carolinians. Advocating for more equitable treatment then becomes part of the local HPO agenda. For example, Lynda Bordallo Aguon, Guam SHPO, was collaborating with other insular areas—the NMI and American Samoa which exist within the same NPS regional division—to develop a request for comparable ability to receive the same flexibility to conduct work on

---

9 For example, Ferguson (1996) similarly notes that the term Native American includes a variety of Indigenous peoples such as Native Hawaiians and does not constitute a single, monolithic cultural or ethnic group” (p.64).

10 This is not to say that NAGPRA would serve the Indigenous Peoples of the US territories well or that it should be applied given its shortcomings. For instance, various experts have assessed that Native Americans and others are becoming concerned with issues such as its “legalistic character” (King, 2002, p. 103), that it causes “tribes to fight about who is more closely affiliated to these human remains” (T. Begay, 1997 as cited in Bruning, 2006, p. 519), and that it challenges “the sovereignty of tribes” (King, 2002, p. 103) among other issues.
intangible heritage as a primary activity (e.g., documenting and promoting oral history and ethnographic information) that has been accorded freely associated Micronesian states (L. B. Aguon, Pers. Comm., 19 Oct. 2010).

In Palau, even the BAC, which had an Oral History and Ethnography Section supported by the NPS, has been working on increasing its ability to promote and maintain intangible cultural resources. Throughout 2009 and 2010, the Bureau Director/Historic Preservation Officer and the Minister of Community and Cultural Affairs discussed reorganizing the Bureau to incorporate both a Division of Culture and Division of Arts. The Division of Culture would continue its current historic preservation work while the Division of Arts would commit more personnel and time to supporting Palau’s arts of all types. Their efforts resulted in Palau Executive Order No. 267, which provided the Bureau the authority do so. As noted earlier, the Palau HPO also worked with UNESCO on several projects specifically highlighting the protection and conservation of Palau’s ICH—holding a Palau National Workshop: Safeguarding of the ICH (Marsh & Alexander, 2010), ratifying the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH, and co-hosting a workshop to further the safeguarding of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture. The Palau HPO also coordinated with national and international partners to produce a CD of historically recorded traditional Palauan chants. It worked with the German Embassy in the Republic of the Philippines, whose purview includes Palau, to translate early 1900s documentation of Palauan tangible and intangible culture from the German language to modern US English (Toribiong, 2010). This in essence would repatriate this intangible heritage to the People of Palau (the vast majority of whom are fluent in US English, though there was also talk of eventually translating it into Palauan).

While this chapter has provided an overview of the historic preservation organizational and epistemological structures in the three areas under study, the following
chapter examines the registers of historic places into which the Guam, NMI, and Palau
HPOs nominate significant sites.
Section Two

Investigation Results

The three chapters that comprise Section Two impart the core information gathered during the study. Each chapter represents a particular type of data gathered through one of the three different methodologies employed—that of archival research, participant-observation, and interviews. A section prefaces each chapter, outlining the methodological approach employed, including the boundaries, challenges, and limitations to the study and those approaches.
Chapter Four

The Historic Preservation Office Registers

Each historic preservation office (HPO) examined in this study generates a range of outputs—from tangible products such as archaeological reports, to intangible ones like monitoring all earthmoving projects in their territory, commonwealth, or nation. Given the large task of examining three differing historic preservation systems nested within distinct socio-cultural and political contexts, limitations had to be placed on the degree of detail that could be researched within a particular time frame. This study restricted itself to examining in detail the offices’ more visible outputs, in particular the cultural and historic resource registers, which have direct impacts upon their communities and are subject to critique by the public.

This chapter accomplishes two main objectives. First, it weaves together profiles of the HPO registers and second, it examines the degree to which Indigenous values are present. This proved to be a complex task as there is no singular overriding definition or understanding within Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), or Palau of what Indigenous heritage/values are relative to cultural resources, although there are areas of strong agreement. For analytical purposes Indigenous heritage/values are defined as “that heritage created or given its significance during pre-European contact times” (also referred to as “Prehistory,” “PreContact,”131 or “ancient times”). While overly simplistic, this definition provides a convenient baseline from which to discuss the shortfalls of this approach and alternative perspectives on what constitutes Indigenous heritage, or heritage of Indigenous value. Such discussion is necessary in evaluating the degree to which Indigenous heritage/values are present.
Methodological Approaches

Some of the most visible outcomes of the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs are the historic preservation registers into which they have nominated specific sites of island cultural heritage. Others are the production of publications, newsletters, DVDs, and the like. Quantifying their composition and content provided an opportunity to approximate the degree of Indigenous Islander heritage present in the island HPOs’ public outputs, in this case, registers. While this exercise furnished valuable data in and of itself, it also served as a comparative tool since other data gathered for the study were qualitatively based on individual and societal perceptions. Quantifiable data could be used to shed light on gaps that exist between perceptions and actual situations. Brought to light, these issues can then be considered and addressed. To understand the issues further, certain aspects of this work were discussed with interviewees (see “Methodological Approaches” in Chapter Six, p. 143, for interview methods).

Historic Preservation Office Files for Inventories and Registers

Research entailed examining nomination forms for the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO historic property registers. This allowed for an understanding of the types of resources that receive the most recognition. There are limitations to the analysis and findings though. To begin with, it must be noted that it is difficult, given limitations in staffing and budget, for cultural resource registries to be kept completely updated. Part of the issue is that communities change over time—their demography, their character, their views on what is culturally and historically significant, and their expectations of HPO goals and priorities. Along with these dynamics, history itself continues to be created, uncovered, re-analyzed, and restructured. Rapid public and private sector development in these communities adds
to this complexity.\textsuperscript{11} This is further corroborated by Evans et al. (2001), who note that the ideal of building a comprehensive inventory in real practice is often a secondary consideration to monitoring “individual projects and undertakings” (pp. 55-56).

Changes have occurred over time in the formatting and categorization of island HPO data as well as in the requirements and expectations regarding the nomination forms used by these programs. These changes, however, were workable fluctuations for this research endeavor as they did not significantly alter the consistency of the data. They did, however, limit the range of data able to be gathered. For example, categories relating to a cultural resource’s significance existed in different scales and formats on nomination forms throughout the years. There was no attempt to correlate these changes into equitable categories that would work over time. Instead, notes were taken.

The programs’ filing systems posed their own specific limitations. At the time of fieldwork, the Guam HPO, for example, maintained two formal filing systems for their cultural resources—a set each of active and working files. Each of these filing systems was further organized into nine regional areas (see Parks Division-DPR et al., 1976, p. 94). Some files had been removed for use by office staff or researchers, or were temporarily set aside for particular research efforts, and some cultural resources had two or more files apiece that might exist side by side or not. Because cultural resource files were organized by region in two separate filing systems, Guam Historic Properties Inventory (GHPI) inventory numbers, which were the basis for the filing order, could jump dramatically from one file to the next. These leaps between numbers may have led to a certain amount of misfiling and difficulty in tracking down certain files.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{11} As noted by one cultural heritage studies professional, no state within the US could claim a cultural resource registry that is fully current and complete either (D. H. R. Spennemann, Pers. Comm., 31 Oct. 2007). Not that this is a situation particular to the US, but people within island communities commonly compare the achievements of an island government office to the real or imagined achievements of US state government offices.
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In the NMI HPO, all the files were in a single drawer and segregated by island. The straightforwardness of this system and the manageable number of registered resources (35)\(^1\) made access uncomplicated.

Palau’s Register of Historic Places (PRHP) files were likewise housed in one file cabinet, organized by state.\(^2\) All 166 files were in order and in place. The Registrar stated that, since Palau’s independence, the Palau HPO has not kept official copies of the nomination forms which placed six of their cultural resources into the US National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in the 1970s and ‘80s.\(^3\) There were, however, some complete and incomplete NRHP forms in the PRHP files.

By the end of Phase I fieldwork, nine of Guam’s local and national resource files and three of the NMI’s NRHP resource files were not able to be located. For the missing Guam files, assessments from a Guam historic preservation specialist and the office’s Historian (each of whom had worked there for numerous years) were garnered to establish the nature of those registered resources.\(^4\) There were a further 14 Guam nomination files in which the relevant form was either missing or partially illegible or incomplete.

As the NMI was in the process of overhauling the organization of office files and reports, three files were not present in the allocated file cabinet, while another file was noticeably incomplete. Further, a fire in the 1980s may have destroyed some of the original files (see McKinnon & Raupp, 2011, p. 891). Missing descriptions for these files were gleaned from two publications entitled *The Historic Sites on Saipan, Tinian and Rota* (Russell, n.d.) and *Historic and Cultural Sites of the CNMI: The National Register Sites* (Cabrera, 2005), written by the NMI HPO’s former Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer and former Historian, respectively.

In the Guam and NMI files, there was rarely a way to verify whether the nomination form in a file constituted the final, approved nomination form. In a couple of instances, the approval form or letter from the Keeper of the NRHP was stapled to what was presumably
the accepted nomination form. There were also, however, a couple of instances in which a lone nomination form was accompanied by a statement noting the need for revision and resubmission. For Palau, nomination forms were typically complete, including the signatures, which denoted the nomination form’s approval by the appropriate parties. There were a few forms with blank categories while older forms were only available in the Palauan language. To offset some of this, the Registrar provided guidance through portions of the register. This researcher’s understandings were verified with a Palau HPO archaeology technician at a later date.

Though there were limitations to analyzing the files, there is confidence that the findings do reflect the larger picture of the island HPO registers under study. However, tracking down the missing data, obtaining the final versions of accepted nominations, or updating the register forms to reflect the sentiments of today’s island societies could potentially change some of the findings noted in this paper.\textsuperscript{138}

Despite these challenges, or perhaps because of them, it was determined early on that it was important to go through island files rather than the presumably complete nomination forms in a National Park Service (NPS) office. The files on-island are the resources that inform the local HPOs and the island community members who access them. It made more sense then to understand the actual files that performed these actions first hand. The decision to do so also provided opportunity to spend much more time observing and participating in the island offices and connecting with island HPO personnel, who provided a fount of other data as well.

Data regarding the heritage listed on local and national registers comprised: known names; village, island, or state; site number; date registered; type of heritage; time period(s) of heritage; and portions of their Statements of Significance and other details that seemed noteworthy. The name, date, and classification data were entered into Excel spreadsheets and further categorized by island entity. Those statements and other details considered
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noteworthy were placed in a QSR NVivo software program in their own folders and subfolders, distinct from the interview material.

Other Historic Preservation Office Outputs
This research project also examined newsletters, publications, DVDs, and other such materials produced by each of the HPOs. The number and location of re-internment sites were also collected. Attempts were made to locate and visit each of these. Owing to time constraints, this material could only be gathered and examined in a cursory way and is thus considered supplemental (see Appendix D).

Inventories and Registers
The inventories and registers of Guam, the NMI, and Palau were examined in several ways. Profiles were first developed. Based on these foundational understandings, the registers were then examined for levels of productivity. Finally, the presence of and the ability to accommodate Indigenous values were explored by island subdivisions, time periods, and type.

Profiles
The formal registers of cultural resources are among the most fundamental, legally binding, and visible outcomes of an HPO. By the time a property has been inscribed in a register, it has gone through varying degrees of public involvement including nomination, public consultation, and expert review. Inscription into such registers thus signals the significance of a resource to the local, national, and/or international community. These registered resources are often the ones understood as special and thus protected, maintained, and visited, and, as such, are typically seen as representative of an area’s history and culture (see Thomson & Harper, 2000). In fact, this notion was conveyed by the NPS’s first interpretive Historian, Verne E. Chatelain, who wrote that “[t]he sum total of sites which we select
should make it possible for us to tell a more or less complete story of American History” (Mackintosh, 1986, “Inaugurating the Program”).

The roles of historic places have also been described more recently as “to educate, and to present the group publicly, both to the group itself and to other[s]” (Kaufman, 2004b, p. 7). Further, Spennemann (2011) calls to attention their long-lasting impact in that, the mere choice of which sites should be selected for interpretation and which themes and ‘messages’ should be used to interpret a given site/place are inherently social and political decisions as they will influence, if not fundamentally shape, how the visitors and, in the case of school visits, the emergent generation of a local community will interpret the past. (p. 13)

Tours meant to showcase island history and culture in the areas under study commonly center around inventoried and registered sites. In Guam, tours of such sites are further being used as tools to help advocates for Chamorro Indigenous issues explain colonial history from an Indigenous point of view (L. Natividad, Pers. Comm., 4 March 2009; see also, Bevacqua, 2007).

As of August 2007, the Guam HPO had over 1,900 entries officially listed in its GHPI (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, p. 12) (Table 9). Essentially anyone can nominate a cultural resource for consideration beyond the local inventory. Completed nomination forms are examined by the Guam Historic Preservation Review Board, which assesses the resources against the nomination criteria and solicits public and expert input. On Guam, resources that succeed through this process can then be placed into the Guam Register of Historic Places (GRHP) and/or be nominated to the NRHP. If nominated to the NRHP, the resource is assessed against the criteria established by the US Secretary of the Interior. As of July 2007, Guam had 157 cultural resources that had been placed into registries (Table 10). One hundred and fifty-six (99.4%) of these comprise the GRHP while 118 (75.2%) had been placed into the NRHP.

As expected, most of the resources are listed on both the Guam and national registers. Notably, one, the Talagi Pictograph Cave (66-08-1965), was included in the NRHP, but not in
the GRHP at the time of fieldwork. However, HPO staff indicated that it was the office’s intention to nominate it to the local register. As the Talagi Pictograph Cave is one of just a few Guam sites containing pictographs, representing ancient Chamorro cultural activity, it is highly likely to be added to the GHRP. Once this occurs, Guam’s nationally registered resources will completely overlap with the local register. Conversely, 38 properties (24.4%) placed on the local register have not been placed into the national register.¹⁴⁰

Guam placed its first cultural resource, the (World War II (WW II)) Tinta Massacre Site (66-06-1223), into the GRHP in 1971.¹⁴¹ Tinta was one of several sites where Chamorros were massacred by Japanese soldiers during the WW II occupation of the island. Pågat, Yigo (66-04-0022), an ancient Chamorro village, was Guam’s first site to be registered into the NRHP in 1974. The site was “generally considered the best archaeological site located on Government of Guam land...[and] is among the ten best archaeological sites on Guam.”¹⁴² Though from very different time periods and holding very different value, both sites are of significance to Chamorros. Thus, Guam started with solid representations of Indigenous value in these registers.

Table 9. Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO Inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island community</th>
<th>Sites &amp; resources in the inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1,900+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>2,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, September 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

Table 10. Guam, NMI, and Palau Number of Resources Listed on Registers¹⁴⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island community</th>
<th>Local register of historic places</th>
<th>US National Register of Historic Places</th>
<th>US Register of National Historic Landmarks¹⁴⁵</th>
<th>Total registered resources¹⁴⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6¹⁴⁷</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.
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Table 11. Guam, NMI, and Palau Number of Resources Registered by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island Community</th>
<th>Register of historic places</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US NRHP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

More than 90% of Guam’s listings were registered in the 1970s and ‘80s, though they were listed into the two registers at different times and rates (Table 11). This early effort was due to factors such as building upon the archaeology-type work conducted by J. C. Thompson and Hornbostel in the 1920s (Thompson, 1932, p. 3) and L. Thompson (1932), and archaeological surveys by Osborne (1947), Reed (1952), Reinmann (1977), the Bishop Museum Guam Inventory Team (Parks Division-DPR et al., 1976), and the Guam Territorial Archaeology Lab.151

A second busy period for placing resources into the NRHP was the year 1991, when 39 resources (33.1%) were accepted, 38 of which were from those nominated into the local register in 1988. After 1991, registration of resources slowed down considerably. This was largely due to the Guam HPO’s increased emphasis on enforcing local and federal earthmoving regulations associated with island-wide construction booms, leaving little time for office staff to conduct in-house surveys and write nominations (W. Hernandez, Interview, 30 March 2007).

The NMI had 2,684 recorded resources in their inventory as of September 2007 (R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 27 May 2008; 16 Feb. 2008; 19 Sept. 2007) (Table 9). The NMI HPO staff were aware of numerous other cultural resources, but these had not yet been formally identified or recorded into the office inventory.152 The NMI HPO keeps resource records in paper file form, while also inputting site information into their office’s Geographic
Information System (GIS)\(^{153}\) (J. D. Palacios, Interview, 9 May 2007; R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 19 Sept. 2007). In May 2007, the NMI had 35 resources listed on the NRHP (Table 10), among them two US National Historic Landmarks (NHL), the “Landing Beaches; Aslito/Isley Field and Marpi Point” (SP-7-044) on Saipan and the “Tinian Landing Beaches, Ushi Point and North Fields” (TN-6-61). The NMI HPO had not developed a \textit{local} register of cultural resources.

In 1974, the NMI successfully nominated its first four resources into the NRHP (Table 11). Two of these were Pre-Contact Chamorro sites—the House of Taga (TN-2-065) and the Rota Latte Stone Quarry (RT-2-016; also known as As Nieves)—while the other two resources were Japanese administration-era buildings (hospital, SP-6-021 and lighthouse, SP-6-051). With an early history similar to Guam’s, that is, a lengthy pre-European contact history in which ancient Chamorros built \textit{latte},\(^{12}\) but with the difference of lesser physical Spanish administrative presence,\(^{154}\) and later, 30 years of administration by the Japanese who built sturdy buildings of concrete, it is not unexpected that these four types of sites were the initial NMI entries into the NRHP.\(^{13}\)

As part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI), the NMI went through several stages in the process of being established as a TTPI district, negotiating a new political relationship with the US, and then developing the social, political and other infrastructure necessary for becoming a US commonwealth. These stages, coupled with the fact that there was comparatively less archaeological survey work to build upon than in Guam, impacted the islands’ HPO. During TTPI times, the HPO staff described themselves as inexperienced and moreover served all of Micronesia’s far flung districts with different

\(^{12}\) House columns of stone.

\(^{13}\) Sources indicate that two reasons existed for early Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) nomination of heritage to the NRHP: significance to the local communities (Force, 1977, pp. 13-15) and “properties that need immediate grants for preservation” (THPS, 1978, p. 8).
cultures (King, 2006, p. 506). Then, during the transitional years, the NMI established its own office while developing a new locally controlled government system. This resulted in fewer resources being registered in the NMI than in Guam during the same period. Throughout 1981, 1985, and 1986 the NMI had eight, six, and five resources entered into the NRHP, respectively. The archaeological information gained during this transitional period of infrastructural build-up perhaps explains why 60% of the NMI’s cultural resources on the NRHP were registered in the 1980s. However, the substantial time demands of mitigating the deleterious effects of construction booms and other dynamics might also explain why, in some years, no nominations were registered.

The archaeologists and surveyors of the Palau Bureau of Arts and Culture/Palau HPO (BAC) had entered 870 of their cultural resources into their GIS inventory database as of April 2008 (Table 10). Each year, Palau’s Survey and Inventory/Archaeology Section, in conjunction with the Oral History and Ethnography Section, surveys one of the island nation’s 16 states (e.g., Kloulubak et al., 2008; Olsudong & Blaiyok, 1996; Olsudong et al., 2003; 2006; Petrosian-Husa et al., 2003). Geographical and transportation issues drove the strategy to survey the more accessible state coastal areas first. The completion of the Compact Road (the newly paved single highway that circumferences Palau’s largest island of Babeldaob) in late 2007, however, has provided new opportunities to reach the previously inaccessible interior sites (R. Olsudong, Interview, 4 April 2008; Kelman, 2007). Palauans, such as the National Archaeologist of Palau, Rita Olsudong, were able to personally encounter sites that they knew only by name and in oral histories or historic accounts (R. Olsudong, Interview, 4 April 2008). As a result of the Compact Road, the Palau HPO has been re-visiting states to survey their interior portions. Additionally, each state is working on building up a resource registry (W. R. Metes, Interview, 31 March 2008).

Although the Republic of Palau became an independent nation in 1994, six of its cultural resources are listed on the US NRHP, an inclusion that dates back to the decades in
which Palau was a district in the TTPI.\textsuperscript{156} Since writing its own historic preservation legislation in 1978 (Kesolei & Associates, n.d., p. 4), 166 of Palau’s cultural resources had been successfully placed on the PRHP as of April 2008.\textsuperscript{14} Further, Palau had initiated five nominations of resources to the United Nations (UN) world heritage list by 2009 (Marsh & Alexander, 2009b, p. 11), two of which had prepared dossiers by 2012.\textsuperscript{157}

Palau’s first five resources registered into the NRHP were a traditional men’s community center, Bai ra Irrai (B:IR-1:1-F2), and stone monoliths: Ked ra Ngchemiangel (part of B:IM-3:21), Meteu ‘L Klechm (B:ME-2:1-F43), Odalmelech (B:ME-6:1), and Ongeluluul.\textsuperscript{158, 159} They, like 11 (78.6\%) of the first 14 resources registered into the Palau register, are distinctively of Indigenous value as they represent heritage such as stone monoliths crafted in pre-European contact times and traditional villages. The remaining sites are a Yapese stone money quarry, a Japanese Shinto shrine, and a Japanese cannon mount. As with Guam and the NMI, Palau’s early entries into the US and Palau registers had a strong Indigenous value imprint.

Palau registered few resources in its TTPI years with just six resources registered into the NRHP (Table 11). Conversely, once Palau began to transition into a political status of its choosing, which also meant gaining control over its historic preservation activities and developing a local register of historic places, entries into the PRHP occurred at a steady and comparatively rapid rate. The first 14 resources appeared on the PRHP in 1989, though three years followed with no new registrations. During the ensuing 15 years, however, an average of ten resources per year were entered into the register, ranging from a low of four resources in one year to a high of 21 in another. While Guam and the NMI have seen a steady decline in nominations annually to local and/or national registers, Palau has registered a relatively high number of resources per year on a regular basis. This steady activity can be attributed

\textsuperscript{14} Official entries to this register began in 1989.
in large part to three factors. First, Palau is the only island HPO under study with a dedicated Registrar. Second, each year the Registrar writes a scope of work, enumerating the number of resources the Registrar will nominate for the PRHP. And finally, the Registrar works hand-in-hand with the Survey and Inventory/Archaeology Section and the Oral History and Ethnography Section to accomplish this goal. The latter two sections’ steady and systematic work provides much material for the Registrar to consider. Indeed, the Survey and Inventory/Archaeology Section recommends sites in its annual survey report for such consideration.

**Productivity**

In the 1990s, archaeologists David Snyder and Brian Butler (1997) claimed that “the proportion of Palau’s total cultural resource base...probably exceeds that recorded for many states in the mainland United States” (p. 45). Their assessment is particularly significant because in Micronesia various segments of the island populations frequently compare local statistics and characteristics to those (real or perceived) of the US—be it the US federal government, a state, a county or a town—depending upon the issue at hand. Thus, comparisons form an important part of this study’s analysis especially in light of the fact that, as became apparent during personal communications with regional experts, some representatives working in Washington DC seem to operate under the impression that Micronesian HPOs are less productive than state HPOs.

For simple comparisons, the states of Wyoming and Rhode Island were examined because of the two elements often used when comparing Micronesian islands to the US—geographic size and population. Rhode Island is the US state physically closest in size to Guam, the NMI, and Palau while Wyoming’s 2007 population count was nearest to that of the island entities (Table 3 and Table 12; US Census 2000 & US Census Annual Estimates to July 1, 2007).160
Table 12. Select Profile Data for Areas Under Study alongside Rhode Island and Wyoming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Registered resources on national registers</th>
<th>Population count</th>
<th>Geographic size in sq. miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,057,832</td>
<td>1,044.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>522,830</td>
<td>97,000.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>173,456</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84,546</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau (national register)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>20,842</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

When using relative geographic size as the basis for comparison of NRHP productivity, Guam and Palau (regarding its national register) were each more productive than Rhode Island by 1.9 and 5.3 percentage points, respectively (Table 13). Indeed, Guam and Palau outperformed Rhode Island even more so when one considers their relative populations. On the other hand, in this same examination, the NMI was quite a bit less productive than Rhode Island, with a comparative disparity of 12.7%.

Table 13. Proportionate Comparison of Guam, the NMI, and Palau to Rhode Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Registered resources on national registers</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau (national register)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

These patterns of relative comparison largely hold true when making a similar evaluation of the areas under study to Wyoming using population size as the basis for comparison (Table 14). The register activity for Guam is close to that of Wyoming (differing by 1.4 percentage points in Wyoming’s favor) while Palau (regarding its national register) registered far more resources than did Wyoming, outperforming it by 29.9 percentage points. The NMI was again comparatively less productive, although all greatly outperform Wyoming when considering relative geographic size. Such findings challenge many of the stereotypes that exist regarding island office productivity and efficacy.
Table 14. Proportionate Comparison of Guam, the NMI, and Palau to Wyoming\(^{164}\)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Registered resources on national registers</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau (national register)</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

Though the NMI did not outperform the states in these comparisons, of the three island entities it has the largest set of inventoried resources. It may be informative to compare the productivity of its inventory to that of Rhode Island and Wyoming to see how the office compared in this aspect of its productivity. The difference between having the largest inventory but conversely the least number and percentage of resources registered may point to a systemic or other issue that has deterred this aspect of the office’s, and possibly the other island offices’, productivity. It is important to note here that using the metric of registered sites is only a partial description of the true state of the productivity and efficacy of Micronesian HPOs. Although it is not the aim of this study to examine these issues at length, development and other issues impact on the ability of these offices to serve community historic preservation needs.

**Nominations by Subdivisions**

One of the first ways that this study examined registered resources was to view them by recognized island subdivisions (see 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) codes of labeling systems in Table 15; also see Appendix C). This study strove to use categories that were well established, readily understood by the community, and culturally meaningful to the Indigenous Islander populations.

Each island HPO recognizes and utilizes different systems of subdivision. The NMI HPO divides the commonwealth by island/s while the Palau HPO partitions the country by
its 16 states, both of which are subdivisions created by the island governments themselves. Guam HPO, on the other hand, labels its resources following the nine quads identified in the US Geological Survey Quadrangle Maps for Guam (Parks Division-DPR, 1976, p. 94), but these quads are not readily known or understood by Guam’s community at large. The people of Guam identify and are more intimately familiar with municipalities; therefore, these were the subdivisions used by this study. Indeed, the Guam HPO uses the existing municipalities in identifying and categorizing registered resources on its website.

Table 15. Site Labeling Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island entity</th>
<th>1st code</th>
<th>2nd code</th>
<th>3rd code</th>
<th>4th code</th>
<th>5th code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>US region (66)</td>
<td>Island region (1-9)</td>
<td>Chronological inventory no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>Island initial</td>
<td>Cultural period (1-6)</td>
<td>Chronological inventory no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Country (B)</td>
<td>State initial</td>
<td>State region no.</td>
<td>Site no.</td>
<td>Feature no.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

These island, state, and village municipality subdivisions are well defined and, as understood during the study, adhere to traditional cultural divisions. Since the divisions have cultural significance for the Indigenous communities, this also allowed for deeper cultural analysis. Further, the use of pre-existing divisions facilitates the consideration and utility of this study’s discussion for these HPOs.

For Guam, the number of registered resources per village municipality ranged from two municipalities with no registered resources to two municipalities that had over 20 registered resources apiece, or 15.9% and 14.0% of Guam’s total registered number of resources, respectively (Tamuning/Tumon and Umatac; Table 16). This meant that these latter two areas, though comprising just 10.5% of the total number of village municipalities, held nearly one-third of the island’s registered resources. Six (31.6%) municipalities had a combined total of 105 registered resources. This meant that they made up 66.9% of the total
number of registered places for the island while six other village municipalities held either no registered places or a nominal number—just one, two, or three—registered resources apiece. Combined, the latter six municipalities’ resources made up a mere 4.5% of those registered despite the fact that one of these municipalities is, in reality, comprised of three villages—Mongmong, Toto, and Maite. Further, the two municipalities with no registered resources, Mongmong-Toto-Maite and Sinajana, are anecdotally described as possessing Pre-Contact/Early Contact Indigenous heritage. All in all, more than two-thirds (68.4%) of the municipalities each accounted for none to 5.7% of the registered resources.

Table 16. Guam Registered Resources by Village Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village municipality</th>
<th>No. of registered resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamuning/Tumon</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatac</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagåtña (capital)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inarajan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yigo</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talofofo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asan/Ma'ina</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dededo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merizo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yona</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piti</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangilao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalan Pago/Ordot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agaña Heights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrigada</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongmong-Toto-Maite</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinajana</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007.*

As the center of Guam’s thriving tourism industry, housing the bulk of the island’s hotels, restaurants, and duty free stores, Tamuning/Tumon is one of the most developed
areas of Guam. Umatac is widely thought of as one of the island’s most historic villages and indeed was the main port of call during the early portion of the lengthy Spanish administration (Babauta, 2009). And Hagåtña, Guam’s capital, has long been a central village for Guam—from pre-colonial times on (Leon Guerrero, “Hagåtña;” R. F. Rogers, 1995, p. 48). These facts may explain some of the imbalance of village resource presence in the registers.

In the NMI, the range of resources registered per division was more stark, with 11 (78.6%) of the islands having no registered resources at all (Table 17). This was not because the NMI HPO staff were not aware of or keen to survey and document resources in the Northern Islands municipality. However, 99.9% of the NMI population lives on the three main islands of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota (CNMI Central Statistics Division, 2002, p. 4). As such, development occurs on these islands more regularly, requiring archaeological reviews. Saipan, the largest NMI island with 90.1% of the commonwealth’s population, comprises nearly half of the NMI resources present on the NRHP. Both Tinian and Rota, which each make up about 5.1% of the NMI’s population, represent 25.7% of NRHP registered resources apiece. Though there are 11 islands that make up the NMI’s Northern Islands municipality, the 2000 census recorded a population of just six individuals (CNMI Central Statistics Division, 2002, p. 4). These islands are sparsely populated or entirely uninhabited, have little or no development, and the expense of conducting work there has been prohibitive. The NMI HPO had little ability to access these more remote islands though the office had tried numerous times over the years to do so (G. S. Cabrera, Interview, 14 May 2007; R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 19 Sept. 2007). While HPO personnel have placed at least one Northern Islands cultural resource into their inventory, they are aware of numerous other resources there and realize that there is much more for them to officially identify. Given the accessibility issues, it is thus not surprising that the Northern Islands were not yet represented on the NRHP.
and that the islands of Saipan, Rota, and Tinian comprised 100% of their registered 
resources.

Table 17. NMI Registered Resources by Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island</th>
<th>No. of registered resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Islands municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farallon de Pajaros</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maug</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asuncion</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguihan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamagan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guguan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarigan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatahan</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farallon de Medinilla</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saipan (main island)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinian/Aguijan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rota</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of May 2007. Islands listed from north to south.

Of the three island entities, Palau exhibited the least disparity in the numerical range of 
resources registered per subdivision (Table 18). Unlike Guam and the NMI, not a single of 
Palau’s subdivisions, in this case states, were without registered resources. However, there 
were still variances in the number of registered resources per state. Half of Palau’s states 
each had fewer than ten resources registered. Their combined 49 registered resources make 
up 29.2% of the total. The other half of Palau’s states comprise 118, or 70.2% of the nation’s 
registered resources, with two states (Airai and Koror) each accounting for 12.5% of Palau’s 
registered resources. Koror and Airai are by far the two most populous states, constituting 
69.5% and 11.0% of the republic’s population, respectively (Ministry of Finance, n.d., p. 4). 
As the former capitol and the current locale of Palau’s only international airport, they are the 
most developed states. Here, as elsewhere, the data demonstrate that, because development 
leads to required archaeological surveys, which then lead to surveyed sites with the
potential of being nominated to the PRHP, the most economically developed locales also have the largest number of registered sites. Additionally, these two states hold significant traditional cultural roles within Palau. Koror is the seat of authority for one of Palau’s two paramount chiefs, Ibedul (The Palau Society of Historians, 1997, p. 16). Furthermore, according to Airai cultural resource signage, the state has been the location of both the division of authority between Palau’s two paramount chiefs and the locale on which they would meet on neutral ground.167 Interestingly though, the state recognized as the seat of authority for Paramount Chief Reklai, Melekeok, currently holds far fewer registered resources than Koror.168

Table 18. Palau Registered Resources by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. of registered resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airai</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koror</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarchelung</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimeliik</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngardmau</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngeremlengui</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngatpang</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaraard</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngchesar</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayangel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angaur</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melekeok</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngiwal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatohobei</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleliu</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonsorol</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of April 2008.*

Nomination by Time Period

Dates for which a resource is significant are placed on the form for nominating a cultural resource to a register of historic properties. These dates became one of the bases for
categorizing data for this research. Though Guam and the NMI have shared history, similar colonial experiences, and families that cross modern political divides, their HPOs run independent of one another, and the historic contexts which those offices have created are also divergent (Table 19). Palau’s HPO time period categorization operates quite differently than those of the US, Guam, and the NMI. For Palau, there are two umbrella-type categories of cultural resources: “Cultural” for resources that are Palauan-made in a customary way or uniquely Palauan-valued and “Historic” for resources built, instigated, or uniquely valued by non-Palauans (C. T. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 7 March 2008).

Table 19. Periods of Significance Used by the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guam&lt;sup&gt;171&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>NMI&lt;sup&gt;172&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Palau&lt;sup&gt;173&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreContact, 174</td>
<td>Prehistoric, 1687 BC – AD 1700</td>
<td>1800 BC – AD 1668</td>
<td>Uab era/Prehistoric/Traditional [ca 3200 BP – 1543]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Colonial Period, 1700 – 1898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st American Colonial Period, 1898 – 1941</td>
<td>German Period, 1899 – 1914</td>
<td>German Administration [1899 – 1914]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Self-governing Period, 1970 – present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

Despite the fact that each office filled out standardized NRHP forms or created a local form largely modeling the NRHP form, room for certain levels of subjectivity in completing
the nominations existed. This subjectivity became especially apparent in the nomination form for the NMI’s Waherak Maihar (SP-4-074), a Carolinian canoe accepted to the NRHP. Its significance was stated to sit in the fact that “it was originally donated by the Island of Puluwat to participate in Operation Sail during the U.S. Bicentennial celebrations. Because of transportation problems the canoe never reached the states.” The periods of significance ticked were from “Prehistoric” to “1900-.” Whoever filled out the form had opted to take a broader view of the canoe’s significance—as a category of an object (a Carolinian canoe being significant to Carolinians from prehistoric times through the 1900s) rather than as a singular item crafted during and connected to a particular event in time. This meant that the Waherak Maihar was categorized as being significant in, or representing the NMI time periods, from “Prehistoric,” through the Spanish, German, and Japanese periods to “WW II” and “Post-War Period.”

Notwithstanding this atypical example, a tendency exists to view a resource as representing a singular time period (e.g., as PreContact or Spanish). However, a review of nomination forms quickly revealed that many resources were labeled as being significant during two or more time periods. There were also complex sites or districts that held resources from multiple time periods.

For Guam, more resources have some value from the WW II/Japanese Military Occupation period on the local and national registers (43.3%) than from any other time period (Table 20). This is just shy of dominating the register by half as estimated by one expert. What might surprise Guam’s community is that the resources registered second most often are those with some PreContact (clearly Indigenous) time value—comprising over a third (35.0%) of Guam’s historic places registers. Heritage with some Spanish Colonial Period value were registered third most often, or making up 20.4% of Guam HPO’s cultural resource registers.
Chapter 4: The Historic Preservation Office Registers

Table 20. Guam Registered Resources by Period of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of significance</th>
<th>One period</th>
<th>Shared periods</th>
<th>Total presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WW II/Japanese Military Occupation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68 (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreContact</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55 (35.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Colonial Period</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Am. Colonial Period</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-WW II/2nd Am. Colonial Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Self-Governing Period</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007. Singular and shared presence/n=157.*

Calculations show that the NMI HPO has registered resources that have some significance during the Japanese Period (Table 21) most often; comprising nearly half (48.6%) of their registered resources. Heritage with some pre-European contact value, meaning NMI Chamorro and Carolinian Indigenous heritage, have been registered second most often, constituting 40.0% of the NMI’s registered heritage. Resources containing some significance during WW II heritage rank third, making up nearly a third (28.6%) of their entries to the NRHP.  

Table 21. The NMI Registered Resources by Period of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of significance</th>
<th>One period</th>
<th>Shared periods</th>
<th>Total presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Period</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17 (48.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Period</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Period</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-War Period</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of May 2007. Singular and shared presence/n=35.*

Palau has, by far, placed the most resources with pre-European contact value into its historic property register (Table 22). Of the three areas, it is the only community that has registered more resources with “Prehistoric,” or Indigenous value, than it has for any of the
colonial eras. Common to all three registers is that resources with some WW II/Japanese Military Occupation, Japanese Period/Administration, and Pre-European contact value are the top two or three time periods of significance though there are some varying historical and other reasons why this is so. For the NMI and Palau, the Japanese administration was one of the longest foreign/colonial administrations. It was also an administration characterized by a great deal of introduced activity and change.

Table 22. Palau Registered Resources by Period of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of significance</th>
<th>One period</th>
<th>Shared periods</th>
<th>Total presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>125 (74.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Japanese Administration]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[WW II]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 (11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Early Contact/Spanish Administration]</td>
<td>7 &amp; 1</td>
<td>3 &amp; 1</td>
<td>12 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[German Administration]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uab era</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[American Administration]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Republic of Palau]</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of April 2008. Singular and shared presence/n=168.*

The reason for the high presence of WW II/Occupation heritage for Guam is perhaps related to the fact that this period represents one of the most traumatic episodes recorded in Guam Chamorro history. It was a forceful enemy occupation, and is still part of living history. It resulted in many military casualties and thereby reflects an interest by certain US citizens, the US government, and US veterans. This episode also concerns an area lost and recaptured by the US. The high incidence may also be related to Guam’s different post-WW II history. While the NMI and Palau, after a time, were guided by the US toward new political statuses, Guam remained an unincorporated territory. As such, some interviewees assessed that Guam is the most Americanized of the three entities under study. This history,
coupled with the fact that Guam’s Chamorros are now outnumbered by others, denotes a greater presence of non-Islander heritage and community members with different ways of thinking about heritage, which has undoubtedly contributed to the decreased presence of Indigenous heritage on Guam’s register.

All of the registries contain little or no listings from more recent history, despite the fact that it had been some 12 years past the standard 50-year benchmark for resources to be recognized as “historic” during this study’s fieldwork (and even longer for Guam’s local register benchmark of 25 years). This is particularly noteworthy in that many significant historical events have occurred in each island entity in those 62 years. For example, the NMI negotiated their commonwealth status and Palau became a republic. The several decades-long TTPI period has come and gone. Yet, certain factors have excluded these properties from the register – perhaps prioritization of certain other types of historic properties, limited staff time, or issues related to consideration of their significance or understanding of their eligibility. Conceivably, this speaks to Islander interpretation of the more current resources as not fitting in readily to Islander cultural identity construction and maintenance. This phenomenon is noted as common in the Pacific. Anita Smith (2007) observes that: “Until recently the heritage of the colonial era has not been recognised at a national or international level as being of significance to Pacific Islanders” (“Background”). Smith does note, however, “the situation is changing, especially in regard to places now associated with struggles for independence and development of national identity” (A. Smith, 2007, “Background”).

For Guam, which has a lengthy and intense history of colonization and is in fact still striving toward self-determination, a certain amount of identity has also formed in resisting colonization (see Chapter Two “Advocacy,” p. 45). This perhaps explains why Guam registered the highest number of resources in more recent time period categories. Many of these sites represent the Chamorro struggle for Indigenous consideration and Chamorro
ingenuity and survival—for example, the Guam Legislature Building (66-1-1102; also known as the Guam Congress Building) was where the renowned “walkout” for Chamorro rights occurred, and the Inarajan Historic Village Architectural District (66-5-1320) demonstrates a period of time in Chamorro-craft architecture that also survived the devastation of WW II.

Palau’s national register had three different types of time categories not found on the other registers. Two were “Traditional” and “Historic,” which are less related to time period of significance than to whether they were considered an Indigenous innovation or uniquely of Indigenous value, though there is some correlation. The third was the category “Uab,” stated as such on the nomination form. Uab, or Chuab (the “ch” is a glottal stop), is a giant who, according to one version of oral history, when toppled, created much of the geography of Palau, thus representing Prehistory or mythohistory. Creating such refined understandings and categories of Prehistory or mythohistory might be a culturally appropriate way to better document and apply value to island cultural resources. After all, the relatively few years after Prehistory/PreContact have been delineated into several time periods while the thousands of years represented by Prehistory/PreContact have often been lumped into a single category though there is growing understanding and usage of the fact that several eras existed within this same time frame.

The cultural heritage on these registers, each representing a time period or shared time periods, was then compared to the total length of time within those periods. This was done to test the notion that a longer time period would be reflected in greater representation on the register. This was an important comparison specifically because the pre-European contact periods for Guam, the NMI, and Palau existed significantly longer, by thousands of years, than any of the subsequent time periods. Earlier in the chapter, the findings showed that Indigenous heritage in all three registers were the second most common or the most common type of registered cultural heritage. That assessment provided the impression that Indigenous heritage was a strong presence on the registers. However, a closer examination
of the Guam and NMI registers reveals that, in each case, a considerable proportional disparity exists between the percentage of total registered heritage from their pre-European contact time periods and the percentage of time that those periods represent (Table 23 and Table 24). On the other hand, in the case of Palau, the two percentages are the closest of the three entities to being on par (Table 25).

In stark contrast, for all three island entities, the colonial administrations and WW II periods are overrepresented, with the exception of the Spanish and American administrations in Palau, which are actually underrepresented. Furthermore, WW II, which lasted three to four years in Guam, the NMI, and Palau, represents a mere 0.1% of those island’s inhabited history and yet makes up 43.3%, 28.6%, and 10.7% of their registered heritage, respectively. It is important to note the large differences in the percentage of this representation between the island entities despite the fact that all suffered high levels of destruction from US invasion efforts. For Guam and Palau, this is the largest disparity between percentage of total time and presence on registers. For the NMI, it is the heritage from the Japanese Administration that is the most disproportionately represented, though for Palau, this administrative period is not far behind in overrepresentation.

Some of this disparity may exist owing to some of the less durable building materials used by the island populations during pre-European contact periods. However, Islanders in all three areas worked with stone, which has endured (though a certain portion of even this has been lost to varying degrees of colonial and WW II destruction, post-war reconstruction, and modern development). Despite standing the test of time and destruction, a percentage of this surviving heritage has not been registered. Such circumstances may speak to a discrepancy between Islander and others’ definitions of resource integrity and categorization of significance or proper ways to commemorate.

Certain mitigating factors, however, might justify overrepresentation. WW II was a traumatic and life-altering part of each island’s history. For some, this is likely justification
for its heavy overrepresentation. Though when each island entity’s history is examined, there have been other periods of time that were traumatic, some perhaps even more so. Yet those periods are not overrepresented in the same way that WW II is. For Guam and the NMI, 27 years of Chamorro-Spanish wars resulting in near devastation of the entire archipelago’s population and a significant change in socio-political and cultural life occurred. Yet Chamorro-Spanish war heritage is virtually non-existent in both Guam and the NMI registers. This is so despite knowing where offenses were staged, battles took place, and particular war figures died, as well as theories of where rallying speeches were made. It is perhaps telling that, for Guam and the NMI, the PreContact/Prehistory time periods are the only time periods with an underrepresentation of registered sites.

Table 23. Guam Presence of Resources on Registers by Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>% of total time of inhabitance</th>
<th>Total presence on registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreContact</td>
<td>3,387 years</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Colonial Period</td>
<td>198 years</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Am. Colonial Period</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW II/Japanese Military Occupation</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-WW II/2nd Am. Colonial Period</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi Self-governing Period</td>
<td>38 years</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Calculated to end of fieldwork, 2008. Calculated total time of inhabitance based on Guam HPO dates is 3,695 years.

Table 24. The NMI Presence of Resources on Registers by Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>% of Total time of inhabitance</th>
<th>Total presence on registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>3,468 years</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Period</td>
<td>231 years</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Period</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Period</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW II</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-War Period</td>
<td>63 years</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Calculated to end of fieldwork, 2008. Calculated total time of inhabitance based on NMI HPO dates is 3,800 years.
Table 25. Palau Presence of Resources on Registers by Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Length of time</th>
<th>% of total time of inhabitance</th>
<th>Total presence on registers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uab era/Prehistoric</td>
<td>2,735 years</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Early Contacts/ Spanish Administration]</td>
<td>342 years &amp; 14 years</td>
<td>10.7% &amp; 0.4%</td>
<td>4.2% &amp; 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Administration</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Administration</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW II</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[American Administration]</td>
<td>49 years</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The Republic of Palau]</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Calculated to end of fieldwork, 2008. Calculated total time of inhabitance based on Palau HPO dates is 3,200 years.

While certain factors can partially explain why time period percentage and total presence on registers do not match up or should not match up, there are obviously large imbalances of representation that need to be addressed. Much of this disparity may be linked to socio-cultural and political differences such as the types and degrees of colonization experienced by each entity over time, including current political statuses and recognition of Indigenous rights; and epistemological and cosmological differences between Indigenous Islanders and entities that provide support to the HPOs.

Nominations by Type

Registered resources were also examined by type. In the historic preservation system as put forth by the NPS, there are five categories for type of heritage listed on the NRHP nomination form—District, Site, Structure, Building, and Object; the Guam and Palau HPOs have emulated these categories for their local registers. Each category has very specific definitions (Cultural Resources, 1997, p. 15). Other types of cultural resources, such as cultural landscapes, including Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), can also be recognized by NPS.
The reasons for examining the categorization used for these nominated resources are threefold. First, it presents an opportunity to assess whether the categories proffered by NPS fit the types of Indigenous heritage that Guam, the NMI, and Palau communities were most interested in preserving and maintaining. Second, this analysis allows for examining the ease and applicability with which Indigenous heritage can be nominated and registered within the extant categories. For example, if little or no Indigenous heritage was nominated in a particular category, this might suggest that that particular category was not relevant in that island situation. Third, the patterns of presence on the registers reveal office emphasis (intended or otherwise). Comparing the regularity of the types of heritage that each island entity was registering allowed for examination of the similarities or differences in emphasis given by each office.

Immediately noticeable is that all three island entities each nominated resources within all types of categories available (Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12, and Table 26). It does not appear that any available category of heritage was ignored or considered completely incompatible to cultural resources that are part of the extant heritage on-island. Also readily discernible is that “Sites” are the most common type of resource that has been registered for all three areas. This is perhaps because archaeological examination of an area is often a prerequisite for earthmoving activities. Further, each HPO is mandated to perform annual in-house surveys, which up to the time of fieldwork, were typically if not wholly archaeological. Not surprisingly then, archaeological studies have resulted in the identification (and nomination) of numerous sites throughout the islands.187

However, there are noticeable differences between the types of heritage registered by Guam, the NMI, and Palau. Though Palau has the largest number of resources registered, just five of these were buildings. By comparison, this category comprised sizeable portions of Guam’s and the NMI’s registered resources (11.5% and 28.6%, respectively). In contrast, Palau had the highest number and percentage of “Objects” in its register, having nearly two
to three times of those in the Guam or NMI registers. The NMI stood out for having the highest percentage of “Districts,” though both the NMI and Guam have six districts in their registers while Palau has registered just one. Some of this may be explained by the types of Indigenous heritage crafted or valued by Islanders. The types of heritage commonly registered are tied in some ways to the emphasis on time periods (e.g., buildings are typically from colonial eras).

**Figure 10.** Guam registered resources by type (as of March 2007).

**Figure 11.** The NMI registered resources by type (as of May 2007).
In the Palau national register, the emphasis on “Traditional” (Indigenous) heritage became readily apparent. It was theorized that examining the “Traditional” heritage by Palauan type might reveal patterns in types of heritage registered and provide an understanding of the ways that Palauans categorize or think about their cultural resources. Further, such an examination might shed light on ways current nomination forms could be tailored to better meet Indigenous Islander/Palauan needs.

The most common type of Palauan cultural resource to be registered was “Beluu” (Traditional Villages) (see Table 27). Beluu comprise 28.2% of Palau’s registered “Traditional” heritage and 23.6% of all of Palau’s registered resources. “Oublallang” (terrace/s) have been registered second most often, making up 9.4% of the traditional registered resources with “Diong” (water areas/bathing pools) and “Bai” (community/chief meeting structures or their stone platforms) following closely behind.
Table 27. Traditional Palau Registered Resources by Local Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource type</th>
<th>No. of resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beluu</strong> ([Traditional] village)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ouballang</strong> (Terrace/s)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diong</strong> (Bathing pool/Water area)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bai</strong> (building for community or chief gatherings, or in some archaeology reporting the stone platform of either)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bad</strong> (Stone)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ii</strong> (Cave)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kli[d]m</strong> (Stone monolith with carved face)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Odesongel</strong> (Stone burial platform associated with the house)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chades</strong> (Causeway)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iliud</strong> (Small stone platform)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olekull</strong> (Cemetery)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taoch</strong> (Channel)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yapese stone money quarry</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rois</strong> (Mountain)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones that make a shape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risos</strong> (Natural stone outcrop)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone carving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blai</strong> (Family house, or in some archaeology reporting its associated stone platform)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chelebacheb</strong> (Rock island)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debull</strong> (Burial)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diangel</strong> (Canoe house area)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euatel</strong> (Defensive feature/fortress)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iporu</strong> (Southwest Island Menstrual house)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ked</strong> (Savannah)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural feature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olsechall</strong> (A type of stone platform)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orsachel</strong> (Stone mortar)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictograph/Petroglyph</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: n=149.

Two things became apparent when reviewing Palau’s register with the aid of their Registrar and survey section staff. First, a wide range of “Traditional” heritage has been recognized, has made it into the register, and continues to exist in Palau’s physical landscape. Second, much, if not all, of the primary significance in registered Palauan cultural resources is in its history and its meaning rather than in the quality of its architectural type.
or in the condition of the extant remains. Traditional cultural resources in Palau have distinctive names, which provide explanation and understanding of people, places, and institutions (e.g., Murray, 2006, p. 35; Parmentier, 1986, p. 179; 1987, p. 167). This significance is so strong that, as explained by the Palau HPO Registrar, some registered heritage was not able to be easily categorized (an activity that may run counter to Palauan epistemology and cosmology) such as evidenced by the category in Table 27, “Stones that make a shape” that was created for analysis purposes but does not exist as a Palauan concept. Though Palau has registered more historic properties than Guam or the NMI and thus has made the current nomination form amenable to office goals, there may be potential in revising the current form to better reflect Palauan ways of thinking about and valuing heritage.

Chapter Summary

The stories that the Guam, NMI, and Palau registers tell are varied. In some ways the registers appear to have a strong presence of Indigenous heritage/values, comprising high proportions of the first sets of properties registered and constituting the highest and second-highest type of property on local and national registers. However, that is only a partial picture. The presence of Indigenous heritage on the registers is considerably disproportionate when examined by the length of time of the PreContact periods. The amount of Indigenous heritage that has endured but is not registered, coupled with the lack of presence of society-altering battlesites and transformative events on the registers, forms a stark contrast to the overrepresentation of WW II heritage. This leads to the conclusion that, overall, Indigenous heritage is underrepresented and has been underserved by either the forms or the processes that lead to historic property registration. Strong differences may exist between Islander concepts regarding historical and cultural significance and integrity and those that exist within the US national register system. This may also explain to some degree the NMI’s lesser registration of historic properties despite having the largest
inventory and why both the Guam and NMI HPOs rate of historic property registration has declined over the decades (though increases in development are likely partially responsible for this trend).

Of the three areas, Palau had the least disparity in representation on its registers by period of significance and by geographical division. There may be something to the additional category in Palau’s nomination form and the composition of its advisory board and both presence and composition of its Society of Historians, which follows customary considerations that allows them to outperform in terms of registering properties to national register when compared to Guam, the NMI, and also the US states of Rhode Island and Wyoming. Palau’s high performance further demonstrates that a higher level of consideration as Indigenous Peoples did not make them less productive or inefficient in their historic preservation efforts.

Time will tell whether Guam’s registration of post-WW II heritage, a good portion of which convey values of Indigenous advocacy, innovation, and survival in contemporary time, will likewise occur over time in the NMI and Palau.

This chapter has examined some of the more visible outputs produced by the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs, that is, their registers, as a means to explore issues that support and challenge the presence of Indigenous values in western Micronesian historic preservation efforts. To further this exploration, the next chapter provides a qualitative window into the ways in which Indigenous values guide the HPO staff in the areas under study.
Chapter Five

Indigenous Values in Historic Preservation Offices:
The Cultural Context

It is important to understand the degree to which Indigenous values exist in each historic preservation office (HPO) under study. Ultimately, as noted in Chapter One, the presence of Indigenous values significantly impacts the socio-cultural and physical health and well-being of the community—Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike. To remove such cultural considerations, which provide the significance and context, and thus the integrity, of island cultural resources, diminishes those resources to mere objects possessed by the community rather than having them serve as functioning, interactive, and contributing elements working within the community (after Parmentier, 1987, pp. 11-14). Chapter Three’s exploration of Micronesian epistemological and cosmological considerations regarding cultural resources and historic preservation helped provide a platform for discussing Indigenous islander cultural perseverance within modern HPOs.

This chapter first discusses the composition of office personnel to introduce the actors and dynamics involved in the observed island cultural behaviors and practices that are presented in the second portion of the chapter. Differences between and challenges to the presence of islander values in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs round out this chapter’s exploration of the cultural contexts of those offices.

Methodological Approaches

Participant-observation allows for gathering data first hand about behavior, events, occupational roles, and organizations. (J. Lofland 1984, as cited in Babbie, 1992, p. 286). It allows the researcher to observe social phenomenon “as completely as possible” which
provides an ability to “develop a deeper and fuller understanding of it” (Babbie, 1992, p. 285). Since the presence of Indigenous values as cultural and societal behaviors in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs had not yet been formally studied, participant-observation provided information that did not exist otherwise.

Another important consideration is that this method of gathering data “permits researchers to study people in their native environment in order to understand ‘things’ from their perspective” (L. Baker, 2006, p. 171). This is important for three reasons. First, participant-observation fits in with this study’s goal of conducting island/Islander-centered research. This places known local actors front and center, which is also extremely important for findings to be considered valid by the island communities. Second, the results will only be truly beneficial if they are meaningful from the perspective of the communities that the offices are meant to serve. And third, much of the best research in Micronesia has benefitted from personal relationships with community members (e.g., Oral History and Ethnography Section, 2010; Steffy, 2006, pp. 536-538). In order to access this knowledge within Micronesia, gain a reputation for appropriate conduct as a researcher, and have the results of the research be positively received, the researcher must develop an identity that is locally understood and respected (e.g., Iyechad, 2001, p. 77; Murray, 2006, p. 44; D. R. Smith, 1978). As Murray (2006) further notes, in Micronesian islands such as Palau, one’s identity provides the “charter to ask questions” (p. 44).

It holds particularly true for Micronesian societies that much knowledge is considered owned, privileged, and restricted. Knowledge is to be officially divulged by appropriate peoples and may be presented in codified, tailored, or curtailed manners (Hezel, 2006; Falgout et al., 2008, pp. 27-28; Kesolei, 1977; Petersen, 1990, p. 3). As Smith (1978) explains, in the case of Palau, knowledge is considered both “finite,” and at times, “secret” (pp. 2 & 4). This can often mean that one must build up rapport to earn knowledge or establish a certain level of comfort in sharing (D. R. Smith, 1978, p. 5; Steffy, 2006, pp. 536-537). Further,
owing to the serendipitous nature of participant-observation, the method also provides the opportunity for less overt “connections” or “analogies” to be revealed and understood (Foster & Ford, 2008, pp. 322-323). This can be a key consideration in societies where information is not freely given.

Participant-observation allows for the study of the actual versus the perceptions or stereotypes that may exist. Also, this method allowed for first-hand assessments of the responses provided to this researcher and previous researchers, important given Micronesian behavioral mores to be outwardly polite, humble, and self-deprecating (e.g., De Oro, “Mamåhlao: Shame;” Nero, 1987, p. 55; Olopai & Flinn, 2005, p. 42; Petersen, 2009, pp. 199 & 204-208); behaviors which can distort a study if not taken into proper consideration.

It is well known that a researcher’s presence and the research process alter the environment under study (AnthroBase.com, “Reflexivity;” Babbie, 1992, p. 289). As an illustration, one interviewee during this research effort responded this way: “I haven’t really thought a whole lot about it before you asked me this but, there’s something big there. Something big is happening...” However, methods were employed to attempt to neutralize these types of effects. Such methods can include the order in which questions are asked, the way in which queries are phrased, following local research protocol, and the like (Babbie, 1992, pp. 147-163). The researcher must be cognizant of this reality, work to offset it, and keep it foremost in mind when documenting and analyzing data.

This researcher was permitted to participate in many office activities and was able to ethnographically observe office staff while researching office archives and while working in the Palau HPO. Typically, several weeks were spent in each office sifting through office files and other end products. Office activities the researcher participated in included sharing food, attending training, participating in fieldwork, attending and providing outreach presentation at schools, visiting sites, and other such daily tasks (see Figure 13). The researcher also otherwise worked toward immersion by participating in as many events
related to cultural heritage and experiencing as many formally and informally recognized historical and cultural sites as possible during the periods of field research.196
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**Figure 13.** Observing NMI HPO staff conduct an in-house archaeological survey. This photo demonstrates the degree of generous island hospitality encountered as a coconut was opened and offered to this researcher while out in the field. (Photo taken by NMI HPO staff, 2007.)

This chapter weaves together relevant interview information gathered from historic preservation, cultural, and other experts in Guam, the NMI, and Palau alongside this researcher’s ethnographic observations and written resources (see “Methodological Approaches” in Chapter Six, p. 143, for interview methods).

**HPO Personnel**

Generally speaking, Indigenous Micronesians are currently administering their historic preservation programs (with at least a couple of exceptions in the past).197 As Table 28 illustrates, during the period of study, Indigenous Micronesians made up the majority of staff in all three offices under study. Within these offices, just one to four staff (or 8% to 33%) were not Indigenous. And, of those few, they were slightly more likely to be “other
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Micronesian” and “other Pacific Islander” than not. Research observations were that Indigenous islanders have also historically been a strong presence in their review boards (as in Guam and the NMI) or comprise them entirely as is currently the case for Palau’s advisory board and Society of Historians.

Table 28. Ethnic Composition of Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island entity</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Other Micronesian</th>
<th>Other Pacific Islander, including Filipina/o</th>
<th>US, non-Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Non-US, non-Pacific Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam (n=12)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI (n=19)</td>
<td>17 (89%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau (n=12)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of February 2007 for Guam and the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau. Some totals may not equal 100% due to rounding off to the nearest percent.

The Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs are comprised of one or two “professional” staff, typically an archaeologist and/or ethnographer, and several historic preservation specialists who are sometimes referred to as “technicians.” “Professional” roles are an integral part of the state foundational HPO structure. Their presence is a requirement in order to qualify for US federal funding (1 NHPA, § 112(a)(1)(B)). The reasons for these requirements are twofold. First, they help ensure the program has a person trained in the professional methods and skills needed to perform the roles required of them (1 NHPA, § 112(a)(1)(A)). Second, they provide for the transfer of professional skills to local personnel, developing a bank of para-professionals that island HPOs can draw upon. This state foundational structure has allowed the HPOs to conduct annual surveys, operate earthmoving permitting systems, and produce professional quality reports and other publications. Additionally, many archaeological and anthropological skills have been transferred over the years. At the same time, technicians have been able to serve as important liaisons of a sort between the professionals and the local community and often have different types of local, cultural, and/or professional expertise to share in their own right.
In some Micronesian areas in the past, non-Islanders or those from outside the local community have often filled the archaeologist and cultural anthropologist/ethnographer positions, as they have had the requisite professional graduate degrees and experience. In the past, these people have hailed from countries such as Austria, Canada, the US, and elsewhere. However, during this study, it became a requirement for Historic Preservation Fund (HPF)-salaried staff to be US citizens, or for the Freely Associated States (FAS), Micronesian citizens as a first priority or otherwise US citizens. All three offices under study, however, have had Micronesian experts serve as professional staff. For example, each has been staffed by an Indigenous Micronesian archaeologist, and Palau has had a Palauan Assistant Ethnographer. Additionally, as of 2012, there were at least one Chamorro and two Palauans working toward being the next Indigenous Micronesian archaeologists, while at least three Palauans held masters’ degrees in cultural anthropology.

Hard data concerning the length of time professional archaeologists and anthropologists were employed in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs was difficult to obtain. However, based on the recollections of HPO staff, most non-local professionals served as such in the HPOs for relatively short periods of time (one, two, or three years with one or more employed for longer). In Palau, the recollection was that just one anthropologist continued their position beyond their two-year period and that at least two or three left before their two years were completed. In the NMI, there have been at least five US archaeologists from the early 1990s through 2008 (J. D. C. Camacho, Pers. Comm., 15 Sept. 2008; Zotomayor, 2011). An additional consideration is that large gaps of time occur between the periods during which positions are filled. For example, it is not uncommon for it to take several months to a year or more to fill a vacated professional position, which creates a nearly perpetual state for affected offices of catching up on annual tasks. Non-locals and non-Islanders were also likely to have had little or no knowledge of how island government or local HPOs operate (e.g., Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 38). This meant that, on a steady basis,
professionals were arriving with a steep learning curve ahead of them (e.g., Kesolei, 1977, pp. 1-5; Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 101).¹⁵

By contrast, in Guam, three locally-based professionals, one a Micronesian from another island and two US non-Pacific Islanders, served as the HPO Archaeologist for numerous years each (eight, nine, and 18 years, with one of the latter also later serving as the Historic Preservation Officer). Similarly, the three Micronesian archaeologists who worked within the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs did so for 14 to 27 years (some advancing from technical to professional staff over the years). Additionally, the nine Indigenous Micronesian historic preservation specialists who discussed their years of employment served for an average of 13.6 years apiece. Together, these figures lead to the conclusion that Micronesian and locally-based HPO staff stay in their positions longer. This can be beneficial in that they gain institutional knowledge, which is “priceless” (T. A. Duchesne, Interview, 2 July 2007). Longer tenures also allow for building up community partnerships.

In fact, standing in Micronesian (and Pacific) communities is expected to involve the building and activation of long-term (intergenerational) reciprocal relationships (Hattori, “Culture of Guam;” Hau‘ofa, 1993, pp. 10-13; Marsh, 2009a). To operate well in a Micronesian community, one must have, or one must develop, a locally-understood identity and participate in relationships that are interpreted by the island community as reciprocal.¹⁶

¹⁵ In fact, Patricia Parker (1987) has stated that, to address some of these issues, “Training for anyone serving as a preservation official in a place like Micronesia should include training in ethnography and other aspects of cultural anthropology” (p. 19). Additionally, observations made for Native American cultural resource management programs seem apropos for Micronesian HPOs as well:

Understanding cultural attitudes, tribal protocol, and sensitivity to native issues takes years and cannot be learned from textbooks or field manuals. Tribal people prefer to develop long-term relationships with individuals whom they can trust. (Gulliford, 1992)

Gulliford (1992) also underscores the importance of long-term commitment, stating that, “To be effective white resource managers must significantly alter their own career paths to stay in one place long enough to learn and respect Indian ways” (para. 10).

¹⁶ For example, not all researchers provide copies of publications back to the community and even for those that do, if the community are not aware of the publications or do not have ready access to
Short-term relationships and outcomes have often been deemed deficient. Oftentimes Micronesian community members have worried that non-Indigenous/non-locals operate according to foreign concepts, duplicate previous work due to lack of knowledge about the history of the community and prior efforts, and take from the community without appropriately giving back (Marsh-Kautz, et al., 2003; D. R. Smith, 1990, p. 117; 1997, pp. 24-25). Long-term staff potentially better fit into these outlined community dynamics than do staff that rotate in and out of island HPOs. Longer tenure, office stability, institutional memory, and culturally understood standing within the community each provide fertile conditions for an island HPO to operate efficiently and effectively.

In support of these goals, the NPS has been working for years to develop a certification program that would encourage Micronesian and other locally-based staff to receive formal recognition of their specialized skills and potentially qualify as professional staff. However, these efforts have not yet been realized, though the National Park Service (NPS) continues to work toward this goal. Several interviewed HPO specialists have attended numerous years of training without earning any certification or degree, and their position, job title, and pay has perhaps remained essentially the same. While in some ways a broader range of skills has perhaps been transferred to technical staff due to the different fields of expertise and interest of the various professional staff, the revolving door of new-to-the-office, -field, and/or -island socio-cultural and political landscapes coupled with unrealized recognition of years of experience and training can lead to frustrations and tensions by trained, long-time local staff.
Cultural Perseverance within Modern Offices

Participant-observation of the offices for periods of time ranging from two months to seven years allowed this researcher to make ethnographic observations of the varying degrees of Indigenous Islander values and lifeways present in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs. Many of these observations were validated in one form or another in a study entitled, “The meanings of work in contemporary Palau: Policy implications of globalization in the Pacific,” conducted by well-regarded anthropologist Karen Nero, Palauan researcher Fermina Brel Murray, and Michael Burton (2000). Though there appeared to be some differences of cultural presence and expression between the offices, key aspects of Indigenous values were found within all offices.

This study found that cultural persistence was expressed in key ways. Underlying essentially all observed behaviors were the ever-important values of reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation to others. Other cultural behaviors and values observed included activating kin relations, sharing food, demonstrating respect for authority and elders, having Indigenous staff, and using Indigenous languages. However, not to be forgotten is that challenges to historic preservation processes and procedures both to and within the cultural context exist—points which are interwoven throughout the discussion.

Reciprocity, Interdependence, and a Sense of Obligation

Generally, the cultural values of reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation “lie at the heart” of Micronesian society and are tantamount to a “sacred duty” (Souder, 1994, p. 194) as Laura M. Torres Souder (1994) and Robert A. Underwood (n.d.) have asserted with regard to Chamorro culture. The depth of these values within Micronesian cultures is evident in the phrasing that has been selected to describe them—that to Micronesians, these cultural traits exude “humanity” (Nero, 1989, p. 119) and are how “[r]eal human beings” behave (R. A. Underwood, n.d., p. 10).204
These core Micronesian values were ever present in the HPOs under study, sitting alongside the modern government office mores of what constitutes “professional” behavior. Moreover, the presence of these traditional values was crucial to the HPOs’ operating in culturally appropriate, and thus valid, manners in the island communities. Ultimately, these behaviors determined whether the office would thus be seen as serving the needs of the community. Conversely, if these behaviors had not been present, there would have been potential for the communities to feel disconnected from the work of the HPOs. Indeed, without them, over time the impression could be formed that the offices were operating a foreign-imposed program promoting other cultural ways of valuing and managing heritage.

Given that the islands under study have demographically mixed communities and are at various stages of blending and balancing traditional and modern political systems, there is already an inherent tension about this type of outside influence.

When HPO staff work in the field or when HPO clients visit the office, time can be spent identifying shared familial or other community connections which provides for a particular or more receptive pathway to share information or an office decision. Sometimes, however, these cultural connections can be sensitive and complex, such as when an office decision goes against the desires of an elder or titleholder as was noted by Palau’s first Palauan National Archaeologist, Rita Olsudong (Interview, 4 April 2008). These cultural complexities can also consist of expected deference to kin or other cultural relationships.

In such situations, several issues can come to the forefront: island custom typically dictates deference to these positions within society or to these relationships (e.g., G. Cabrera, Pers. Comm., 17 June 2012; Hezel, 2001, p. 124). Office activities and decisions, however, are typically handed out by a non-elder, a younger person, who by definition has lesser traditional community standing, would not yet have a title, and may even be from a clan with lesser social standing. Moreover, the office staff will have earned his or her position of authority through non-traditional means, by formal education and/or by virtue of being
employed within a modern government institution. Added to this, in carrying out mandated tasks to protect and preserve cultural and historical heritage, island HPO staff challenge traditional land rights when they process earthmoving permits and evaluate the appropriateness of other activities, such as whether a cultural or historic object can be altered or removed from a piece of property.

The sense of reciprocal obligation, of being either a good guest or polite host, can manifest itself as a “need” to share something such as drink or food or provide something as a token of respect for time spent or for being an imposition (e.g., L. M. Olopai, Interview, 21 May 2007) (for discussion along these lines, see, Mendiola, 2010; BAC/PHPP, 2008, pp. 10-12). While working in Palau, for example, sometimes locally grown or produced foodstuffs (e.g., citrus fruits, coconuts, or something freshly cooked) were shared with office staff by fellow government employees or others. Likewise, Palau HPO staff members often brought some small food or drink item or office products (brochures, reports, and the like) to provide to those they encountered in the field. Similarly, Guam HPO staff provided home-cooked foodstuffs for advisory board and other meetings. These types of cultural mores prompted former Palau Historic Preservation Officer, Vicky N. Kanai, to work for years with the NPS for authorization to use historic preservation grant funding to provide interviewees what is termed “traditional compensation” (i.e., an object of relatively nominal cost that, upon being offered, would be traditionally considered a means of demonstrating respect; V. Kanai, Interview, 10 April 2008).

Reciprocity and a sense of obligation also manifested themselves in the level of support staff from different offices and entities gave each other in carrying out their responsibilities. In one regard, there was a sense of being in a cultural office that behaved in a culturally appropriate manner, built up valuable networks, and participated in cooperative efforts. However, these activities had to be carefully balanced so that the goal remained helping
each other succeed without impeding each others’ ability to meet their own goals and deadlines.

**Indigenous Staff**

Local Island values also exist in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs through the presence of Indigenous staff. Although having Indigenous staff does not in and of itself guarantee operating according to Indigenous values, and workers from other ethnicities or areas can also be culturally sensitive and possess skills that provide for managing such situations, the latter cannot fully emulate or compare in certain ways to actually having Indigenous personnel in island HPOs. Further, it is disempowering to an Indigenous community when a large number of high-level positions or key positions within a homeland are consistently held by those who are non-Indigenous, capable or well-intentioned though they may be. This is a topic discussed in Guam history classes when exploring the US naval administration of Guam, a time when all upper level positions were held by non-Chamorros (e.g., C. P. Taitano, 2002, p. 48). This is likely even more true for positions that deal with island socio-cultural and historical issues such as those which exist within HPOs (following discussion with J. S. Castro, Jr., Interview, 25 April 2007). Stapp & Burney (2002) essentially ask, if the descendent community members (Native American tribal members in their case) are not part of the cultural resource program, would it be a program that truly serves the descendent community (p. 9)? The research herewithin recognizes the critical importance of high levels of Indigenous involvement but not to the express exclusion of others.

Those interviewed noted that Islanders may better know the island, land, and social practices (Interviews: V. N. April, 22 March 2007; G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; J. S. Castro, Jr., 25 April 2007; R. N. Magofña, 14 May 2007) and through local identity and community ties receive ready consideration (e.g., Genz, 2011, pp. 18-20). This can lead to recognizing
archaeological sites (meaning human-modified or -valued features) and artifacts more quickly, or more readily understanding a cultural practice in its fuller context (Interviews: J. S. Castro, Jr., 25 April 2007; H. C. Tudela, 25 April 2007). Further, Ross et al. (2011) note that Indigenous resource managers have the potential to “combine their knowledge and experience in a social context that ensure that all relevant elements of knowledge can come together regularly” (p. 36).

Additionally, Indigenous staff who were encountered and interviewed during the course of this study recognized that some of the power of historical and cultural sites is tied to the islands being homelands. For those interviewed, these are places where their ancestors thrived for hundreds or thousands of years and became uniquely Chamorro, Carolinian, Palauan, or Palauan Southwest Islander. This concept was eloquently expressed by two NMI HPO staff—one their former Historian and the other a historic preservation technician:

[A] place of power would be—your home, where your identity is the most strong. And nowhere is it stronger than your place of birth, where you draw physical connection with, not only people but your environment…this is where I live, this is where my line, my blood line exists. (G. S. Cabrera, Interview, 14 May 2007)

“I think that the closest connection with me and my ancestors is when I’m right there, I feel what they feel, I see what they saw” (H. C. Tudela, Interview, 25 April 2007). For Palau, Minister of Community and Cultural Affairs, Faustina Rehuher-Marugg, had discussed in 2009 and 2010 the potential need for a register of sacred sites to give the sites more appropriate recognition and consideration within Palau’s modern setting.

One staff member was asked specifically what it meant to him as an Indigenous Islander to be working at an HPO. He replied that though he had never really thought about island history before working at the NMI HPO, he now really cared about history and had become someone who tells others to care about and take care of their history (T. D. L.

Indigenous staff can also be beneficial in utilizing Indigenous epistemologies within the day-to-day operations of the offices. For example, throughout much of 2010, the Palau HPO Oral History and Ethnography Section staff provided a Microsoft Office Powerpoint presentation in local and international settings that highlighted the ways in which Indigenous Palauan epistemology (itself a form of intangible cultural heritage (ICH)) guided the work of the HPO. Palau HPO staff followed local epistemology concerning traditional order, protocol, terms of address, ways of eliciting information, types of confidentiality provided, reciprocal exchanges, and more. Similar forms of cultural consideration were found in many aspects of Guam and NMI staff work (e.g., Interviews: G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; T. Ramirez, 29 June 2007).

However, having Indigenous staff working in the offices does not in itself guarantee the promotion of what might be viewed as Indigenous epistemology (e.g., Diaz, 1994, p. 33). Years of historical and cultural influence in the islands, especially in colonial/administrative and modern on-island and off-island education systems, can add up to introduced value and concept systems (E. Rechebei, Interview, 31 May 2007; Nero, 2001, p. 129), cultural disconnect, or what some might refer to as a “colonization of the mind” (Hereniko, 2000, pp. 82-83). Julian Aguon (2009), Chamorro attorney specializing in International Law, states for Guam and to some degree for the NMI, “Chamorus suffer from unresolved trauma related to centuries of outside efforts to annihilate us, not just by one set of colonizers or oppressors, but three” and, “Indeed, the U.S. colonial enterprise in Guam has fostered deep disempowerment in the Chamoru people” (p. 38).

---

17 The presentation was shared at the University of Guam in 2010 and at the 2010 conference of the Society for Hawai’ian Archaeology (SHA) held in Hawai‘i.
Some worry that traditional sensibilities such as respecting elders and viewing elders as repositories of wisdom and experience will be further challenged by a growing number of Western educated youth (e.g., L. M. Olopai, Interview, 3 June 2007). As stated by Lynda B. Aguon (Interview, 23 March 2007), in Chamorro culture, where one’s accomplishments or other are set aside, “you still show respect to the elder... But, nowadays, it’s phasing out, we’re losing it.” In Palau, many of these youth are increasingly serving as heads of entities and leaders within the different levels of community—clan, hamlet/village, state, and national positions—and, as a result, there may be a lack of certain inclusion of Palauan epistemological and cosmological considerations (in Marsh & Alexander, 2009a, p. 15).

**Kin Relations**

A strong cultural feature of the HPOs under study is that staff seated their identity within the customary structures of family—status within the family, family roles and obligations, family village association, and family’s reputation and status within society (Hattori, “Culture of Guam,” Hezel, 2001, p. 15; Murray, 2006, p. 29; Petersen, 2009, p. 101). This was found to be the case for Palau during research conducted by Nero et al. (2000):

> In general, individuals are not associated with a single occupation. Rather they are seen as productive members of their household, clan, and village, who are responsible for a number of different tasks...Status is not based on a specific career or vocational skills, but rather on learning a combination of life skills that can promote a Palauan way of life. The Palauan systems of status and prestige, with its locus primarily in the position of the family, clan, and village rather than in individualized occupations, is the fundamental way in which Palauan and American (and other western) conceptualizations of work differ. While Palauans have incorporated many new work occupations and ways of thinking from the Japanese and the Americans during the past century of colonial administration, the ways in which they have incorporated new occupations do not necessarily imply a fundamental transformation of their conceptualizations of work and prestige systems. (p. 329)

The researchers also note that,

> One’s social status is derived primarily from one’s position in the family, clan, and village hierarchies. In addition...that person’s actual position is only achieved through the hard work involved in producing and providing the appropriate foods and services for family, clan, and village elders during
special occasions as well as on a daily basis. Hard work in the service of the community is a prerequisite on the actual position one will hold among a range of possibilities provided within the kin system. (p. 329)

Certainly, these conclusions validated this researcher’s observations made during four years of working at the Palau HPO. In many ways, the above observations reflect the state of Indigenous staff and their working environments in Guam and the NMI as well.

Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO staff acted and related to each other as if they were family or from the same hamlet/village (traditionally, hamlets/villages were comprised of a limited number of clans who interacted very closely with one another). They ate together, shared food, were at times related to one another, attended and/or contributed to family events, and more. As Nero et al. (2000) assess for Palau’s modern workplace, urbanization and the incorporation of new occupations and workplaces appear to have had less [read minimal] impact and appear to have been integrated into a new Palauan framework. Their inside meanings reflect Palauan values and practices. Islanders treat and rely on social relationships among workmates much as they used to rely on village mates. (p. 341)

Kinship relationships are pathways to knowledge, provide social standing and identity, and are understandable and safe organizational structures (Asang, 2004, pp. 19 & 46; Hezel, 2001, p. 136; Iyechad, 2001, p. 77; D. R. Smith, 1978, pp. 2-3). Their existence between people in the HPOs becomes apparent when one pays attention to such details and, in fact, they occur with a fair amount of regularity. As Hezel (2001) notes, this can be very beneficial. Hezel was informed that kinship relationships between workers make “imminently good sense” and are a “sensible strategy” (p. 136). This is because Micronesian family systems are extant developed structures that provide a roadmap for navigating the dynamics of staff working together and being able to share opinions with each other (Hezel, 2001, p. 136) which are not necessarily innate or easy activities between individuals from different families, villages, or states. Kinship relationships observed in the HPOs included
staff being related to each other as, for example, uncles and nephews, near and distant cousins, and in-laws.

Similar kinship relationships were found to extend between HPOs within Micronesia. One family in particular was said to be just a couple of cousins shy of having a family member in each of the Micronesian HPOs. Sometimes staff between offices would speculate as to their own or other known community members’ possible family connections across territorial and national boundaries.

Kinship relationships also existed between HPO staff and staff in offices conducting other work. These proved to be helpful connections as relatives were good about reporting sightings of undocumented heritage, earthmoving activities and the like, and were generally supportive. HPO staff were similarly supportive of the missions of offices where their relatives worked.

These relationships were also valuable networks in helping to ensure a task or project’s success (R. H. Rogers, Interview, 17 April 2007). For example, in Palau, being related to members of the community being surveyed by the archaeology and ethnography sections eased the survey process. As Palau Community College professor Isebong M. Asang (2004) notes, in Micronesian islands such as Palau, “knowledge is intimately tied to relationships” (p. 19). This is not to say that supportive networks would not have existed otherwise. However, as noted previously, kinship relationships are comfortable, reliable networks already in place, and the sense of obligation can run quite strong. This can be especially helpful when dealing with offices following quite different missions or with offices that exist at different levels of government (and can consider themselves quite distinct entities) such as at the village or state level versus the HPOs, which are territory, commonwealth, or national level offices. At these times, even if there are no family ties, being from the same village or state can be an important way to connect with communities or other office staff. Finding
such common ground is thus extremely important in the island context (see, e.g., Asang, 2004, p. 20).

In this same vein, having attended school together can be an important way to connect. Palau has one public high school and five private high schools, which bring together students from all 16 states. The University of Guam (UOG), Guam Community College, Northern Marianas College, Palau Community College, and select other colleges and universities offer opportunities for students from various communities in Micronesia to connect with one another. Overall then, being related or having shared experiences can be very important in Micronesia where consideration in society can be very competitive (for discussion of the latter, see Bevacqua, “Châmpada;” Petersen, 2009, p. 221).

Created and blood kinship relationships, long-term community connections, and shared experiences are likewise important for non-Islander HPO staff. These relationships provide them with a local identity and can help socialize them to island socio-cultural environments (Nero, 2000, pp. 343-344; D. R. Smith, 1978, pp. 2-3). Certain perceptions exist about non-Islander researchers. For example, they, among other types of non-Islander workers, have reputations for profiting or otherwise taking and benefitting more than they give back or for viewing themselves as solutions to situations that Islanders may not view as problems. Non-Islanders often have considered their perspective of a situation as “modern” or “correct” as opposed to that of “backward” Islanders and island situations. Indeed, non-Islanders were often culturally different to the point of not knowing how to operate within an island system (Kesolei, 1977; see, e.g., Peck, 1997, pp. 1-9; D. R. Smith, 1978, pp. 4-5; Stapp & Burney, 2002, pp. ix, xi-xii, 6, 11, 29-30 & 50; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

One of the ways that staff in the offices act as family or village mates is in contributing to and attending family rituals and ceremonies such as christenings, Palauan first birth ceremonies (ngasech), and funerals of close relatives. These events are important and non-
attendance is not taken lightly. Within the Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs in Palau (within which the Palau HPO is housed) notices are sent throughout the ministry announcing the passing of a close relative of fellow ministry personnel and providing details of how to proceed for those who wish to contribute *badek* (money provided to families of the deceased). Typically, in Chamorro, Palauan, and Carolinian cultures, such contributions are documented in some fashion for future reference and reciprocation (S. Maluwelmeng, Pers. Comm., 24 Nov. 2010; Marsh & Aguon, 2011; see also, e.g., Parmentier, 1994, p. 64; in Palau, they may also be announced aloud at the event and via newspaper or radio). Palau Ethnographer’s Assistant Sylvia Kloulubak notes that such contributions and events are important in that they signify and provide opportunities to identify and learn about who comprise one’s relatives/social network (S. Kloulubak, Pers. Comm., 16 July 2010). During a trip to Palau in 2010, NMI HPO Archaeology Technician III, Herman Tudela, explained that it is at such gatherings that family/social network bonding occurs (H. C. Tudela, Pers. Comm., 16 July 2010). In all the areas under study, acts of reciprocation indicate how closely related or connected one is with others, show real concern, and demonstrate what are considered “human” qualities within the islands (terminology borrowed from Nero et al., 2000, pp. 343-344). To not participate in them ultimately causes rifts between personnel.

This is not to say, however, that issues do not occur. Indigenous staff are part of the community and work and exist within the island cultural context. As such, relatives and families closely linked to them may expect different consideration than that accorded to others.

Relations are also significant when staff conduct work, for example, when they, go out and collect oral histories, the elders, they want us to introduce ourselves first. And, if they’re not too familiar with our family name, or if they know that we’re from one of the lowest clan in our State...we’ve heard [that] some elders, they didn’t want to share anything with one of our staff because, they didn’t think that...they’re in the right position to ask. (L. D. Tellames, Interview, 11 April 2008)
On the other hand, Tellames notes that, somebody working in the office from a higher family clan can pave the way for easier success for a project (L. D. Tellames, Interview, 11 April 2008). Another Palau HPO staff member confirms these points, adding, however, that exhibiting proper behavior can balance out these other considerations (C. T. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 1 July 2010; for detailed discussion see Nero, 1987, pp. 55-58). Those issues that tend to occur, however, do so within the island cultural context. As such, there are ways to work through them. The social investment in reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation provide a support system that can be called upon to navigate through such choppy waters.

**Sharing Food**

During this study’s periods of observation, staff continually brought in food to share and eat together. On Guam for a while, Friday was officially recognized as the day to bring in food to eat together. Staff members were perpetually calling each other over to eat. Sharing food and eating together are very important bonding activities in Chamorro, Carolinian, Palauan, and Palauan Southwest Islander cultures, as Nero (1989) notes: “Sharing of food...[is] the quintessential Pacific metaphor of social relationships” (p. 120). She and others discuss this more’s applicability to Micronesians (as cited in Goodenough, 2002, pp. 265-266; Hezel, 2001, p. 12). For example, Stephen Murray (2006) assesses that,

> the exchange of food among Palauan families and kin groups has remained probably the most visible and symbolically important of the gestures that define social relationships. At occasions both formal and informal food is in constant swirling motion—received, displayed, distributed, consumed, marked in memory, then returned at the appropriate time. (p. 99)

As confirmed by long-time anthropologist to the area, Peter Black (Interview, 14 Feb. 2009), “There’s nothing more important [than sharing food]. Nothing.” The importance of sharing food continues to be so strong that being able to expand the ability to do so (beyond traditional compensation) would improve the acceptance and, thereby, the success and
effectiveness, of much of the work carried out in Micronesia. In fact, further studies may show that some historic preservation work is impeded or not initiated by the office’s limited ability to offer food during historic preservation related work.

**Demonstrating Respect**

Important aspects of traditional Micronesian culture also include recognition of authority along with homage and respect given to elders, traditional leaders, and community members with expertise (DCA, 2003, pp. 25-29; Hezel, 2001, p. 124; Nero, “Culture of Palau;” Petersen, 2009, pp. 199-204). This showed up in two ways in the offices. Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs have advisory boards comprised of various experts. Palau had two advisory-type bodies. As is customarily important within Micronesia, Palauan cultural protocol is to not publicly speak for another family, community, or state (Falgout, et al., 2008, p. 28; K. Kesolei, Interview, 24 April 2008; Murray, 2006, p. 31; Nero, 2011, pp. 136-137). Consequently, both the Palau Cultural and Historical Advisory Board and the Klobak er a Ibetel a Cherechar (Society of Historians) were structured so that each state was able to represent and speak for itself in sharing its perspectives, history, and customs. This fits in with the perspective shared by Asang (2004):

> If Palau had but one philosophy to guide its society it would be the notion of *omoengull a deluill ma deleongel* (respect for village relations and relationships). As an oral society, the primary source or method for theorizing about knowledge is in the word(s) of an authority and/or verbal testimony from a reliable source or person. It is knowledge inferred based on the reliability of the relations and relationship and grounded in the notion of *omoengull*. (p. 105)

Further, Palau HPO staff felt that this level of representation, in addition to being appropriate, was important in another sense. It helped provide for their products to be perceived by the Palauan community as having authoritative sources. This is extremely important given the relatively high levels of contestation and negotiation that can exist in Micronesian communities when discussing issues such as oral histories, titles, social status, and land and heritage rights (e.g., Petersen, 1990; 1995).
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Having such a body might also help the Guam and NMI HPOs contend with issues that result from a regulatory agency operating outside the realm of traditional authority. At the very least, such a body would allow for increased inclusion of Indigenous perspective. Such a body does not fully stop contestation and negotiation of the subject matter at hand or who has the right to make such cultural declarations (such as whether it should be a traditional individual or entity or a modern governmental one), given that such contestation and negotiation are inherent to Micronesian cultural systems.

Usage of Indigenous Languages

Owing to the high numbers of Indigenous Micronesians within the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs, certain cultural behavior is a prevalent part of the HPO environments. For example, in each office Indigenous languages are spoken. In Palau, during the periods under study, daily work, staff and advisory board/historian meetings, and other interactions were largely conducted in Palauan unless a non-Palauan visitor was present.213 In Guam and the NMI, this was somewhat less common owing in part to the more ethnically mixed composition of office staff and visitors.

Speaking Indigenous island languages within the historic preservation work environment is important in at least two ways. First, as cultural resource conservationists, segments of the communities expect the offices to also be actively conserving and promoting the Indigenous language/s.214 This has been voiced in Palau HPO annual symposiums and other activities (BAC, 2006, p. 6). Second, languages are carriers of cultural concepts; having fluent speakers furthers the notion that historic preservation includes the active perpetuation of its practices. As former Senator Benigno Palomo (2004), a native Chamorro speaker and well-known commentator on local issues explains: “The spoken word reflects a People’s culture, tradition and history” (p. 18).215 Palauans have stated: “Our language is our identity and once we lose it we lose our culture” (BAC, 2008, p. 2). Similarly, it has been
argued that speaking in Palauan “functions to position people in the world, to shape the range of possible representations, to define meanings surrounding a concept, as a tool to actively theorize and construct reality, to encode truths rather than merely reflect them” (Asang, 2004, p. 27).

Having Indigenous staff, especially those fluent in their mother tongue, creates an optimal setting for Indigenous concepts to guide office cultural resource management. With regard to documenting and imparting cultural and historical information, two issues came to the forefront. First, as noted by Chamorro oral historian Rlene Steffy (2006, p. 536), speaking in the mother tongue can be one of the important factors in determining the amount and kind of information one might receive from informants. Second, while working in Palau, this researcher was informed that written work needed to be developed in Palauan first, then translated to English. The difference, as it was explained, was that if one conceived of something and presented it in English first, it would not make as much sense when translated to Palauan; certainly it would be harder if not impossible to recapture the original concept.

Micronesians surveyed by O’Neill (2005) felt the survival of their language was “critical to continuance of their culture” and that it was “closely linked to elements of traditional knowledge” (p. 299). In this researcher’s experience of working with Guam and Palau HPOs, recognizing and conserving the language is part of preserving historic sites and the truest sense of their significance as it can best be understood and conveyed when rooted in a language thousands of years old with multi-layered and nested words and concepts (W. R. Metes, Interview, 31 March 2008). Indigenous island homelands that house living island cultures, the tangible and the intangible—sites and the language (as well as the related dances, chants, and more) encoding them—cannot and should not be separate concerns, as explained by the Guam HPO Historian (T. Ramirez, Interview, 29 June, 2007). Another researcher within the region, Amy Owen (2011), notes that “[t]here is also a moderate
correlation between how much an individual speaks the ancestral language and how much an individual retains the traditional culture” (p. 184).

**Challenges to Cultural Perseverance**

There are many reasons why the presence of Indigenous epistemological and cosmological considerations differs in Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs. In addition to the commonly understood impacts of development, modernization, globalization, and other forces that contribute to homogenization (Freland, 2009, p. 13; O’Neill, 2005, p. xviii; see also, e.g., O’Neill & Spennemann, 2006b, p. 1; Owen, 2011, pp. 185, 186 & 188), several other circumstances impact the presence of Indigenous values in Micronesian HPOs. The circumstances that challenge this presence range from political status, governmental structure, and cultural differences, to colonial and other history.

As discussed in Chapter Three, owing to their political statuses, Micronesian island HPOs have different relationships with the US and thus with the NPS. Consequently, NPS guidelines and requirements differ among them. Palau and other Micronesian entities in free association with the US can document ICH as a primary activity while domestic entities, though they likewise have Indigenous populations, cannot. The offices are also nested differently within their island government systems and how they figure into their island’s cultural resource management landscape. For example, while all three study areas have museums, Guam and the NMI have a history of humanities councils, Indigenous affairs offices, language commissions, and councils that promote the arts, none of which existed in Palau during this study’s fieldwork.\(^\text{18}\) This has meant that HPO visions and goals and community expectations of them have differed as well.

\(^{18}\) Since then, however, Executive Order 267 and Pub. L. No. 8-7 were approved in 2009 to develop a division of arts within the Bureau of Arts and Culture and a language commission. As of mid-2012, these had yet to be implemented.
Three other circumstances also impact the presence of Indigenous values. First, within
the islands under study, there are four distinct ethnicities recognized formally as Indigenous
to those islands—Chamorros, Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders; each
have their own customs, lifeways, epistemologies, and cosmologies. Additionally, these
identities can be further subdivided by island, state, village, or clan. These local identities
run strong in Micronesia. For example, anthropologist DeVerne Reed Smith (1990; 1997),
found that such perceptions of distinctiveness ran so strong that Palauans “argue that each
state’s history is different, and therefore there cannot be just one book of Palauan history. They
maintain a true history will emerge when the history of each state is written” (p. 21;
emphasis added). This illustrates that each of the culture and sub-culture groups have had
somewhat different ways of developing and continuing their epistemological and
cosmological understandings in the face of environmental and socio-political circumstances.

Second, Guam, the NMI, and Palau each had varying levels, lengths, and types of
colonization. Guam and the NMI differ from the rest of Micronesia (and the Pacific), in
having the “dubious distinction” (phrase used by R. A. Underwood, 1983a, p. 3, and other
authors of Guam history) of many “firsts” in Oceania, such as having early trade relations
with Europeans as well as being colonized and missionized hundreds of years before their
Micronesian neighbors. These distinctions had their own adverse consequences such as
significant Chamorro population loss (Goetzfridt, “Spanish response to Chamorro
depopulation;” Shell, 1999; J. H. Underwood, 1973, pp. 16-22). Though Chamorros have been
lauded for their cultural survival in the face of such harsh challenges (Diaz, 1994;
Kasperbauer, 1996, p. 26; Madrid, 2006, p. 10; Souder, 1992a; Thompson, 1947; R. A.
Underwood, n.d.), nevertheless, such an extensive period of colonization was bound to have
a profound impact both socially and culturally. Further, regarding colonialism, it has been
noted that, it “is not just a matter of military conquest and economic exploitation, it is also a
process of imagining through which dominated populations are represented in ways that
play upon and legitimise racial and cultural differences” (Nicholas 1994 as cited in O’Neill, 2005, p. 12; see also, e.g., R. A. Underwood, 1998).

Because this colonial experience differed so markedly from the rest of Micronesia, the Chamorro culture has taken its own unique historical path. Consequently, aspects of it seem quite different than many other Micronesian cultures (superficially at least though their cultures are no less valid). This, in part, also explains why Chamorro epistemology and cosmology have been under fire from various colonial systems, some of which have denigrated the island culture (see discussion in Diaz, 1999; Souder, 1994).

This history of colonization has combined with other factors, though with some differences between Guam and the NMI, to challenge the existence and expression of Chamorro and NMI Carolinian epistemology and cosmology. For example, they have become outnumbered in their homelands (US 2000 Census) and have been treated in the case of Guam Chamorros, if not also their neighbors in the NMI, as a minority (M. P. Perez, 2002, pp. 466-467). One consequence of these circumstances is that public spaces are often fraught with tensions regarding acknowledging and promoting Indigenous Islander values and behaviors. As will be discussed in Chapter Six, historic preservationists in US (domestic) insular areas such as Guam and the NMI can be perceived as un-democratic (not treating everyone equally), racist, or anti-American when focusing on Indigenous Peoples or on negative aspects of island colonial history (e.g., Bevacqua, 2010; J. J. N. Camacho, 2008; Souder, 1994, p. 195).

The third extant circumstance is the variance in the attention received from and interaction with anthropologists and other researchers resulting from these differing circumstances.

---

19 While this has similarly been the case for other Indigenous groups within the US, such as Native Hawaiians (Coffey & Tsosie, 2001, p. 195), legally, they and Native Alaskans have essentially been afforded more Indigenous rights recognition than Chamorros and NMI Carolinians (Duryea Jr, 2010; J. Aguon, 2009); though carefully parsed as the protection of interests as US citizens and ‘equal citizenship’ (Coffey & Tsosie, 2001, p. 195).
histories and colonial/political statuses (see, e.g., Diaz, 1995; Falgout, 1995; Kiste & Falgout, 1999). Falgout (1995) observes that: “Indeed, more American anthropologists are estimated to have studied Micronesia during the wartime-postwar era than any other area of the world in the history of the discipline” (para. 4). And yet, it is also true that, “with few exceptions, anthropologists have systematically overlooked the Chamorros, especially of Guam, in their search for culture in Micronesia” (Diaz, 1995, p. 2). Kiste (1999) supports this conclusion, noting that the one anthropologist who was commissioned to conduct research on Guam was not allowed back on the island after the war and that:

At the same time, the CIMA [Coordinated Investigation of Micronesian Anthropology] planners evidently believed that anthropological research was not warranted in the Northern Marianas; it was the only USTTPI district to have no anthropologist as part of its CIMA team. Chamorros may have been seen as too acculturated, too westernized, to merit anthropological investigation, or perhaps the people of Saipan were considered a pathological case [referring to the one early study on NMI Chamorros and Carolinians in which two physicians ‘administered intelligence tests and personality tests and collected psychiatric case histories’; the first anthropological study was not conducted until the next team of investigators]. (pp. 444-445; emphasis added)

During the 200 years of more intense Spanish colonization in the Mariana Islands (as compared to their short-lived and virtually non-existent presence elsewhere in Micronesia), certain European and New World influences were forced, promoted, or adopted and “Chamorroized” (Kasperbauer, 1996; R. A. Underwood, 1998; n.d., pp. 26 & 38). This resulted in fewer anthropological/ethnographical studies. Such studies can validate a culture (R. A. Underwood, Interview, as cited in Marsh-Kautz, 2002, p. 57). Petersen (2009) likewise notes that, owing to the colonial history in the Mariana Islands:

As a consequence, professional ethnographic research did not get under way until centuries after indigenous ways of life there had been much more significantly transformed than in other regions. We are dependent on a handful of the earliest historical reports for our understanding of traditional Chamorro social life and have a much thinner sense of it than we do elsewhere in Micronesia. (p. 33)

Early anthropologists in Micronesia were largely interested in “salvage ethnography” — documenting purportedly pristine cultures before they were “lost.” They
considered Chamorro culture as tainted or no longer existent (Diaz, 1995, p. 2). With some exceptions, most did not understand or accept certain fundamentals of the dynamic nature of Peoples, languages, and cultures, so they erroneously concluded that Chamorro/s essentially no longer existed (Diaz, 1995, p. 8). Many academics and Mariana Island community members have stories of encounters and public discourse that encompassed these positions. Diaz (1995) shares this story: “An anthropologist once told me that upon inquiry he was dissuaded from pursuing any work in the Marianas by a well known senior anthropologist because there were only Spanish peasants there” (p. 5; emphasis added). Similarly, the late Carlos P. Taitano, credited as key in Guam’s Chamorro cultural renaissance, would recount his experience as a student at the University of Hawai‘i in the 1930s. Professors told him at the time that there was no research in the Indigenous culture of his island of Guam because it was “gone” (T. Taitano, Pers. Comm., 4 Nov. 2010).218

Such assessments and other dynamics led to Chamorros feeling embarrassed or ashamed for exuding Chamorro attributes—speaking Chamorro or speaking US English with a Chamorro accent or behaving or interacting with one another in cultural ways (A. P. Hattori, Interview, 20 March 2007). Though some in Guam’s and the NMI’s communities have learned to recognize a living island culture that adjusts through time, acknowledgement and allowance of Chamorro culture as a valid expression20 in public spaces, including government offices, is often still wrapped up in these older ways of viewing Chamorros and Chamorro cultural processes. Public spaces, such as Government of Guam offices, suffer from assessments that island cultures, and their approaches to running modern governments and offices, are backward, corrupt, inefficient, or inappropriate (e.g., Leibowitz, 1989, p. 5). Guam’s SHPO labeled some of what they contend with as a

---

20 As opposed to being perceived as fabricated or borrowed from other Pacific Islanders.
“credibility issue” (L. B. Aguon, Interview, 23 March 2007). Some of these tensions may also be those that occur between the archaeological and Indigenous communities who can have very different ways of thinking about research goals and approaches (see “Epistemology,” p. 66). Further, these issues are sometimes idealized and racialized or culturalized. Islanders are often held up to standards that, perhaps unconsciously but nonetheless ethnocentrically, are idealized by expatriates even though the concept or procedure may not operate according to the idealized vision in the mother country/culture either. These standards can become internalized in that Islanders themselves may evaluate cultural behaviors in modern situations as backward, corrupt, inefficient, or inappropriate (Gegeo, 2001b, p. 181; Kushima, 2001, p. 11; see also, R. A. Underwood, 1983b; 1983c).

This study proffers that the presence of anthropologists and certain other researchers as well as of Peace Corps volunteers and volunteers from similar entities such as the Japan International Cooperation Agency and the Taiwan Technical Mission, have in many ways validated Island Peoples, their cultures, and their heritage (see, e.g., Kluge, 1991, p. 18) by listening to Micronesians, documenting their cultural practices, and at times serving as their advocates (e.g., R.A. Underwood, Pers. Comm., as cited in Marsh-Kautz, 2002, p. 57; Willens & Seimer, 2000, pp. 86-87). With regard to anthropologists in Micronesia, Falgout (1995) comments that it was their “role...to listen to what the Micronesians had to say and to make suggestions about how they might improve their position.” She also notes that some were critical of the US Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) administration and were so

---

21 This is an issue that deserves further attention than time constraints permitted for examination here. One interviewee had served in a state HPO. His experience of working in an office of some 35 staff who each, excluding administrative staff, had graduate degrees may be typical of state offices which may help them offset some of the perceived credibility issues in Island HPOs.

22 In other instances, however, they have invalidated certain Micronesian cultures such as that of the Chamorro (see earlier discussion).
close to Micronesians that they were “suspect in the eyes of other expatriates, even administrators” (“Accommodation,” para. 8). Fischer (1979) supports these assessments:

The fact that the district anthropologist was often seen by both Americans and Micronesians as a representative and defender of Micronesian interests sometimes led to the anthropologist’s being regarded by some of the Americans as subversive or excessively softhearted and softheaded. (p. 244)

Further, there is some discussion that these anthropologists and volunteers have spread liberal ideas and, for some at least, “anthropology was [seen and perpetuated as] largely committed to an anti-colonialist perspective” (Petersen, 2005, p. 310). In fact, Glenn Petersen (2005), long-time anthropologist researcher in Micronesia states, “my interest in Micronesia was from the outset thoroughly embedded in the larger framework of my opposition to American imperialism” (p. 309).²³

Discussed in the next chapter are certain other considerations, including grant guidelines and requirements that also have potential to directly and indirectly challenge the presence of Indigenous values in Micronesian historic preservation.

**Overall Assessment**

Overall, this study found that Indigenous values had a strong presence in all three HPOs. This assessment falls in line with the findings by long-time researchers of Micronesia (Nero et al., 2000). This was further validated recently by Hezel (2011) who observes that in Guam, regularly assessed as the most acculturated of the Micronesian Islands,²²⁰ “the basic set of Island attitudes and values” continues to be present despite hundreds of years of colonization and the most affluent lifestyle in Micronesia (Hezel, 2011, p. 550; see similar statements in Turner, 2012; DCA, 2003, p. 23).

---

²³ Though, in other instances, anthropologists have been viewed more critically as paving the way for “Americanization" of the area and increased construction of US military and hotel development projects (see some discussion in, Guam -Bill 1-31," 2011; Rainbird, 2004, pp. 22 & 31-36).
While Hezel states that this continuance may “suggest” that they cannot be “uprooted” by forces such as colonization and globalized standards of living, cultural loss is possible. Chamorro academic Robert Underwood (n.d.) discusses the processes of cultural change and potential for loss this way:

Cultural change does not necessarily imply being unfaithful to ‘true’ culture. It may be the simple adoption of a much needed value or trait in order to assure continuation of the group. However, if change is thrust upon the group in rapid doses and in unfamiliar terms, the resulting crisis may be more than could be withstood and would naturally result in the loss of identity and aberrant behaviors. The group would quickly discard all familiar symbols and fall into a pattern of anomie, restlessness, indecision and loss of self-worth. (p. 1)

Certainly this calls for all involved to develop strong understandings of what supports and challenges cultural perseverance.

Many of the observations and much of the discussion within this chapter closely follow some of the action steps that have been recommended for the NPS. These include, but are not limited to, working to: “Increase recruitment of Native Americans [read Indigenous] as National Park Service employees.” “[U]se native stories and languages in park interpretation.” “Facilitate connections by Native peoples and their living cultures to parks.” And to “help…[fellow community members] learn from indigenous peoples that we do not inherit the planet from our ancestors but hold it in trust for our children and grandchildren” (C. Cameron, 2009, as cited in J. L. Rogers, 2009).

**Chapter Summary**

Micronesian HPOs have relatively high levels of Indigenous staff. However, for some offices, the professional positions of archaeologist and ethnographer are often filled by a “revolving door” of non-Islanders or non-locals. While offices have been productive and visiting professionals have helped build staff capacity by transferring professional skills, the continual turnover does not allow for the offices to reach their full operational potential.
Chapter 5: Indigenous Values in Historic Preservation Offices

Indigenous values have a strong presence within the island HPOs under study. Indigenous values explored were the presence of the underlying Micronesian values of reciprocity, inter-dependence, and a sense of obligation; Indigenous staff; kin relations; sharing food; demonstrating respect; and usage of Indigenous languages. While these values come with their own complex sets of issues, their presence is essential for the programs to be embraced by the communities they serve. Furthermore, their lack of presence would cause the programs to be interpreted as neo-colonialistic impositions.

The perseverance of Indigenous values in Guam, NMI, and Palau communities and HPOs faces numerous challenges. In addition to the more commonly understood challenges of development, globalization, and modernization are the different recognitions of Indigenous rights, colonization histories, and outside/non-Indigenous perceptions of island culture and ways, the latter of which can be internalized. Island HPO staff need to be cognizant of these dynamics. The offices are tasked with balancing both societal desires and the perceived need to adapt traditional ways and adopt other customs with preserving cultural heritage for the people of today and the future. This includes maintaining traditional Micronesian ways of viewing, valuing, and interacting with Island/er tangible and ICH.

The following chapter builds upon some of these same ideas by presenting and understanding the perceptions of historic preservation specialists and related experts and the directions they envision for the future.
Chapter Six

Visioning and Re-visioning the Historic Preservation Offices

The next step after better understanding the historic preservation office (HPO) registries and socio-cultural settings was to explore the community’s perceptions of these situations to identify gaps between the two circumstances. It was also important to take the time to explore ways of building upon strengths and mitigating challenges.

Members of the Guam, Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau communities possess expertise in a broad range of fields. Within this chapter, historic preservation specialists, anthropologists, cultural experts, historians, and political scientists impart information that can serve as roadmaps for maintaining and strengthening island historic preservation, especially as it relates to Indigenous values.

Methodological Approaches

A number of sources have discussed the ways in which Micronesians traditionally view heritage and the safeguarding and conservation of it (see Chapter Three). However, this study is the first to assess the views of cultural and historical experts regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their island HPOs or their visions for the offices as they strive to meet community heritage needs. Such data is best gathered by conducting interviews.

Interviews were semi-structured and open-ended (see Appendix E, Appendix F, and Appendix G for research information statement and consent forms) since an open-ended response format has been determined as “the least culturally-biased response format as it [does] not convey specific norms” (Marsella et al., 2005, p. 295). Interview questions were tailored to the area of the interviewee’s expertise, though there was often overlap in the questions asked (see Appendix J for typical guiding questions) in order to cast a net, so to
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speak, to trawl for themes in issues or concerns. Interviews for this study covered multiple
topics within a limited time frame, thus information shared should be considered
representative, not comprehensive. The discussion of interviewee-shared issues will be
limited to those most relevant to the goals of this study.

While in much the same vein as for participant-observation, having some level of local
identity or demonstrable acumen in island life is important in carrying out interview
research in Micronesia. In this particular case however, it was also known that many of the
cultural experts were already well versed in the process of giving interviews. This was
especially helpful given the relatively short amount of time allotted to conduct research and
develop rapport in each island area.²²¹

The aim was to interview approximately 10 to 15 individuals per study area (Table
29).²²² In total, 44 historic preservation specialists and experts in related fields representing
eight categories of community membership and expertise were interviewed (Table 30).²²³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island entity</th>
<th>No. of interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some experts were interviewed more than once for a total of 48 interviews.*

Palau differed from the other two island entities in that a former director of their HPO
and one of its archaeological staff were now in key positions in a state government office.
Interviewing them provided an understanding of Palau’s national HPO history, and elicited
perspectives about state government historic preservation systems and relationships with
the national HPO.

The interviews were held in various informal venues, from offices to beaches to
restaurants, whatever setting provided comfort and ease of mind for the interviewees.
Because much of the knowledge in Micronesia is “owned,” it was thus the interviewee’s prerogative whether, and where, to share that information. The research design was thus accommodating in this regard.224

Table 30. Guam, NMI, and Palau Island Interviewees by Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Academic historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPO personnel</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Staff Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Staff Historian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic preservation supervisors, technicians and specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPO Board member</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPO Society of Historians</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>Leader (titleholder, officeholder, recognized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural expert</td>
<td>Academic cultural expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional cultural expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other preservation organization personnel</td>
<td>Head of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some of these interviewees were former HPO personnel at the time of the interview.*

Interviews were interactive, providing an opportunity, in addition to gaining valuable insights and information to develop further rapport as a continuing, contributing historic preservation community member. However, the objective of not leading the interviewee was kept in mind to minimize interview bias.

An important part of life in Guam, the NMI, and Palau involves knowing people and the ways in which they are connected to one another. As illustrated in an article, “The Belle of XXX” (1993),225 researchers need to be careful in such populations because it can be very easy for research interviewees or subject identities to be identified, with possible negative
consequences. The historic preservation, history, and cultural expert populations in the study areas are relatively small and issues that they deal with can become contentious. It was therefore deemed critical to provide high levels of confidentiality to interviewees. However, when assessed as acceptable, people are cited accordingly by name, area of expertise, island entity, or other aspects that helped validate a point.

Additionally, the merit of an issue can become clouded if attached to particular camps of thought or well-known personal positions. Many of those interviewed displayed a certain amount of hesitancy to critique local governments, HPOs, the National Park Service (NPS), or the United States (US) in general. On the other hand, a couple of interviewees did state that they had nothing to hide despite some frank critiques. Some expressed concern over local- or federal-level reprisals, including the potential of jeopardizing their funding overseen by NPS. Concerns were also voiced about being misinterpreted, with one particular person experiencing previous bad experiences as an interviewee.

Owing to the sensitivity of these shared perspectives, and respecting the Micronesian island cultural way of expressing such assessments confidentially (O’Neill, 2005, p. 254; see also, OHES, 2010; Parker, 1987, p. 18), interviewees are cited at times in groupings and are not always identified by name or position. Years of study, as well as experience, and working and interacting in the islands guided this researcher’s determination of which opinions were able to be shared in a public space (see similar discussion in Petersen, 2009, pp. 5-6).

Community Perceptions of Island Historic Preservation

Community member and expert perceptions were placed into several categories. The first of these is island historic preservation strengths. These strengths are followed by some of their challenges, including serving as a cultural broker of sorts. Since the offices work so closely with the NPS, it was important to explore the relationship strengths, challenges, and
needs/desires. Rounding off this discussion are the overall perceptions held by the community regarding historic preservation in their islands. Each island community parsed these perceptions in quite distinct ways.

**Strengths**

Interviewees noted some 36 strengths regarding their communities’ HPOs (Table 31). More than half, if not all, of these strengths directly or indirectly promote the presence of Indigenous values. Nine, or nearly a fourth, of the strengths directly relate to Indigenous values with another 12 at least partly relating to Indigenous values.

Twelve of these strengths revolve around the idea of having a “kind of inafa’maolek approach” as one interviewee stated, referring to the Micronesian concept of reciprocity (as expressed in the Chamorro language). Inafa’maolek can be read in the NMI HPO’s projects in partnership with other entities and their provision of archaeological studies for small-scale development projects. It is further evident in the high degree of community support in some of the offices, the interest among the community in the information gathered in the HPO studies, and the involvement of community members in surveys and restoration/rehabilitation projects. Further, this is likely part of the dynamics in Palau when traditional chiefs and their communities are involved. Their involvement in turn provides opportunities for traditional roles to be activated: roles such as chiefs entertaining people while conducting community work and people understanding that a site is significant by contributing towards restoring/rehabilitating it.

Palau is the one island HPO under study that offers an annual “restoration” grant, noted as a strength with many positive features (W. R. Metes, Interview, 31 March 2008).

---

24 Some discussion existed in the Palau HPO during the study as to whether some of the restoration projects were, by NPS definition, rehabilitation projects.
### Table 31. Community Perceptions: Strengths of Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guam</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office retrieves valuable information [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Can produce a lot of literature for public awareness and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Good people doing a good job&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NMI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Created public museum [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Networking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Kind of have <em>inafa‘maolek</em> approach (working together to make things good) [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Have conducted numerous projects in partnership with other entities [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility as a program, e.g., provide archaeological study for small-scale development projects [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with Pacific Regional Educational Learning organization to develop a history course to certify new teachers [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a &quot;very, very aggressive publication program&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having &quot;a public education component&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Has been a main focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Is concerned and active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Protection of sites&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous staff who are &quot;part of the local culture&quot; can provide that input and help the office understand impacts of HPO decisions [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have &quot;had a very active historic preservation review board&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palau</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office founders &quot;put down a very good foundation in term[s] of our relationship with the community&quot; [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having the equipment to get work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community support [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community wants to know historic preservation information gathered [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work to build community involvement and stakeholdership [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting surveys gets people interested in preservation; community &quot;pitches in&quot; [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Restoration of sites which engages people [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Gets traditional chiefs involved [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Chiefs entertain people during site restoration [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Gets people together and involved [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Informs people about a site and the site's significance [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Demonstrates the commitment of office and staff to historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering, recording, and archiving information in a retrievable way [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having &quot;very capable people&quot;/&quot;Having a lot of good staff&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know each other &quot;personally&quot; which helps in working together [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have had good directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Good, open communication&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff have &quot;good, solid background[s]&quot; [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spurred on by realizing the importance of their work [2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.
The awarded recipients typically restore/rehabilitate traditional Islander heritage. Former Director of the Palau HPO, Vicky Kanai (Interview, 10 April 2008), explains that the project, is not just restoring a site so it will become exposed or become beautiful or clean and all of that but, at least the chiefs and the people in the community understand that this is very beneficial to us, this is our identity, as well as, if we clean it and expose the site, it’ll be exposed and our younger generations will learn a lot about it.

Each office (though it was expressed in different ways) was noted for having “good people doing a good job” (L. B. Aguon, Interview, 23 March 2007), many of whom were interviewed, speaking knowledgeably and passionately about preservation issues. Indigenous staff work in each office (see Table 28), which was specifically noted by the then NMI Archaeologist as a strength:

The strength is the people here, being part of the local culture, knowing the oral tradition. All of that. That is a big plus that I think most of the stateside offices don’t have. Maybe when you get out west when you might have some Native Americans on your team. But, otherwise you’ve got a lot of people that are not part of the local culture that are making decisions that may not be completely accurate without the input from the locals, the natives, which they do try to get. But, it’s different from when you’re surrounded by people who grew up in the culture and are still part of it, learned from their grandparents and parents. (R. H. Rogers, Interview, 17 April 2007)

Additionally, many HPO Indigenous staff — archaeologists, historians, historic preservation specialists and technicians, public education officers, grants managers, and the Palau Registrar — had been in place for numerous years, accumulating invaluable institutional knowledge, as noted in Chapter Five.

**Challenges**

At the same time, each office faces numerous challenges (Table 32, Table 33, & Table 34), some of which have the potential to deeply impact the presence of Indigenous values in their historic preservation efforts. Seventy-eight challenges among the three island areas were discussed in interviews, with some overlap. Island HPO strengths and successes are then perhaps that much more notable given the high level of challenges that the island
HPOs contend with on a daily basis, including relatively severe funding issues; shortage of equipment, supplies, and staff; overwhelming workloads; development pressures; and community misunderstandings about historic preservation regulations. While all challenges affect Indigenous values at some level, nine directly relate to the presence of Indigenous values while 12 are partly related.

A major US military build-up is slated for the region with all three island entities undergoing some level of consideration for increased military presence and/or activities; the largest impacts are scheduled to occur in Guam and the NMI. The planned increase of non-Islanders and associated utilization of land has already directly impacted Indigenous heritage. Historic preservation specialists, and HPO staff in each office discussed the need to update and strengthen guiding legislation. As King (2009a) points out, this need is not isolated to island areas, but there is also a similar need within the US. During the period of study, each island entity worked towards these ends — Guam and the NMI successfully introduced legislation while Palau, which had introduced similar legislation in the past, gathered expert input to revisit their efforts. An important part of these updates, at least for Guam and Palau, was adding in or augmenting guidelines for human remains, especially ancient Indigenous Islander remains. One historic preservation specialist, after many years of contending with the demands of development, questioned what the offices were able to truly preserve: “Are we just an office that, in a way, permits the destruction but in a legal way?”

Some of the reported difficulties revolved around challenges in being able to conduct “cultural preservation” — work in which cultural considerations are fundamental rather than secondary or supplementary — and in performing HPO activities in a culturally appropriate manner. To do the latter has the potential of making the effort more meaningful to the Indigenous Islander community, which feeds into a higher potential for the effort’s continued success and the HPO being embraced by the community.
Respondents noted issues in HPO interaction with community members, developers, and researchers — having effective systems of community and office dialogue; ensuring awareness of the earthmoving permit process; conveying the benefits of the data that the permit requirements provide and enforcing submission of the results; balancing or offsetting desires for development; and dealing with “looting.”

Chamorro, Carolinian, Palauan, and Palauan Southwest Islander cultures present their own situations that call for reflection. In many ways, Indigenous cultures in Guam, the NMI, and Palau continue to be oral cultures where it is not only more appropriate but more meaningful to convey information by word of mouth. Interviewees noted that a published HPO document will “just sit on the shelf” and that community members “don’t really bother to go and take it out to read it” (M. Miko, Interview, 26 March 2008). According to one informant, expectation of traditional deference to elders and community status as well as to land ownership rights are also issues with which island HPO staff have to contend.

Further, all three island HPOs serve as community and cultural brokers (Table 35), balancing the demands and desires of different community groupings and interests (e.g., by ethnicity, occupation, or other). Such issues proffered by respondents were placed in two categories comprised of eight community groupings or interests. Each of these categories potentially has far-reaching impacts related to Indigenous heritage. For example, the Palau Bureau of Arts and Culture’s (BAC) Archaeological Surveyor notes: “It’s important to keep artists informed of their [HPO] archaeological findings and knowledge because they are educating the public through their work” (C. T. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 7 March 2008). Indeed, several inaccurate interpretations of ancient traditional island culture were encountered during this study. For example, in Guam some illustrations and wood carvings depicted four Chamorro latte (house columns of stone) serving incorrectly as cornerposts.

25 Known latte sets consist of “four or more pairs,” or eight to 14 or more house columns (see Cunningham, “Latte structures;” emphasis added).
one of the former existing in a children’s story book, Meet the *Mannge’ Manhoben* (Cute Youth), which presents inaccurate ancient Chamorro house-building engineering to young readers.

**Table 32. Community Perceptions: Challenges of the Guam HPO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Capacity           | Guam community is in transition with large changes ahead (slated US military build-up)  
                      Whether office can protect resources as effectively as staff desire  
                      Lack of opportunity for Historic Preservation Review Board involvement  
                      Hesitancy to identify office challenges or weak points in order to address them  
                      Not organized for maximum efficacy  
                      Lack of vision  
                      • In constant crisis mode  
                      • In survival mode  
                      • Hurts efficacy  
                      Efforts tied to elections  
                      Not moving forward  
                      Lack of prioritization  
                      Lack of long-term goals |
| Community broker   | Balancing community and developer interests  
                      “Adapting the office to meet all the needs of the community”  
                      A disconnect with the community  
                      Not getting enough back-and-forth dialogue with community, including Chamorro community  
                      Balancing between protecting a property and determining its use  
                      Act territorial over issues related to their mission |
| Funding            | Continual lack of funding  
                      Certain positions cannot be filled due to lack of ability to fund them  
                      Office security  
                      Job security  
                      Austerity holidays and other measures  
                      HPO understaffed  
                      HPO staff overworked  
                      Efficacy and ability of office to perform compromised |
| Public awareness   | Educating community about earthmoving process, especially developers and government agencies  
                      Threats                                                                                                                           |
| Staff              | Lack of sufficient staff  
                      Overwhelmed with workload  
                      Staff leaving office  
                      Having the educational backgrounds to be considered “credible” by others |
| Threats            | Looting of artifacts |

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.
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### Table 33. Community Perceptions: Challenges of the NMI HPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Getting required archaeological data submitted to office [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening historic preservation legislation [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of office holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting comprehensive survey of NMI [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access restricted by US military [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of unexploded ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack certain efficient equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will lose locally funded staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Too much emphasis on tangible heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To advocate [for] the intangibles&quot; [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural preservation [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing cultural resource preservation in culturally appropriate manner [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Lack of sufficient staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can't maintain or develop all the sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Historic preservation issues become political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHPO is a political appointee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of &quot;platform&quot; to address program weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting people to recognize value of requiring clearance so that office may gain heritage information [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education</td>
<td>Misunderstanding or misinformation about need for earthmoving clearance [2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.

Impacts from on-going US military build-up efforts in Guam, the NMI, and Palau ranged from the military acquisition of land, to the development or endangerment of areas with heritage, to the lack of accessibility to traditional heritage locales by Islanders. The influx of non-Islander populations, either through incorporation into the US (meaning freedom of movement by US citizens to the islands), imported labor, US militarization, colonialism, or war has introduced its own sets of challenges to historic preservation. Some of these challenges include introducing other ways of valuing heritage; vying for community power and consideration, including consideration in historic preservation efforts; and purchasing, leasing, developing, and using cultural and historic resources. Tourism was
found to be another powerful force in the region especially as it is considered one of the few resources that the islands can develop (Krause, 1992, pp. ix-x; Treloar & Hall, 2005b, p. 169).

Table 34. Community Perceptions: Challenges of the Palau HPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Harmonizing local government, Palau state government, and NPS ways of doing things [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to update legislation and add in human remains guidelines [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing enough state outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of national government support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't have a boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't always have fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community broker</td>
<td>-Don't want to be seen as holding nation back&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governors &quot;negative&quot; towards historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community are &quot;into development&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published documentation &quot;just sit on the shelf&quot; [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community members -don't really bother to go [to where HPO publications are] and take it out and read it&quot;[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Local government struggling financially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sufficient funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have to limit work that can be supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Some people are difficult to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Have to try to work ahead of fast pace of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HPO viewed as &quot;blocking development,&quot; “stopping development”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult if it's someone traditionally &quot;dominant&quot; (elders, titleholders, etc.) [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with political leaders, &quot;most people leading our government are developers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminding people to balance development with ecosystem and cultural concerns [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People feel they should be able to do what they want with their land [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View earthmoving clearance process as a &quot;hassle&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some will develop without permit (take a chance on getting away with it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.

Challenges to the collection of Indigenous Islander oral history and ethnographic information were also gathered from the Palau HPO (Table 36), which was the one office under study that was permitted to directly conduct such work with US Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) monies (see Chapter Three, p. 48). The two main types of challenges in this line of work that respondents shared revolved around gathering information and community acceptance of the information. According to responses, the largest perceived issue is the
passing of elders without transferring their unique bodies of knowledge and life histories. This was said to be due to not only having enough human resources to collect the information but also because some elders have continued to follow the custom of not imparting information easily and retaining what is considered proprietary information within the family (e.g., L. M. Olopai, Interview, 21 May 2007).

Community members have told Palau HPO staff: “You should have come earlier like, five years before, because the elders that had passed away knew about the stories of this historical site. So, right now, it’s standing over there but, we don’t know what its stories or meaning behind that” (F. Carabit, Interview, 17 April 2008). And certainly, in a society where information is conveyed orally, is dependent on myriad considerations, and is valued according to one’s personal relationship to the conveyer, it is difficult to present gathered information in a written format that is widely accepted by the breadth of Palauan society (Asang, 2004, p. 105; Kesolei, 1977; Nero, 2011; D. R. Smith, 1978) (see similar discussion for Pohnpei in Petersen, 1990).

During this researcher’s employment with the Palau HPO, the Oral History and Ethnography Section’s public awareness materials and publications were used as tools to encourage conversations between elders and younger generations (i.e., transmission of knowledge) rather than as fixed absolutes. A handout meant to serve as a guide to a produced poster of a typical traditional village of Palau encouraged readers to “Talk to your family and village elders for understandings about your village and state.” This encouraged transmission of information that perhaps no longer occurred regarding ancestral traditional villages from which family identity partly stems. Similarly, a publication designed originally to document and impart the titles and rankings of traditional chiefs per hamlet/village evolved into a reference guide to past and present documentation of this information. This publication informs readers that, for citable material, they need to contact state and village leaders who are the final authority regarding this information. Similar statements were
placed in reports containing state oral histories. As a final example, the Section gathered the meanings of symbols incised and/or painted on traditional bai (community/chiefly meeting centers), which parents requested that the Palau HPO publish as a booklet. However, the Section ultimately opted not to do so because it would have undermined an already existing exercise annually assigned to elementary students in the nation. This assignment was an optimal opportunity for the Palau HPO to encourage students to regularly consult with elders instead of soliciting HPO staff or poring through an HPO publication. To publish these as authoritative references would circumvent the transmission of this information through more traditional means. Direct communication between various community members, including students, researchers, and elders keeps alive both the information and the practice of maintaining it.

While the challenges for the HPOs under study were expressed in different ways, this researcher’s impression was that heritage specialists encountered in the field remained committed to preservation goals and finding ways for the cause to persevere. One respondent observed that challenges related to basic needs can be crucial in providing HPO specialists the opportunity to strive beyond working in crisis mode to even begin to “imagine the creative possibilities” of serving island historic preservation needs such as ensuring the appropriate presence of Indigenous values. She observed that the reality is that “they are so busy, so overworked, [and] so understaffed.” In fact, during the period of study, some offices’ staff numbers declined. For the NMI, the drop was severe, down to just three or four staff in the main office for a period of time according to anecdotal evidence. Indeed, it proved to be somewhat difficult asking about “elevated” HPO mission issues when the cumulative effect of these challenges were at times so disruptive to the fulfillment of even the most basic of HPO mandates.
Table 35. Community Perceptions: Guam, NMI, and Palau HPO Roles as Cultural Brokers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community groupings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Artists | Important to keep informed of *archaeological findings and knowledge*<sup>“</sup>  
Educate public through their work<sup>“</sup> |
| Military | Accessibility of local heritage  
Brings in money  
Militarization  
Prioritization of preserving local heritage |
| Mixed population | Different ethnicities  
- Indigenous population  
- More than one Indigenous population  
- Non-Indigenous  
Different age groups |
| Private land owners | Property rights |
| Public sector | Some have high turnover rates, hard to keep educated about local regulations  
Section 106 compliance issues  
Misunderstand compliance |
| **Interests** | |
| Economic considerations | Development  
Sustainable practices  
Money changes situations such as valuation of heritage |
| Religion | Have benefitted from historic preservation efforts  
Do not always support historic preservation efforts  
Is a strong presence  
The faith is the culture to some  
Churches have museums  
Have used social and political leverage regarding historic preservation |
| Tourism | Can promote historic preservation efforts  
- Heritage can be an important tourist attraction  
- Known cases of promoting preservation  
- Encourages maintenance of sites  
Considered an answer to economic issues  
Can challenge historic preservation efforts  
- Changes traditions and values  
- Intensification/speeding up of socio-cultural changes  
- Some heritage will be *sacrificed*  
- Damage to heritage  
- Looting  
- Sensationalization of heritage  
- Development of heritage into something else  
- Some sites too sacred to open up  
- Overdevelopment  
- Issues in disseminating accurate heritage information  
- Incorrect heritage can be presented to meet tourist expectations  
- Foreign tour guides  
- Not always set up to benefit local population economically |
Table 36. Challenges as Perceived by the Palau Oral History and Ethnography Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering information</td>
<td>Elders passing away without transferring knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If don’t feel appropriate behavior or connection or other, may not feel like sharing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May take more than one visit to build up rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family connection and family status may cause them to think person doesn’t have the right or are in the right position to ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some keep information in traditional way, for family only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to show appropriate amount of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to make them feel comfortable with interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel the need to follow tradition of bringing something to show respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have to let them know that you believe what they’re going to tell you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to be able to introduce ourselves, explain where we come from, and why you are asking them for the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community acceptance</td>
<td>Negative comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office does not necessarily document as holistically as people expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People have their own beliefs and ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US Historic Preservation Funding and National Park Service Oversight

Benefits

HPO staff were very clear in that they are grateful for the opportunity to conduct their work and for the support they receive from the US Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and the NPS (Table 37). This gratitude was often expressed first, before further responding to queries about their island HPO’s relationship with the NPS. One respondent remarked that perhaps such an office would not have been conceived locally. This is perhaps because conservation has traditionally been built in to daily living and is not a segmented, formal activity. Also, as the areas under study are young and developing, some assessed that government emphasis would otherwise likely be on what society often deems as more overt critical needs—health care, infrastructure, education, and the like—with few if any resources left over to focus on other critical needs such as historic preservation (Interviews: V. N. April, 22 March 2007; J. S.
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Table 37. Working with the NPS: Guam, NMI, and Palau Reported Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>&quot;Mentor objectives&quot;&lt;br&gt;Has been very good to us&lt;br&gt;The program exists [as a result of NPS support]&lt;br&gt;&quot;A local Chamorro wouldn’t have come up with an office such as historic preservation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Serves as another layer of regulations&lt;br&gt;NHPA Section 106&lt;br&gt;Advise how to get most out of program and grantor relationship&lt;br&gt;Have provided a good framework&lt;br&gt;Provide guidelines&lt;br&gt;Provide deadlines&lt;br&gt;Make sure &quot;we really do preservation&quot;&lt;br&gt;Some NPS staff have advocated for Micronesian needs [2]&lt;br&gt;Have adjusted grant conditions to take cultural protocol and considerations into account [1]&lt;br&gt;Allow for traditional compensation [1]&lt;br&gt;Allow for site restorations [1]&lt;br&gt;Supportive regional staff&lt;br&gt;Provide program advice [2]&lt;br&gt;Have &quot;guided us in the preservation work&quot;&lt;br&gt;&quot;They have been very helpful&quot;&lt;br&gt;Have &quot;had a very good relationship with them&quot;&lt;br&gt;Have good intentions, &quot;mean well&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Are fortunate to receive it&lt;br&gt;Has benefitted Micronesian HPO programs&lt;br&gt;The programs are &quot;alive&quot; owing to funding support&lt;br&gt;Have been able to conduct a lot of projects&lt;br&gt;Have been able to document cultural resources [2]&lt;br&gt;Have been able to restore cultural heritage [1]&lt;br&gt;Able &quot;to promote and preserve our own culture&quot;[1]&lt;br&gt;Have funded needed specialists [2]&lt;br&gt;Fund professional staff [2]&lt;br&gt;Fund local staff [2]&lt;br&gt;Has enabled the purchase of equipment which allows work to occur&lt;br&gt;Increase capacity&lt;br&gt;Fund professionals [2]&lt;br&gt;Provide trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.
While all listed benefits assist in the ability of the island HPOs to carry out their work, including work related to Indigenous heritage, five were found to have been directly instrumental in promoting Indigenous values, with seven assessed to be at least partly related to such promotion. Some of those directly instrumental were:

- That certain grant conditions have been adjusted at times to take Indigenous Islander cultural protocol and other considerations into account. For example, Freely Associated States (FAS) such as Palau may use HPF monies to purchase “traditional compensation,” given as a sign of respect for the sharing of oral history and other traditional knowledge.\(^{238}\)

- That HPOs have been able to document and in some cases, restore/rehabilitate, cultural resources though this latter activity was said to have been curtailed over the years.\(^{239}\) As noted earlier, Palau offers an annual grant to carry out “restoration” projects which, to date, have most often been of Indigenous Islander heritage.

- And, in Palau, one respondent assessed that the HPF and NPS support allowed the ability to “promote and preserve our own culture.”

Key benefits that at least partly promoted the presence of Indigenous values in island HPOs were:

- That some NPS staff have advocated for Micronesian HPO needs and have offered advice as to how to make the program work within island environments.

- That HPF monies funded certain professionals and staff such as the Palau HPO Cultural Anthropologist/Ethnographer and Ethnographer’s Assistant whose main tasks are to gather oral history, life histories, and document traditional Islander customs and lifeways. However, this was true exclusively for Palau, as
neither Guam, nor the NMI are permitted by the HPF to support such hiring. This is despite the Indigenous Islanders in those areas having traditions that they want to “convey” and “preserve” as expressed for Guam by the Island’s Historic Preservation Officer (L. B. Aguon, Interview, 23 March 2007).

US legislation and funding with oversight by the NPS were said to have also been helpful in combating perceptions held by some that island human resources and government offices are less authoritative, effective, and professionally trained. The layers of US federal legislation and grant guidelines were perceived to be helpful when dealing with contentious situations such as development, politics, and competing views about historic preservation (Interviews: L. B. Aguon, 23 March 2007; W. R. Metes, 31 March 2008; M. Miko, 26 March 2008; S. Russell, 22 May 2007).

**Challenges**

The study also gathered some of the challenges in working with the NPS (Table 38). Of the 40 challenges gathered, 21, or slightly more than half, were assessed to directly challenge the presence of Indigenous values in island historic preservation — inconsistent with cultural epistemologies and social, cultural, and economic environments. Another issue was determined to at least partly challenge this presence.

Interviewees shared three types of challenges to Indigenous values. First, complex and labor intensive grant processes demanded inordinate amounts of time spent fulfilling requirements (a not uncommon assessment among grant recipients in general), thereby taking away time from conducting actual preservation work.26 Staff, many of whom speak English as a second language, stated feeling uncomfortable submitting work that would be

---

26 See similar discussion regarding anthropological work for the US federal government (including CRM work) by NPS Acting Federal Preservation Officer Winthrop as cited in Fiske, 2008, p. 127; also see similar interview findings in J. G. O’Neill, 2005, pp. 269-270.
reviewed by native English speakers with graduate degrees, especially given that, typically, island staff do not themselves hold such degrees. They also worried that they did not know how to adequately express themselves according to the US ways of thinking about heritage and historic preservation work. For example, some noted that it was difficult to translate meaningful Indigenous words and concepts into the English language. They explained that it was hard to choose the right word, that there may not be an equitable translation, that the meaning and significance can become lost, and that translation can create categories for Indigenous Islander heritage that did not exist traditionally but may be learned by the upcoming generations exposed to their English language publications\(^{240}\) (Interviews: L. B. Aguon, 23 March 2007; M. Fleming, 2 June 2007; K. Kesolei, 24 April 2008; W. R. Metes, 31 March 2008; J. B. Pangelinan, 24 May 2007; T. Ramirez, 29 June 2007; S. Russell, 7 May 2007; 22 May 2007).

Second, respondents noted that, as part of the reality of their social and cultural island context, it was difficult to harmonize local protocol and NPS ways of doing things. Interviewees pointed out that island governments and societies traditionally have complex layers that must be dealt with in culturally appropriate, albeit time-consuming, ways (Interviews: W. R. Metes, 31 March 2008; H. C. Tudela, 25 April 2007).\(^{27}\) It can be very difficult then, to complete projects from beginning to end within the one-year grant project cycle. However, the layers of traditional societal and familial obligations, though complex to deal with, are actually positive indicators that the culture is still a living tradition. And, importantly, these layers are in fact features of the Island heritage that HPOs are tasked directly or indirectly to conserve.

\(^{27}\) See also Isebong Maura Asang (2004, pp. 19-20) and Jennifer McKinnon (2011) who each discuss the necessary and appropriate but lengthy and complex processes (taking weeks, months, or years) of identifying the correct community partners/stakeholders/advisors/informants for a project, establishing rapport, and working collaboratively in Micronesia.
Table 38. Working with the NPS: Guam, NMI, and Palau Reported Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative issues</td>
<td>Micro-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex and labor intensive reporting [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-island approval really slows process down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office — needs [s] to really know how to justify [their] requests for funding, for technical assistance, like that” [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting expected to be done in a certain way of thinking and expressing [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to translate into grantor’s language (English) [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard to choose the right word [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May not be a ready translation for the word or concept [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meaning and significance are lost when translated [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can create categories for heritage which did not exist traditionally but may be learned as such by the upcoming generations [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forms filled out by those with high school or college degrees but reviewed by people with graduate and postgraduate degrees [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes away from time to do actual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May have to do work with fewer staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some NPS officials that don’t know the islands need to see first hand how preservation is different in the islands [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical environment harsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Equipment doesn’t last as long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social, cultural, and political circumstances [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenges meeting the needs of the community, i.e., multi-layered or more demanding projects cannot be done in short timeline [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hard to meet deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficult to harmonize local government and NPS ways of doing things [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Criteria for valuing heritage do not necessarily mesh” [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have the additional state layer of involvement [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Have to do cultural tradition and practice’ [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire for more training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don’t have as much experience in historic preservation as a field [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Need to make sure that [program is] not relegated to a kind of second class status”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have special conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long distance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phone calls are costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel is costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited to one-year projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guam and NMI cannot do oral history projects [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May not fully realize the limits of local funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can take a long time to reimburse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects and pay can be put on hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming more strict and less flexible [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrict types of projects that would serve community needs [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transmission projects not funded as such [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intangible heritage projects not funded for Guam and NMI [1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [1]—assessed as a direct Indigenous value. [2]—assessed to be at least partly an Indigenous value.
Third, interviewees pointed out that HPF monies could not support certain types of
desirable and culturally significant conservation efforts. These types of activities include
gathering intangible heritage in its own right for Guam and the NMI, and supporting
projects that would allow the transmission of intangible heritage, such as chanting, weaving,
and wood-carving (Interviews: L. B. Aguon, 23 March 2007; G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; F.
Carabit, 17 April 2008; L. D. Tellames, 11 April 2008). However, informants also noted that
the region’s NPS Program Manager is providing assistance in how the offices might fulfill
these desires.

Worth highlighting is that there are numerous challenges to conducting historic
preservation efforts in the islands: developing economies; limited infrastructure, on-hand
supplies, and expertise; harsh tropical environmental conditions; inconsistent power supply
and less proficient Internet service; expensive, imported, and often less up-to-date
equipment; among others. Further, beyond being immediate challenges, these have a
cumulative, debilitating effect in carrying out all aspects of an HPO’s annual workload.
Ideally, the reality of such conditions would allow for some level of flexibility on the part of
granting agencies, though these agencies also have to answer for preservation program
successes and issues within their systems of management and accountability can complicate
the ability to implement this ideal.

**Island Desires from NPS**

Being informed of these challenges makes the shared desires from NPS understandable.
Shared desires include making reporting more manageable, increasing training concerning
the administration of the grant, helping island government systems understand how they
can be more supportive in meeting island historic preservation goals, and making historic
preservation standards more reflective of island situations (Table 39).
Table 39: Working with the NPS: Guam, NMI, and Palau Reported Desires from the NPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Desire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Make standards more reflective of island situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produce more manageable form(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase training of SHPO and HPO staff for administering grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider adding in requirements to local government to keep trained SHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and staff in place for length of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use Micronesian Endowment for Historic Preservation/annual consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gatherings for these types of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use circular letters/tracking system for communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen the NPS relationship with the national government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Fund more staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase funding to offset difficult local economic realities/rapid development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase capacity</td>
<td>Provide technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIS training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to provide professionals and specialists that can -bring [office] up to a certain standard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Be more instrumental and more helpful&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See situation first hand (for those who haven’t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addressing these desires may allow for the increased ability to “imagine the creative possibilities” of serving island historic preservation needs, including Indigenous Islander values, instead of spending nearly all their time and energy contending with the reality of being “so busy, so overworked, [and] so understaffed.”

**Overall Perceptions**

Interviews in Guam, the NMI, and Palau revealed differing perspectives and priorities regarding island heritage and historic preservation. On Guam, several interviewees responded of their own volition by highlighting particular ethnic or political group represented by type, or by the symbolism imparted. The former was likely related to the reality that Guam is the most demographically mixed of the areas under study (see Table 3); its Indigenous Islanders no longer constitute a majority of the island’s population (42%) (US Department of Commerce & US Census Bureau, 2004); many Indigenous rights are not
recognized; and it is where overt Indigenous advocacy was assessed by interviewees to have the strongest presence.

In the NMI, some experts focused instead on whether the heritage was tangible or intangible, or whether there were more Indigenous approaches to managing heritage. This finding for the NMI is perhaps partly due to the fact that NMI residents appear to have a greater awareness of more of their Indigenous resources. One respondent also surmised that the presence of cultural and historic sites in the NMI is denser than in Guam (S. Russell, Interview, 22 May 2007).

In Palau, the balance between serving island community needs in the face of a mixture of outside and inside interests surfaced. One expert who asked to remain anonymous assessed that some of the outside support for cultural and historical resources served foreign interests and agendas, such as encouraging Palau’s support for certain causes in international organizations. Varied outsider interests in World War II (WW II) heritage surfaced during the period of study, with projects involved in tracking down the remains of US prisoners of war, repatriating WW II human remains and proposing that the WW II battle on Peleliu be commemorated as a heritage area, park, or World Heritage site (see some discussion in Murray, 2006, p. 6). Palauans encountered in the field, on the other hand, were concerned with maintaining the viability of traditional sites and cultural lifeways and harnessing the economic potential of both WW II and traditional cultural and historic assets at the grassroots (state) level (see, e.g., Interviews: D. Alexander, 12 May 2011; V. N. Kanai, 10 April 2008; R. Olsudong, 4 April 2008).

A third, but no less powerful set of interests to balance was that related to traditional and modern cultural resource management systems. Community members and leaders deliberated about which roles should be maintained or redefined by the community and traditional leadership and which should fall under the purview of modern government.
Operating at a low-key level were the ways in which the concerns of the minority populations of Southwest Islanders were balanced within the larger society.

Despite the differences in the ways that people categorized the work of the three island offices, there were areas of overlap. Interviewees from all three entities noted that ancestral areas, including traditional “places of power” and where daily living activities took place, were some of the most significant sites to Indigenous Islanders (Interviews: G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; A. P. Hattori, 20 March 2007; L. M. Olopai 2 June 2007; R. Olsudong, 4 April 2008; J. B. Pangelinan, 24 May 2007; H. C. Tudela, 25 April 2007). This finding falls in line with earlier studies (Spennemann, 2003; Spennemann et al., 2001; 2002, p. 56). The belief still exists that traditional and cultural Micronesian sites of power, if not remembered or honored or treated appropriately, or if developed, can have dire consequences such as illness or death (Bevacqua, “Taotaomo’na;” L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007; J. Reyes, Pers. Comm., 18 May 2007).

On Guam, interview respondents opined that, for various reasons, heritage from the Spanish or US colonial eras dominated much of the attention and money spent on historic preservation efforts. Specifically referenced were monies from both the Government of Guam and the HPF. They further commented that this emphasis fostered a storyline focusing heavily on what the Spanish and US did while missionizing and running colonial governments. One person took this line of thinking further, stating that, in his evaluation, the system was set up in a way so that historic preservation was more readily promoting the “national mission to preserve historic sites of America” and that “historic preservation is being manipulated to direct us to think...‘I’m American’” (meaning to promote a sense of US identity for the Island and the Island’s People). Another of Guam’s community experts stated that nearly half of the Guam register sites represented WW II, something the expert assessed as “a very high number. Very high.”
By contrast, interviewees felt that Indigenous Chamorro heritage on Guam traditionally received relatively little attention or money. And yet, as assessed by long-time Guam historian Larry J. Cunningham (Interview, 15 March 2007), much of the community interest is in understanding ancient Indigenous Chamorro heritage and feeling connected to it in ways that inform one’s identity as an Indigenous Pacific Islander. Similarly, former NMI SHPO Jesus “Jess” Baza Pangelinan stated (Interview, 24 May 2007) that contemporarily the most important sites to Chamorros in the NMI would be the “ancient Chamorro sites, because they [the sites] went through World War II and are still around” despite the heavy destruction caused by the war, intense colonization, and more recent developments.

The desire to better understand and connect with ancestral ways has been a driving force for at least some of the Carolinian community as well. NMI HPO staff stated that Carolinian teachers, students, and community members have asked about NMI Carolinian artifacts during HPO presentations. They expressed interest in the office creating a display of customary Carolinian tools, instruments, jewelry, and the like as the office has done for Chamorro artifacts (Interviews: J. S. Castro, Jr., 25 April 2007; R. N. Magofña, 14 May 2007).

In contrast to their NMI and Palau counterparts, some Guam experts also expressed and promoted more interest in more contemporary Indigenous Chamorro heritage resulting from skills developed or adapted after European contact. For example, following years of smaller preservation efforts, the Guam Preservation Trust (GPT), in collaboration with the Guam HPO and others, rehabilitated the 1911 Jose P. Lujan House, site of the pre-war Guam Institute (66-01-1115). Built by a Chamorro master craftsperson, the Lujan House melds Indigenous construction materials and knowledge with those introduced during the Spanish and early US naval administrations (GPT, 2011). Identification and nomination of like contemporary Indigenous heritage had not occurred yet in the NMI and Palau during the periods of fieldwork in those areas. When a long-time Palauan historic preservation
specialist was asked whether Palauan interest in this portion of their heritage existed, the answer was a flat “No.”

A Guam historian recalled being told that there was a greater emphasis on colonial sites due to the availability of dates, events, names of particular architects or persons associated with these sites (data to place on register nomination forms). However, these are concepts that do not necessarily reflect island cultural perceptions of what makes Guam, NMI, and Palau Islander heritage significant (e.g., Interviews: A. P. Hattori, 20 March 2007; W. R. Metes, 31 March 2008; L. M. Olopai, 3 June 2007; D. Shuster, 9 June 2008). Even when such information for Indigenous heritage was readily available, something in the system, or perceptions/misperceptions of how the system operated, or some other circumstance caused certain types of Indigenous Islander heritage to be underserved.

Some of these dynamics may relate to the fact that, in numerous ways, island communities have various dual realities such as that which is recognized in government offices and other public arenas and that which exists at home and in the community spheres (see, e.g., R. A. Underwood, 1991, pp. 14-15). For example, local Chamorro and Carolinian communities hold sets of criteria for determining Indigenous site significance, criteria that include considerations such as whether a family has been attached to land for a long period of time, provides clan identity, or village status regardless of whether anyone in the family was a historic figure or part of a historic event. Carolinian cultural expert and advocate Lino M. Olopai illustrates this for students who may themselves not see the dualities or incongruities of non-island ways of thinking and behaving that have crept into their homelands (Interview, 3 June 2007).

Guam State Historian, Toni Ramirez (Interview, 29 June 2007), shared that certain things that show up on nomination forms, like time periods, are not “easily defined” from the island perspective or, at the very least, are different than the American perspective:
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To the American experience, World War II for Guam was 1941 to 1944, but to the Chamorros, of course not. World War II began as early as 1937. They felt the conflict because of what was happening between Guam and Saipan. The borders between US-held Guam and Japan-held northern Mariana Islands became closed. Guam Chamorros were essentially told, ‘You can’t go to Saipan. You can’t get married to anybody from Saipan. It’s been stopped, you can’t travel over.’ And, vice versa. People [on Guam] talk about this all the time.

And, in regards to the end of WW II, Ramirez (Interview, 29 June 2007) asked:

Did World War II end for the Chamorros in 1944 or 1945?... Those that survived, the American soldiers, went back home. With the Japanese, it was the same except for the war dead... For the Chamorros, they remained when the battle was over, so they had to deal with everything that was really a part of the war.

Chamorros and NMI Carolinians today are still dealing with war compensation, land loss, and environment destruction issues, more than 60 years after the formal conclusion of the war (Marsh & Taitano, 2012, p. 145).

Ramirez (Interview, 29 June 2007) went on to point out that there are, certain things that have to be allowable, on the regional level, to see [what and] how we perceive to be important to our own history, and not just simply meeting a standard again because that’s the way it has to be done. You know what I mean? Fill out the form and…check the boxes and all that.

Two cultural experts, one from the NMI and one from Guam agreed that when dealing with their Indigenous cultural and historical issues, there needs to be a holistic approach. Ramirez (Interview, 29 June 2007), for example, expressed: “I cannot see how something could be understood in its entirety if I don’t know the archaeology of pre-contact, if I don’t know basics of the language, if I don’t know the culture.”

The former NMI HPO Historian mentioned that for historic preservation surveys, planning should ideally include extensive research of the culture, the people, and the environment connected with resources — including its immediate and neighboring environment, oral histories, ethnographic research, consultation with elders, and so forth (G. S. Cabrera, Interview, 14 May 2007). Similarly, in preserving and transmitting the intangible heritage of Carolinian octopus hunting, Carolinian cultural expert Lino M. Olopai was,
during the study, teaching a group of Carolinian youth how to hunt for octopus utilizing traditional methods. Important elements of the program reached beyond the scope of instilling basic know-how into the youths’ minds. Females and males each learned the types of hunting/fishing their gender would have traditionally conducted, and parents were to perform and teach their customary roles, such as those of women weaving thatch coverings for the canoes and providing meals for the fishers. He noted that, ideally, traditional behavior related taboos would be taught and followed as well (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 21 May 2007).

Despite concerted efforts by the NPS to assist the Micronesian programs in meeting their community’s needs by coordinating needs assessments, resource studies, and regional training, Island HPOs were described by interviewed staff as largely modeled after HPOs in the US mainland. This modeling, or perceptions of how the model is meant to operate, may, in part, inadvertently discourage offices from identifying, maintaining or nominating particular cultural resources or types of heritage. Other factors may have to do with the way that Islanders have been taught to view their histories, government offices, and political relationships with the US federal government. Also of import may be their islands’ struggling economies and the need for external funding so that staff are less likely to take chances, push the boundaries, or rock the boat with federal funding and the guidelines that come along with it.

Another concern raised was the sensitivity of historic preservationists in US (domestic) insular areas such as Guam and the NMI being perceived as undemocratic (not treating everyone equally), racist, or anti-American when focusing on Indigenous Peoples or on negative aspects of island colonial history (e.g., Bevacqua, 2010; J. J. N. Camacho, 2008; Souder, 1994, p. 195). As Spennemann (2011) notes, such interpretation and tensions can arise “both in cases where the majority marginalizes a minority, and in cases where a numeric minority exerts political control over the majority” (p. 13). In Guam, both situations
occur simultaneously. Though Chamorros constitute a plurality of the island population, as an unincorporated territory with an Indigenous population, Chamorros are treated as a minority in their own homeland (e.g., M. P. Perez, 2002, pp. 466-467). In the meantime, the political and cultural expectations of the non-Indigenous population have become very assertive.

One interviewee evaluated the depiction of the colonial eras as very romantic — as “beautiful Spanish buildings” and “beautiful Spanish churches” with the result that one would finish a tour of the Island with “a positive sense that this was a nice colonial relationship” (A. P. Hattori, Interview, 20 March 2007). But, the story of the colonial legacies are much more complex than that. There have been many actors with varied agendas and a wide range of types of events, each with underlying dynamics, some of them quite unpleasant.

Interviewees on both Guam and the NMI pointed out that, despite information available in historical texts, Chamorro battles and battlefields and their devastating effects are not part of the visible historic site panoply. Other types of colonial history noted as absent or underrepresented (Table 40) were understandings of introduced diseases during the Spanish administration and “mourning of what Chamorros lost in the process” of colonization (Interviews: G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; A. P. Hattori, 20 March 2007). These particular examples are what has been termed “negative heritage,” defined by Meskell (2002) as,

a conflictual site that becomes the repository of negative memory in the collective imaginary. As a site of memory, negative heritage occupies a dual role: it can be mobilized for positive didactic purposes (e.g. Auschwitz, Hiroshima, District Six) or alternatively be erased if such places cannot be culturally rehabilitated and thus resist incorporation into the national imaginary (e.g. Nazi and Soviet statues and architecture). (p. 558)
Table 40. Guam Community Perceptions of their Public Historic Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need a more complete view of colonial history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely celebrates the colonial experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanticized view of colonial nation presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents an American identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking or underrepresented:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understandings of what Guam was like before the Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diseases introduced during the Spanish administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Mourning of what Chamorros lost in the process” of colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chamorro latte sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the War in the Pacific National Historical Park (WAPA; itself a registered site, 66-01-1091) in Guam and the American Memorial Park located in Saipan have made concerted efforts to provide a local presence in what they present (e.g., Schumann, 2006, pp. 283 & 286). However, as large, well-funded historic preservation efforts in those islands, their actions make a prominent statement about a war that was imposed on the islands and Islanders (Guam Chamorros were US wards at the time of the war, and disallowed any real political voice). Furthermore, the commemoration of the war dominates the Indigenous history present on that same landscape.

Because of multifaceted political status struggles with the US, memorials and historic sites on Guam have been used as ways to show “sign[s] of allegiance and pride and connection to the US” (R. A. Underwood, 1977). This assessment was similarly expressed by two other interviewees. A Guam respondent noted that within historic preservation on the Island, “there isn’t really a strong, pro-Chamorro identity” or a “pro-Chamorro sentiment” in the Island’s monuments or other sites.

For all three areas under study, there were concerns regarding the types of development and the mitigation processes that have been allowed by HPOs (i.e., archaeological research conducted, but ultimately development rather than avoidance of a
Interviewees noted, “development will come and go” but, “once you ruin [a cultural site], it’s irreplaceable,” “it’s gone forever” (Interviews: M. Fleming, 2 June 2007; T. Ramirez, 29 June 2007).

**Visions and Recommendations for the Historic Preservation Offices**

Historic preservation efforts are in constant flux (e.g., NPSCC, n.d., p. 3; Silberman, 2009). Communities and their needs, and the socio-cultural and political environments within which they exist, are constantly shifting, necessitating that cultural heritage management entities respond accordingly. As noted by former NPS Associate Director for Cultural Resources, Jerry L. Rogers (2009), the historic preservation vision is “a moving target” (p. 11) and “must be maintained, updated, and kept constantly in front of those who have to carry it out” (p. 7).

Input gathered for this study offered various perspectives as to how historic preservation can better reflect and connect with island communities (Table 41). Although the visions may vary, the desired goal largely remains the same, namely to make the process more meaningful, especially to the Indigenous Peoples of Guam, the NMI, and Palau.

Visions for the offices were placed into seven categories: driving force, engaging stakeholders, increasing capacity, making research more responsive, organization, promoting culturally appropriate consideration, and training and education. Overall, the three types of issues that invoked the most discussion were engaging stakeholders, increasing HPO capacity, and training and education. These revealed the heightened conscientiousness, passion, and concern of HPO staff for their work, as well as commitment to serving their communities. These visions also illustrate that Indigenous heritage effort concerns are interwoven with other heritage considerations.
### Table 41. Community Expressed Visions for the HPOs of Guam, the NMI, and Palau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Theme</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving force</strong></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Refocus on surveying and inventorying</td>
<td>Shift from being driven by development</td>
<td>Have similar entity for benign competition to stimulate activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Be driven by cultural imperatives; “reorientate the objectives” to better serve Indigenous culture(s)</td>
<td>Conduct work with “vision of the future” and “viability of the culture’s future”</td>
<td>(following traditional bitang ma bitang (two halves of a whole) model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing more holistic surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Coordinate community-based projects, e.g., traditional food &amp; medicine community gardens</td>
<td>Increase community involvement/Increase community awareness and stakeholdership</td>
<td>Encourage state offices to be more active regarding historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage safeguarding sites</td>
<td>Increase number of historic sites registered and developed</td>
<td>Increase fieldwork that HPO can provide to states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create an archaeology site model for people to see and understand first hand about Pre-latte and Latte era sites</td>
<td>Rehabilitate sites</td>
<td>Augment program to restore sites for future and for economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get people to be more active in and better understand “their legacy, their history”</td>
<td>Have staff participate in various mediums—different media forms, workshops, seminars</td>
<td>Determine community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make them feel like the sites are theirs; that it’s not just a government responsibility</td>
<td>Update technology of outreach—e.g., use PowerPoint presentations</td>
<td>Provide theatrical productions of legends and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remember that the office acts as a steward for the community who are their “clients”</td>
<td>Update website (link to/with other active local websites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educate the younger generations that some things shouldn’t be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Theme</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing capacity</td>
<td>Tourists (not necessarily excluding community)</td>
<td>Find ways to make sites more interactive/dynamic, e.g., have someone in cultural dress at site</td>
<td>Continue to develop sites for tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other entities</td>
<td>Go beyond &quot;enforcement attitude,&quot; &quot;be part of the solution&quot; when interacting with other agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-sponsor exhibits with the national museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a good state repository</td>
<td>Have an archaeology lab</td>
<td>Capture, safeguard deeper levels of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to build the inventory of resources</td>
<td>Increase staff—more archaeologists, more in-branch offices, add grant writer and ranger</td>
<td>Document diasporic ways of activating Palauan customs where located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secure more funding</td>
<td>Lobby national government for increased support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey to create more comprehensive understandings</td>
<td>Move on to more intensive surveying—digging, testing, carbon dating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have archaeologist with Mariana and/or Chamorro archaeology background</td>
<td>Harness graduate and postgraduate students to come in and carry out research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have survey team comprised of people sensitive to the culture(s)</td>
<td>Develop cultural center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Theme</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Make research more responsive | Organization | Develop list of research questions | Take out from under Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), make own cultural resources office | Reorganize the office to be "better"
| | Could be re-grouped with natural resources | | | |
| | Keep within DPR, but be more interactive with it | | | |
| Promoting culturally appropriate consideration | Have understood cultural protocol processes, especially for when encounter artifacts and burials | Be more proactive about cultural preservation and cultural identity issues; conduct intangible heritage efforts | In the community, increase cultural skills, build up talents, and strengthen identity and pride |
| | Document intangible heritage like FAS HPO do | Write about ourselves | Build up arts sectors in community |
| | | Write in the vernacular | Possibly create registries of intangible heritage and traditional wealth items |
| | | Recognize—nominate, develop—cultural traditional properties | Represent the full range of communities, including foreign communities |
| | | House in traditional structure like a canoe house | |
| Training and education | HPO specialists | Regionally based education and training | Training in geographic information system (GIS) and organization | Educate states to assume many or all historic preservation activities |
| | Community | Disseminate archaeological findings in general public formats | Figure out how to provide even deeper understanding and connection to heritage "Enhance the historic education and their cultural education further" | Cont'd |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Theme</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Guam</th>
<th>NMI</th>
<th>Palau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tour guides and tourists</td>
<td>Provide accurate information about sites and historic preservation laws</td>
<td>Correct inaccuracies perceived by community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Conduct archaeology field schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work closely with the education system like the Northern Mariana College”</td>
<td>Work to make — a discipline that may be related to the History, Culture, Archaeology” to be — a priority of this nation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide educational materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep updated re local events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There was a high degree of like goals gleaned through participant-observation, years of working with the offices and their staff, and interviews. As in any community, however, certain contrasting or distinctive visions for the offices did surface. In fact, one NMI Carolinian cultural expert expressed that perhaps the maintenance and preservation of NMI Carolinian heritage was better served by being in Islander hands with government support rather than in a formal government institution (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007).

Those on Guam and in the NMI expressed “stronger concern with development” as being a driving force for HPO activity, so much so that other office objectives such as surveying and inventorying island resources and direct preservation work do not occur as often as they used to or ideally should (Interviews: G. S. Cabrera, 14 May 2007; W. Hernandez, 23 March 2007). In Guam, with the ongoing US military build-up, the HPO has been seeking funds to hire additional staff in order to keep up with ever-increasing development demands (L. B. Aguon, Pers. Comm., 19 Oct 2010). While not the driving force in Palau, earthmoving permits were likewise on the rise (R. Olsudong, Interview, 4 April 2008). For Guam and the NMI, respondents remarked that their offices’ priorities had shifted over time toward regulatory functions. Island HPO staff noted their need to “re-orientate the objectives” to allow for the office to be “driven by cultural imperatives,” thereby better serving Indigenous cultures, as well as other groups that comprise “part of the island story.”

Part of this shift would involve conducting surveys more holistically and in stronger accordance with Indigenous sensibilities, as noted in this chapter’s first section. An example of a project that leans in this direction is the NMI’s recently completed underwater cultural resources survey (McKinnon & Carrell, 2011; McKinnon, 2011), which was conducted in partnership with the NMI’s HPO, Coastal Resource Management office, and Division of Environmental Quality. Project members consulted with various community groups/stakeholders, created end products “inclusive of multiple viewpoints and
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including quotes of several cultural groups involved in the battle (i.e. Chamorro, Carolinian, Japanese, etc.),” and are seeking to print the end products in Carolinian, Chamorro, English, Japanese, Korean, and Russian (McKinnon, 2011, pp. 97-101).

The second idea for re-visioning the office was to increase the involvement of stakeholders in island historic preservation processes in a variety of ways. Visions consisted largely of reaching out to three factions — the community, tourists, and other governmental entities. Ideas ranged from coordinating community gardens that would cultivate traditional vegetation such as foods or medicines to creating first-hand experiences via a model archaeology site. Respondents also discussed ways that HPO staff could interact more directly with the community including offering more historic preservation services such as surveys, participating in more community forums (different media forms, workshops, seminars, and so forth), and upgrading the outreach tools by updating HPO websites and developing PowerPoint presentations. Also suggested was to continue to make the sites more accessible by rehabilitating, restoring, and developing them. Finally, there was a desire for HPO staff to strive beyond “enforcement,” working with others to “be part of the solution” when regulatory issues arise.

Island experts noted that certain Indigenous cultural sites could be added to the NMI and Guam registers. Of particular interest are properties that would represent the fuller breadth of the archipelago’s history from the Chamorro and Carolinian perspectives and would be important across the modern political divides. Former NMI HPO Historian Genevieve S. Cabrera (Interview, 14 May 2007) stated that, “if we’re looking at a place to nominate, then I think that the last stand, the last battle, it would be there.” Referring to the Chamorro-Spanish battle on Aguiguan Island, this “last stand” in 1695 was the end of nearly three decades of war against the Spanish reducción, defined by Rogers (1995) as Spain’s “conversion and collection of pagans into Christian congregations” (p. 347). This ultimately
meant the end of over 3,000 years of Chamorro independence and self-rule, a pivotal event to Chamorros in Guam and the NMI alike.

Currently, this portion of Chamorro-Spanish history is not readily portrayed in registered sites. There are sites on the register where villages suffered forced abandonment due to the reducción; where Chamorro-Spanish War battles took place; and where Chamorros burned foreign buildings or attempted assassinations of missionaries, Spanish soldiers, military leaders, and government officials. However, most known registered sites are not designated on the basis of this salient history. They are registered as architecturally significant buildings or structures, as archaeological sites, or as latte villages with potential to yield more information. Nor is their significance of primary consideration. An example is Asquiroga, an area on Guam named after the infamously ruthless Spanish military commander Quiroga (e.g., discussion in Farrell, 1991, pp. 168-169) who led a battle against Chamorros there. Asquiroga Cave (66-09-0069) is laudably registered as one of the few known Chamorro pictograph sites. However, the significant Chamorro-Spanish battle that took place in that area remains overlooked. The intricacies of Carolinian-Spanish history are likewise not much showcased.

Within the Guam Register of Historic Places (GRHP) and the US National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nomination forms, some of the harsh aspects of colonial history have been duly recorded. In the NMI, for example, the Rota Latte Stone Quarry nomination form stated that perhaps the quarry work was never completed because, “There could have been civil war, or the destruction of the upstart clan in Rota, or as most believe work could have been interrupt[ed] by the arrival of the Spanish” (NMI HPO office file; emphasis added). The NMI Chalan Galaidi Latte Site noted that one of the latte sets “does not appear to have been occupied at all. It may record the expansion of population at the settlement — a process interrupted by Spanish colonialism in the 1700s” (NMI HPO office file; emphasis added).
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Within the NMI and Guam, there were at least two public signs accompanying Indigenous remains or artifacts that noted unpleasant aspects of Spanish missionization and colonization of the Mariana Islands (these sites exist in NMI and Guam inventories, but have not been placed into local or national registers of historic places). The decades of Chamorro resistance and Carolinian history that occurred before or during Spanish colonization are essentially a silent part of the overall story that the NMI and Guam registered sites are meant to tell.

And yet, from oral chants and traditions, and the written accounts of priests, visitors and government officials, the locations of many of those or other notable sites are known. Additionally, archaeologist Rosalind Hunter-Anderson has also speculated that, “From historic accounts we know stones [slingstones] were used as weapons against the Spanish, and perhaps the open sites with numerous slingstones were the scenes of battles and/or practice areas” (Hunter-Anderson, 2005, p. 35). Archaeological work can likely further identify such sites.

In the category of “increasing capacity,” ideally historic preservation efforts need to be regularly refined according to new developments in the fields of conservation and technology, and according to the changing needs of the communities served. Interviewees stated that inventory work must continue, but they also suggested conducting more intensive surveys, developing state repositories and archaeology labs, securing more funding, and increasing the number of researchers and the number and types of staff, especially those armed with cultural knowledge and sensitivity.

Preserving the work and processes of the offices was a recommendation that stood out. Past losses of work due to fires, typhoons, and other tropical conditions underscored this important consideration. Historic preservation experts lamented the loss of survey forms (e.g., McKinnon & Raupp, 2011, p. 891), video recordings of ceremonies, and audio
recordings of interviews with knowledgeable elders long since passed. Another notable vision, provided in response to a query regarding diasporic Islander populations, was to document Islander culture as it is activated in new communities.

Ten responses directly addressed “promoting culturally appropriate [e.g., Indigenous Islander values] consideration” in historic preservation efforts. One was the suggestion to create a list of research topics as a way to ensure that issues such as Indigenous heritage receive community-desired consideration when conducting required archaeological surveys.

As noted earlier, in recognition of their Indigenous populations, respondents in Guam and the NMI stated the desire for documenting intangible heritage for its own sake as FAS can with HPF monies. Similarly, former NMI HPO Director Pangelinan (Interview, 24 May 2007) also noted that “people are talking about the need for historic preservation to be more involved in...especially the preservation of language [and other] intangibles” such as the dances. When asked what heritage they thought was most important to maintain, Carolinian community members, a husband and wife who were interviewed together, reflected on the cultural more of behaving respectfully (A. S. Mality & V. E. Mality, Interview, 2 June 2007). These sorts of intangibles have been, to varying degrees, incorporated in the current historic preservation work of surveying, identifying, and protecting tangible districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. However, Genevieve Cabrera (Interview, 14 May 2007) stated that she wanted intangible resources to be “part and parcel to the program,” having recognized value and merit in their own right not just because they happen to provide context to tangible heritage. Cabrera (Interview, 14 May 2007) also said, people need to,

sit down and find a way where there is a recognition of what these Micronesian cultures are, what they represent, and what things, what sites, or ideas, because it’s not just sites and historical buildings or structures, things that you can touch and feel and, and smell and see. It’s the intangible, it’s the intangible elements...that are the heart of these Micronesian cultures. And for them to not be recognized as products, then you are not recognizing the People, and the culture and the cultural resources for which you are continuing to push these objectives.
Interviewees were also in favor of the idea of work being written in the vernacular by Islanders themselves as currently occurs in Palau (though more recently required to be accompanied by English language translations).

In Guam, which has the largest and lengthiest multiethnic population of the three island areas, one suggestion called for the HPO to have cultural protocol processes in place for the treatment of burials or artifacts. This is an important consideration as Guam is the one island entity under study in which cultural and historical resources on the land oftentimes belong to non-Indigenous landowners. This issue surfaced intensely during the study when numerous ancient remains and artifacts were twice suddenly unearthed on Guam. The solution at the time was to have ceremonies at each location, commemorating the ancients who had been disturbed. One interviewee stated that, “If we can instill in this new generation that there’s a system that you need to go through, I think that will do a lot for historic preservation” (J. S. Flores, Interview, 2 July 2007).

Other visions involved creating intangible or traditional wealth registries as a way to better serve Indigenous communities. However, an interviewee suggested that the office should proceed with caution, stating that some of these ideas have been debated for years in Palau but not acted on for various reasons including uncertainty about whether such proposals do more harm than good. For example, such registries would mean making owned or private knowledge public and potentially documenting it in a way that removes control over the way that knowledge is disseminated.

Another respondent suggested working within the concept of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), which has the potential of recognizing Indigenous community significance of a heritage site. Though the concept of TCPs was adopted by the NPS in the 1990s and put into place by specialists who had worked in Micronesia and remain connected to its HPOs (e.g., King, 2006), it has not become a standard form of documentation within
Guam, the NMI, and Palau. In fact, no known Micronesian cultural place has been
documented this way despite the fact that the concept has now formally existed for some
three decades. This may point to a systemic issue such as whether Micronesian HPOs are
able to afford the survey work required, feel assured that the concepts will be received by
NPS/NRHP, or are able to focus the requisite time and energy within a single year (see
similar discussion among US professionals in King, 2009b; Lusignan, 2009). Training in this
type of survey and documentation work may not have occurred in the region, which may
alleviate some of these concerns.

Respondents envisioned striving beyond the regulatory functions of HPOs and
becoming more proactive in supporting heritage related to Indigenous cultural identity.
Others expressed the desire to increase the presence of cultural skills, build up talents in
cultural practices, support an arts sector in the community, and strengthen identity and
pride (D. Alexander, Interview, 12 May 2011). The BAC Director/Palau Historic
Preservation Officer envisioned the office expanding to more fully incorporate safeguarding
and promoting intangible aspects of Palauan heritage. BAC Director Alexander (Interview,
12 May 2011) stated:

I really hope the office will be strengthened to the point where the young
people can walk around and know what their culture is, know what their
practices are. When they hear a chant, they may not necessarily know the
words in them and to whom it’s directed but they at least know the overall
meaning of chants, of the overall significance to the country and to the
Palauan people. I want them to take pride in being Palauans and the
uniqueness of their culture.

In line with this thinking, Palau’s Ministry of Community and Cultural Affairs
reorganized itself through the Republic of Palau Executive Order 267 in 2009. Part of this
reorganization included formally broadening the goals and responsibilities of the BAC. The
HPO work was seen as documenting and safeguarding some portions of the culture but not
others such as Palauan arts. Therefore, a new Division of Arts was tasked by the executive
order to document, promote, and coordinate activities in the area of arts — “i.e., music; dance; applied arts such as carving, weaving, jewelry, pottery, culinary, and fashion design; literary arts; visual arts; and photography and videography and others’ at all levels.” Another vision in this category was to house the HPO in a traditional building.\(^{253}\)

Visions concerning “training and education” for HPO staff; the community, including members located elsewhere; and tour guides and tourists is the last category to be discussed. The focus of these visions involved connecting cultural descendants to accurate information concerning ancestors and figuring ways to encourage the next generation of historic preservationists.\(^{254}\) During this study, some steps were taken in this direction. A respondent noted that the UOG, responsible for the education of many of the historic preservation staff currently serving within Micronesia, began offering archaeology field schools and took other measures to foster the next generation of heritage specialists. Ensuring that tourists were given accurate information was another expressed desire.

Building on the theme of education, one NMI community expert said that “the students need to understand the historic sites and prehistoric sites, and what has been done, how people lived in those periods,” but also take it a step further, asking, “What is the meaning of that? You have to go deeper. And that’s probably where we’re lacking.” The expert assessed that there is much to be gained by attaining this deeper appreciation for island heritage: “We need really to save whatever we have in terms of our prehistoric knowledge, how our ancestors lived and it looks like we’re having a difficult time doing that because I think we have lost a lot about our culture.”

Part of this task involves decoding island history from the currently dominant colonial historiography within the Mariana Islands and replacing it with Islander-centered viewpoints (e.g., Goetzfridt, 2011; Kushima, 2001; Marsh, 2006). While conducting fieldwork in Guam and the NMI, this researcher observed HPO personnel presentations in which this
decoding was already occurring. During such presentations, students are told of ancient Islander engineering abilities and sophisticated levels of developed civilization.

Guam historian Anne Hattori (Interview, 20 March 2007) provided this assessment: “Ultimately, I think that however we remember the past, that’s kind of a reflection of where we are today in society. History isn’t really about the past, it’s about how people today want to remember our past.” It seems that the island communities are now ready to re-examine how they remember and showcase their past.

Chapter Summary

This chapter imparted historic preservationist and other experts’ assessments of Guam, NMI, and Palau historic preservation strengths and challenges as well as visions for its future. In many ways, it is difficult to understand Indigenous values separate from the other circumstances and issues surrounding historic preservation in general. Funding and staffing levels, as well as pressures from military build-up and other types of development, for example, greatly impact HPO ability to ensure that a proportionate amount of Indigenous heritage is served.

Numerous strengths were identified for the island HPOs, many of which revolved around the Indigenous value of reciprocity — working in partnership with other agencies and the community, and conducting surveys for grass-roots level development. However, interviewees also noted that there are many challenges to the program and more specifically to Indigenous values. This includes getting the community to impart owned, privileged, secret, and sacred knowledge or gaining community acceptance of a modern government agency’s authority to dispense traditional knowledge.

One of the clear findings was that historic preservation specialists are grateful for HPF and NPS support. Without this support, some were not certain that historic preservation-type programs would thrive, let alone exist. It is through decades of this partnership that
offices have survey reports, publications, registered sites, and public awareness efforts that have benefitted the community and the effort to safeguard island heritage. With this passion for the health of their island communities and the field of historic preservation also come desires to refine and build upon what the offices and supportive entities offer. These desires ranged from receiving more types of training, comporting their work in even more culturally appropriate ways, to very specific suggestions such as initiating community gardens and housing HPOs in traditional-type buildings. Some of these visions can occur through focused efforts internally; others would benefit from guidance from external entities that have access to particular types of expertise that are less accessible in the islands. A noteworthy vision was to preserve the story of island HPOs themselves.

This chapter concludes this study’s presentation of gathered data. The subsequent chapter weaves together the various data to discuss their implications.
Section Three

Integrated Discussion and Conclusion

This study’s final section consists of two chapters. First, the sets of findings are compared and contrasted to further explore their underlying dynamics and implications. This information is then utilized to discuss mitigating challenges to the presence of Indigenous values in island historic preservation efforts and office structure. The final chapter provides this study’s key implications regarding the presence of Indigenous values in historic preservation in Micronesia and notes possible directions of future studies.
Chapter Seven

Weaving the Fabric of Micronesian Historic Preservation: An Integrated Discussion

In the previous chapters, this study has examined three island homelands of Indigenous Peoples whose traditional cultures remain rich and vibrant with a focus on determining the extent to which Indigenous values are present in island historic preservation. Each of these areas has a distinct political classification: an unincorporated territory of the United States (US), a commonwealth within the US, and an independent nation that is freely associated with the US. All three island entities operate historic preservation offices (HPOs) supported by Historic Preservation Funding (HPF), which falls under the oversight of the US National Park Service (NPS). The data collection reflects the results of *inter alia* networking with the island communities in order to be directed and informed by their historic preservationists and other experts in related fields.

The data articulated in the previous chapters — both quantitative and qualitative — are integrated and critically examined in this chapter as a means to discuss the degree of presence that Indigenous values have in Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau’s historic preservation. Themes in the data will be discussed first, followed by sections that explore the underlying and overt dynamics of three aspects of current Micronesian historic preservation theory and practice. Overall, there is a strong level of presence of Indigenous value in Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs despite considerable challenges.
Themes in Data

Two recurrent themes emerged in all three case areas: a) the types of Indigenous rights, both formally and informally recognized, affect the presence of Indigenous values in island historic preservation; and b) the potential to build upon current relationships with the NPS.

The Recognition of Indigenous Rights

From the outset it must be noted that though Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders are all in their own right Indigenous Peoples residing in their ancestral and/or traditional homelands, their rights as Indigenous Peoples are recognized differently within the domestic US system as well as the international community. This single fact has major implications for the abilities of the programs. The Chamorros of Guam, for example, are considered and treated as a minority population despite constituting a numerical majority in their homeland until 1980, and today are the island’s largest singular ethnic population (42%; see Table 3) (Munoz, “Chamorro migration to the US;” US 1980 & 2000 Census). This designation, of course, is problematic inasmuch as the term “minority” connotes certain ideas and assumptions in the American and international political imagination. In the former, for instance, the term is generally associated with an “immigrant population” vying for conventional political rights on an “equal” footing with all other classes of persons within the polity. Further still, the term is sometimes associated, albeit less so, with Indigenous bands within the continental US, i.e., American Indians or Native Americans, though as discussed below, the US does not accord Chamorros nor NMI Carolinians some of the same rights as they do Native Americans.

Like many Native American groups, the Chamorro on Guam are a People continuing to exist in their ancestral homeland with its roots still deeply in place. However, Chamorros and Carolinians in the NMI, due to their divergent colonial history, have been afforded more consideration than their Indigenous brothers and sisters in Guam as far as indigenous
rights recognition is concerned (Underwood, 2006, pp. 10-11; Willens & Ballendorf, 2004), though these considerations are at present being steadily eroded by recent US federalization and militarization efforts (e.g., McPhetres, 2011). Nonetheless, both Guam and NMI Chamorros and NMI Carolinians receive less, or at least different, consideration and protection of rights as Indigenous Peoples within the US system than Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Native Alaskans. Though distinctions abound among them, the latter three groups, have been afforded sufficiently autonomous and exclusive control with respect to their traditional lands, territories, and resources, as well as the attendant heritage, so that they may be considered as possessing some form of self-governance (e.g., Aguon, 2009; Gulliford, 1992). As inhabitants of an independent nation, Palauans and Paluan Southwest Islanders clearly have the strongest degree of formal recognition of Indigenous rights within the US system, which was the core political consideration to many Micronesians as they worked toward self-determination (Petersen, 2004; 2011), as outright independence (more than the domestic nation-within-a-nation model of qualified self-government) lends itself to the promotion and protection of such rights.

Important to note for purposes of this study, the differential recognition afforded to Islanders in the three study areas is not limited to the legal framework by the governments that have administered the region but rather extends to academic disciplines. In fact, Guam and NMI natives have been considered and treated differently than other Indigenous Peoples within Micronesia for centuries — by the scientific/academic community, including anthropologists and ethnographers, and others. This has been due to geographic considerations and historical circumstances as well as to erroneous assumptions about their cultures and their very existence as Peoples — they have often been regarded as culturally tainted, hybridized, neo-Peoples, or as no longer existing (see Chapter Two). Yet core values continue to be cornerstones of their behavior (Diaz, 1994; Nero et al., 2000; R. A.
Underwood, n.d.), and they continue to speak their mother tongues, both laden with their unique ways of viewing the world.

This different treatment is a residual historical artifact with very real legal implications still in existence\(^{28}\) because the US has tended to award the recognition of Indigenous rights in a piecemeal fashion, selectively expanding and refining these considerations over time (see d’Errico, “Sovereignty: A brief history in the context of US ‘Indian law’;” King, 2002, p. 101).\(^{29}\) The critical consideration here is that the question of the granting of Indigenous rights in the US is often intricately tied to the public discourse of sovereignty status (e.g., Clinton, 1994; d’Errico, “Sovereignty: A brief history in the context of US ‘Indian law’”).

Internationally, Indigenous rights fall under the broader category of human rights\(^{255}\) and, as such, are growing in recognition (e.g., Aguon, 2012, pp. 56-57). In 2007, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which, among other rights to be safeguarded, “protects indigenous peoples against ethnocide, genocide, forcible relocation, and assimilation. It assures [their] right to practice and transmit [their] culture, which is a concept conceived broadly and progressively” (Aguon, 2012, pp. 56-57; UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). Scholars have assessed Indigenous Guam Chamorros as “experiencing overwhelming suffering” physically and socially in no small measure from loss of recognition of their Indigenous rights (Rapadas et al., 2005, p. 166). Some similar findings likely apply to the Chamorros and Carolinians in the NMI who are also experiencing loss of control over their homeland. For


\(^{29}\) Similarly, Underwood (2006) has assessed that, “There is no federal master plan for territories or widespread acceptance that they are colonial dependencies operating outside the US democratic principle of ‘consent of the governed’” (p. 7).
example, the US has taken control of NMI immigration (McPhetres, 2010), which is bound to have adverse economic and sociological impacts on the NMI.

There is no compelling reason why the US cannot continue to expand existing legislation and appropriately recognize and protect the rights of Chamorros in Guam and the NMI, as well as the rights of NMI Carolinians as Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples. Indeed, for decades, various sectors within the US, including the NPS, have called for further expansion and refinement of meaningful inclusion, consideration, and representation of diverse populations within the US, including Indigenous Peoples. While the NPS has been proactive in many ways, and has progressed this cause, it recognizes that this will be a continuing process (Kaufman, 2004a; 2004b; NPS Director’s Order 16B, 2012, esp. “Diversity Beyond the Workforce;” Wray et al., 2009). In a small step to this expanded consideration, the US government just recently agreed to match local funding regarding Guam’s efforts toward decolonization (News Release, 20 June 2011).

In contrast, Palauans (including Palauan Southwest Islanders) and other Micronesians have generally received more consideration and recognition of rights as Indigenous Peoples. This is in no small measure due to the fact that these entities chose independence with a certain degree of affiliation with the US through the various Compacts of Free Association. This implies on the one hand that the new nation states fully manage their own internal affairs, but that on the other they are given rights to access US federal programs akin to those of the 50 states of the US. This has particular relevance to historic preservation efforts in the islands. As will be discussed below, these different types of consideration and recognition of rights as Indigenous Peoples have resulted in significant differences in levels of Indigenous heritage value present within island HPOs and their efforts regarding historic preservation.

Part of this special consideration is that their historic preservation programs have different abilities and allowances tailored to reflect their Indigenous cultural contexts. A
specific consequence of this was a special study intended as a survey and capacity building exercise, i.e., the 1989-90 Micronesian Resources Study (MRS), which was funded by a US Congressional appropriation (Parker, 1994). The MRS was confined to the Marshall Islands, Palau, and to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) (with a study conducted in each of its four constituent states of Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap). No such study was carried out for the NMI, or for Guam, even though both entities would have likewise benefitted from capacity building and externally funded survey.

Resource professionals of the NPS who had conceptualized the MRS and then shaped its implementation within the funding boundaries set by Congress, strove to maximize the benefits. Important objectives in the MRS were “[t]o ensure that the study was truly Micronesian and of maximum usefulness” to the island governments (Parker, 1994, p. v; emphasis added). The effort was in fact premised on the underlying theory that “Micronesians define historic preservation differently than is traditional among Euroamericans and Europeans, and in a manner not unlike many Native American groups” (Parker, 1994, p. 4). Because of this, the study addressed ethnographic, in addition to archaeological, cultural resources (Parker, 1994, p. 4), which, in the NPS, are categorized and dealt with distinctly. The study recognized that historic preservation work in Micronesia benefitted from having trained ethnographers demonstrating an appreciation for the ethnographer’s unique training “to observe and understand living cultural systems” (Parker, 1994, p. 4; see similar discussion in Ross et al., 2011, p. 99).

Not only is there no compelling reason why the US cannot continue to expand existing legislation and appropriately recognize and protect the rights of Chamorros in Guam and the Chamorros and Carolinians in the NMI, but rather there is, as stated above, already precedent in adopting a more progressive policy position for other Indigenous groups within the family of freely associated US-affiliated nation-states such as the ROP, FSM, and RMI --- so there is a way...the question remains to be seen: is there a will?
Building upon Current Relationships with the National Park Service

This discussion builds into the second theme, that potential exists within the NPS to provide expanded program consideration, training, and guidance in order to enhance their ability to meet the interests of island communities. Prospects also exist for increased networking and collaboration to meet individual island HPO goals as well as those of the NPS as a bureau. One of the benefits, for example, is that a number of NPS staff have worked within the system for decades and thus have much to offer in understanding their field of expertise as well as the NPS system (e.g., J. L. Rogers, 2009, p. 13). In this respect, the words of Margaret Wheatley, Commissioner, NPS Century Commission ring true: “In every system, the solutions we need have already been discovered and are being practiced somewhere in the system. We always need first to look within the organization to see what’s been invented and what’s working” (McCown et al., 2011, p. 2).

Additionally, the NPS Second Century Commission (n.d.) put forth as a long-term goal for the NPS to “[a]ssure that all parts of the National Park Service fully comprehend and value the cultural resource and historic preservation part of the mission” (p. 11; emphasis added), as some have made the “common and serious mistake” of assuming that “cultural resources and historic preservation are secondary interests of the National Park Service” (p. 1). Within both the federal government and the NPS systems, there have been calls to move away from the focus on sites and to better represent and reflect varied landscapes and peoples (e.g., Kaufman, 2004b; Loomis, 1983). In the 1980s, a study carried out by the NPS and the American Folklife Center recognized that it was “essential” for the US government “to commit itself to a well-rounded system of cultural conservation” (Loomis, 1983, p. 7), to bring together historic and cultural promotion and preservation movements.

Furthermore, within the NPS there are divisions specializing in international and Native American affairs, (park) ethnography, and other fields as well as interacting with Native Americans. In fact, the NPS Second Century Commission (n.d.) notes:
Neither parks nor regions nor specialized program areas can continue as the nearly independent principalities they have long been. An overall interdependence must replace the situation in which cultural resource programs, natural resources programs, interpretation, law enforcement, and other parts of the Service have fought separately for individual interests with little regard for the whole. (p. 3)

Networking potential within the NPS was verified through communication with two ethnographers within the NPS system in this researcher’s capacity as the Palau HPO Ethnographer. Each offered to share information concerning NPS ethnography programs with one providing updates about certain NPS program efforts to develop a new type of site responding to Indigenous community needs and values, “Indigenous Cultural Landscapes” (Beacham, 2011a; 2011b; C. Smythe, Pers. Comm., 8 Dec. 2011; F. York, Pers. Comm., 9 Dec. 2011). Such NPS officials are permanent fixtures tasked with providing consideration to multi-faceted communities, including Indigenous Peoples, while conducting historic preservation and like work and thus can be tremendous resources (e.g., J. L. Rogers, 2009, pp. 7 & 9). Reciprocally, Micronesian HPO programs can also provide useful field experience to others in the NPS system (King, 2006; e.g., Parker, 1987).

Continuing the theme of maximizing Micronesian HPOs’ relationships with the NPS, potential exists in networking with the entities overseeing other Indigenous Peoples and/or non-state programs such as Tribal Historic Preservation Offices. Sharing successful strategies and approaches could be productive.

The Presence of Indigenous Epistemological and Cosmological Considerations Related to Cultural Heritage Management

The study set out to explore the presence and degree of Indigenous epistemological and cosmological consideration related to cultural heritage management within island HPOs. It found strong evidence of Indigenous values throughout the workings of the offices: from the island HPO registers, the staffing patterns within the offices, to Islander-centered visions of
experts in historic preservation and related fields. They were also found in the way HPO staff perceived cultural resources and in the way they performed their work. However, there is inconsistency in their presence and there are areas in which they need to be strengthened. While Indigenous values had a relatively strong presence in the offices, numerous challenges exist. Such potential impact points to the need to ensure their continued Indigenous value presence in the face of myriad challenges.

**Historic Preservation Office Staff Perceptions Regarding Cultural Resources**

Micronesian historic preservation staff continue to have an awareness of traditional Islander concepts of cultural resources. In addition to constructed spaces such as houses, monumental structures (e.g., *latte*, stone pavings and platforms, etc.), and archaeological sites, these include natural features; ancestral resource areas; places of power; places of ancestral activity; and vegetation such as trees considered sacred or otherwise powerful. In recognition of the strength of the intangible elements of their cultural heritage, all entities expressed a desire to focus more time and attention on documenting and conserving them.

Although handled differently per island area, staff generally recognized the importance of the various facets of cultural heritage. Palau HPO was the one office under study allowed by the NPS to utilize HPF monies to document intangible heritage as an integral part of the office’s annual work. While currently not permitted to do likewise, the Guam, NMI, and American Samoa SHPOs were working to have like consideration applied to US territories, and the former Chair of the NMI Historic Preservation Review Board stated that there is a need to provide a deeper connection and understanding of ancestors than has occurred.

Though it has HPF support for this purpose, Palau perceives a need to further increase its current emphasis on intangible heritage. Thus, in 2009, Palau created a new Division of Arts, to sit alongside the existing Division of Culture, that would attend directly to
intangible heritage (ROP Executive Order No. 267). Additionally, as an independent nation, it has a higher level of access to regional and international support than do Guam and the NMI. Thus, the Palau HPO has been utilizing this support to develop the nation’s first cultural policy (Kloulechad-Singeo, 2011, p. 2), hold the Palau National: Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) workshop in 2010 (Marsh & Alexander, 2010), and ratify the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the ICH in 2011, among other activities.

Work Practices in Island Historic Preservation Offices
Island HPOs have a high number of Indigenous Islander staff as well as staff from neighboring island areas (see Table 28). This in itself, however, does not guarantee the presence of Indigenous concepts for numerous reasons including forces at play in island contexts that advertently and inadvertently colonize mindsets, such as the usage of foreign textbooks in island school systems. However, the presence of Indigenous staff, especially those fluent in their mother tongue, does create an optimal setting for Indigenous concepts to be infused in island HPO processes and activities.259

Within each office, abundant examples of Pacific Islander/Micronesian cultural behaviors occur regularly. Indigenous Islander staff understand the customary lay of the socio-cultural and political landscapes. Traditional core values of reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation to others underlie most if not all office activities – from sharing food, attending and contributing to family life events, and activating kin and other relationships within and outside the office. Each of these values is crucial in carrying out cultural resource management in the islands in a sensitive fashion. Since historic preservation is meant to support and strengthen the fabric of a community’s heritage, it is imperative that its processes, and presence, are not alien to the community’s socio-cultural and political framework. It can be argued that to compromise these facets is to compromise the validity and acceptability of the work to the community. Moreover,
depending on their individual situations, Indigenous staff have familial connections to the land and have grown up traversing the island terrain, hunting and gathering food within it, fishing its waters, listening to oral narratives from elders, observing social mores, and living within the Island’s Indigenous cultural context.

Staff from each office follow traditional island protocol to different degrees. In fact, in Palau, cultural and historical knowledge bearers, one from each state, comprise the HPO’s Advisory Board and the Klobak er a Ibetel a Cherechar (Society of Historians). The latter entity compiles the cultural practices and traditional laws and lifeways that are documented each year. The presence of Indigenous staff and advisors involves Islanders in their own history. Office staff repeatedly maintained that working in the island HPO fostered deeper levels of appreciation and dedication to the cause of conserving ancestral heritage.

On a more general level, to not have Indigenous staff would not only perpetuate colonial policies in a sense but would also be disempowering within an Indigenous homeland, potentially building up a real or perceived disconnect from their cultural heritage and the conservation or preservation of it. Indigenous staff provide members of the community with the confidence that the office recognizes and works within the island culture, important for community trust, but also for the long-term success of an island office. Further, Indigenous staff, along with locally-based staff, were typically found to stay longer in their positions, building up an invaluable depth of expert and institutional knowledge. Non-Indigenous or non-local staff commonly moved on after just a year or two or three. Long-term involvement, which allows for the building and activation of reciprocal relationships, is what makes sense in island communities. Further, the value of locally-held expertise and institutional knowledge cannot be understated in carrying out the specialized tasks of historic preservation and in meeting the multifaceted and intricate requirements of NPS historic preservation grants.
Interviewees noted that certain NPS activities support the presence of Indigenous values in Island HPOs – documenting and, for Palau, restoring/rehabilitating cultural resources; allowing for certain Indigenous Islander cultural protocols; having NPS staff who advise and advocate for Micronesian HPO needs; and funding professionals such as an ethnographer for Palau who assists the office in documenting intangible Palauan heritage. Additionally, the Palau HPO answers the community call, as a cultural resource preservation office, to actively conserve and promote the Indigenous languages of Palau by publishing much of its material in the Palauan languages, although there is also a requirement by the NPS to publish English language translations of the material as well.

**Visions and Other Community Perceptions**

This study has determined that there is a strong presence of Indigenous values present within island HPOs and their efforts, which falls in line with the findings of long-time researchers of Micronesia and others in cultural industries (Hezel, 2011, p. 550; Nero et al., 2000; see similar statements in Turner, 2012; DCA, 2003, p. 23). In addition, the work of historic preservation cannot and should not exist apart from Indigenous epistemological and cosmological considerations. In Indigenous communities, historic preservation work preserves the culture, which is considered important heritage in and of itself, and provides the context within which the tangible heritage exists. Surveyed youth and teachers in Micronesia have regarded intangible heritage such as “traditional skills, stories, crafts and the like” as more valuable than tangible heritage (O’Neill, 2005, p. 298; Spennemann, 2003, p. 55). Further, within areas of Micronesia such as Palau, and perhaps as a reflection of the cultural view of the connectedness of tangible and intangible heritage, island government has been structured so that the HPO is given the responsibility to conserve holistically.

In a similar vein, reports dating to at least the 1980s written by and for the NPS and the US federal government have recommended that both entities commit to fuller and “well-
rounded” systems of cultural conservation, where tangible and intangible heritage are conserved in concert, protecting the “complete spectrum of cultural resources” (Loomis, 1983, pp. 7 & 25). For example, the National Park System Advisory Board “recommended that the agency ‘nurture living cultures and communities,’” further stating: “We are coming to understand that the parks become richer when we see them through the cultures of people whose ancestors once lived there” and that, “[t]hese irreplaceable connections should be nurtured and conserved for future generations” (Wray et al., 2009, pp. 48-49).

The Degree of Presence of Indigenous Heritage in Island Historic Preservation Office Registers

Guam and the NMI are mandated to register sites into the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) each year. While Palau still has six sites registered in the NRHP from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Island (TTPI) era, as an independent nation it now only actively nominates sites to its own national register. Only Guam nominated sites to a second, local register. While non-Indigenous heritage did have the highest level of presence in the registers for Guam and the NMI, higher rates of Indigenous Islander heritage existed than was expected for those two US insular areas, occurring second most often. In contrast, Indigenous Islander heritage comprised the majority of Palau’s registered sites. As will be discussed, however, Indigenous Islander heritage presence in island registers is not as clear-cut as these statistics infer.

Stereotypes

All three island entity HPOs have accomplished much in the relatively short time that they have existed. The fact that each area has large inventories of cultural resources demonstrates that the island HPOs and their staff have been actively working over the years to comply

---

30 The National Park System refers to the collection of national parks within the US, a system which sits within the NPS.
with local government and NPS mandates to build comprehensive inventories and registries. Stereotypically, Micronesian administrations are seen as inefficient, unfocused, and generally lacking administrative rigor (e.g., Leibowitz, 1989, p. 5). Concomitantly, the Micronesian HPOs are often considered less productive than those of the US states; yet a comparison of the number of historic properties entered into registries, setting Micronesian entities alongside similar-sized US states, shows that this is not necessarily the case (see p. 88). Refuting stereotypes is important because they are so prevalent in the study areas, far beyond the realm of historic preservation, and have significant impacts on the well-being of Indigenous Peoples and their communities. The stereotypes can be debilitating and demoralizing which in turn, for example, can disenfranchise Indigenous Peoples from the HPOs and their efforts. Refuting stereotypes also reinforces the point that what is perceived as non-productivity may instead be differences in epistemology and cosmology regarding heritage — in particular, differences with respect to what is significant and how to manage it. The NMI’s comparatively low performance in registering sites may indicate a need to expand elements of the US historic preservation process by: 1) making the type of heritage eligible to be documented and registered more relevant to diverse contexts, including Indigenous Micronesian contexts; 2) providing and/or allowing for a different time-frame and set of procedures for Indigenous heritage to be documented and nominated; and 3) allowing for other end-products to serve as markers of productivity, such as transmission activities.

Disproportionate Representation

As noted above, the island registers under study were initiated with strong Indigenous Islander heritage presence being placed within local and national registers. However, registered traditional Indigenous Islander heritage for Guam and the NMI is not present in all island geo-political divisions and was found to be greatly underrepresented when
examined by total time and presence on registers. A considerable proportional disparity existed between the percentage of total registered heritage from their pre-European contact time periods, time periods of clear Indigenous Island value, and the percentage of time that those periods represent.

While there are reasons why time period percentages and presence on registers are not equivalent, much of the disparity may also be linked to socio-cultural and political differences such as the types and degrees of colonization experienced by each entity over time, including current political statuses. Statistics suggest that Palau’s independent status, as well as the greater support and allowances for Palauans as Indigenous Peoples, has afforded their HPO the ability to keep the level of registered non-Indigenous heritage more appropriate than for Guam or the NMI. For all three island entities, the colonial administrations and World War II (WW II) periods are overrepresented. An exception is the period of the Spanish Administration in Palau, which is underrepresented, probably due to the Spanish Administration’s very short temporal and slight physical presence in Palau. WW II, the shortest of the non-Indigenous Islander periods, lasted three to four years in Guam, the NMI, and Palau, representing a mere 0.1% of those Islands’ inhabited history — yet made up 43.3%, 28.6%, and 10.7% of their registered heritage, respectively. Large differences in the percentage of this representation between the island entities existed despite the fact that, commonly, all suffered high levels of destruction from US invasion efforts, portions of Palau perhaps most of all.

While this disproportion has been perceived by some to be tied into Guam and the NMI being more Westernized or Americanized in some fashion (e.g., Falgout et al., 2008, p. 33), and having a more demographically diverse population, others such as Underwood (1977) have provided other interpretations. Underwood states that intensive displays of US patriotism and usage of American symbols or modes of commemoration are utilizing the symbols “available and readily understood” (R. A. Underwood, 1977, p. 121A), a tradition
that started during the US military rule of the island, and “[m]ilitary governments are not known for encouraging freedom of expression” (R. A. Underwood, 1977, p. 121B). These symbols were used as a means to celebrate Chamorro gratitude for ending the Japanese WW II occupation but also Indigenous heroics, strength, and perseverance; to create a sense of unity; and to demonstrate their loyalty as “an irrefutable argument for civil government” (R. A. Underwood, 1977, p. 121C). Some of the latter displays of patriotism appear to continue today as a means to earn consideration or call for the activation of a reciprocal relationship to further the causes of self-determination and compensation for suffering during WW II (Bevacqua, “The resistance and insistence of decolonization amongst Chamorros in California;” R. A. Underwood, 1977, p. 121C). Additionally, Underwood states that the ideological rhetoric and sense of Chamorro identity have become “confused,” resulting in the ways Chamorros now participate and consider US symbolism, rhetoric, and activities (R. A. Underwood, 1977, p. 121C). Careful consideration of such disproportionate representations of time periods in registers can shed light on why some time periods are overrepresented while others are underrepresented. Closer examination of the WW II heritage in registers may uncover Indigenous values not readily understood.

Common to all registers, however, is that the post-WW II period has little or no real presence despite the fact that, during the period under study, it had been some 12 years past the standard 50-year benchmark for sites to be recognized as “historic” (“eligible” are all sites prior to 1962), and an even shorter benchmark (25 years) for Guam’s local register (“eligible” are all sites prior to 1987). This correlates with earlier findings, and shows a lack of interest in valuing more recent heritage (Spennemann, 2003, p. 55). Certain factors, such as prioritization of particular types of historic properties, limited staff time, or issues related to consideration of their significance or understanding of their eligibility, may explain why these properties are not included in the register. While these factors are not limited to the three entities under discussion, they appear to be more pronounced. One of the key reasons
may be connected to the concept that valued Indigenous heritage provides a sense of identity and identity is largely tied to core cultural traditions. For Palau, for example, the traditional village is considered a golden era of sorts, with “connections to clan and family history, burial areas, property rights and local identity” (Snyder & Butler, 1997, pp. 44 & 81). This strong sense of, and attachment to, place may account for why traditional villages constitute the most common of Palau’s registered and restored/rehabilitated sites.

Gaps
Interviews with historic preservation specialists and experts in related fields revealed that varying and sometimes contrasting perceptions and interpretations regarding their islands’ historic preservation efforts and the stories those efforts impart exist. These diverging ways of categorizing their heritage demonstrate the historical and current circumstances that are part of the social, cultural, and political landscapes with which the island HPOs under study must contend.

Some of the interviewees perceived that too much of the attention and monies spent on cultural resources has been focused on colonial period heritage. And, when considering Guam and the NMI, there is much to support that view. Community members and tourists are readily exposed to, and are very aware of, long-maintained and commemorated WW II and foreign administration sites such as the NMI’s Suicide Cliff, Banzai Cliff, and other WW II sites; or Guam’s Fort Soledad, Plaza de España, and numerous historic Catholic churches. On the other hand, the public may feel that Indigenous sites are much less likely to be as developed, visible, accessible, promoted, visited or commemorated. Collectively, millions have been spent on non-Indigenous heritage. While Indigenous heritage on Guam and the NMI has been commemorated or rehabilitated, the efforts have typically occurred on a much smaller scale—archaeological surveys, cleaning, and maintenance of sites, the development
of small parks, or the creation of exhibits, displays, or commemorative markers (e.g., Calindas, 2005; Saipan Tribune, 2005).

Although the register findings illustrate that there are many registered pre-European contact resources—resources with obvious Indigenous value—a gap exists between the prevalence of these efforts and those with which the community is cognizant. Part of this is because most registered heritage is under the direction of various private and public entities. Cultural resources have often been developed as public parks, tourist locations, and as part of private enterprises—pursuing potentially different visions and goals—or else have remained undeveloped. Resource maintenance and development is carried out by a variety of local government and semi-autonomous agencies such as the Guam Preservation Trust (GPT) and the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) on Guam, the Department of Community and Cultural Affairs (DCCA) in the NMI, and state governments in Palau. Federal agencies, hotels, golf courses, resorts, private foundations, public-private partnerships, churches, and clans or individuals directly maintain other sites.

Though latte sites are of iconic Indigenous value, students who were informally asked in classroom settings during this researcher’s instruction of history of Guam courses at the University of Guam (UOG) were often unable to list more than a few latte sites throughout the Mariana Island archipelago—Guam’s Angel L. G. Santos Latte Stone Park and the NMI’s House of Taga and As Nieves latte quarry were those that were best known. Some of the lesser HPO emphasis on Indigenous heritage may also be due to a combination of perceived and real incongruities between the community valuation of Indigenous heritage and existing registration forms and processes. Workshops or mentorship programs may be able to address some of these issues by guiding island HPO staff through working with Indigenous heritage utilizing extant NPS and local processes. Practical and theoretical workshops with hands-on exercises that walk staff through identifying, surveying, and nominating specific local cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) may likewise alleviate
some of the perceived incongruities between local and US systems (such as a workshop wherein each participating HPO would walk away with one or more draft survey project notifications, surveys, and nominations).

Nomination forms were found to largely, if not completely, emulate those of the US National Register for Historic Places (NRHP). The one notable exception was that Palau had developed one more criteria for inclusion into the Palau (National) Register of Historic Places (PRHP)—that cultural resources are also recognized as significant if “associated with lyrics, folklores, and traditions significant in Palauan culture.” It could be argued that these associations could apply to the pre-existing understanding that places qualify for registration if they are significant in “history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture” (NPS, 1997, p. 1; emphasis added). However, hesitation to consider such elements of Indigenous culture eligible may exist since they may not be associated with the criteria of significance provided by the NRHP registration form: “historic events or activities” or “important persons,” or have “distinctive design or physical characteristics,” or “potential to provide important information about Prehistory or history [following the more formal definition of ‘history’].” The guidelines further state, “A property must meet at least one of the criteria for listing” (NPS, 1997, “Guidelines;” emphasis added). These stipulations appear to leave out quite a few types of property significant to Indigenous Peoples. These issues are in fact part of the dynamics that led to the development of NPS Bulletin No. 38, which outlines how to evaluate and document traditional cultural properties (King, 2006, p. 9). 262 Indeed, NPS Ethnography Program Manager Charles Smythe (2009) notes that the TCPs and their guidelines:

were developed in response to narrow interpretations of the NHPA [National Historic Preservation Act] by federal and state agencies, which put a primary emphasis on the ‘built’ environment and did not adequately meet the need for documenting and considering the cultural significance of places in planning documents and administrative manuals. (p. 16)
Additionally, those within the NPS have worked to develop another type of site meant to be responsive to, and representative of, Indigenous values—that of Indigenous Cultural Landscapes (Beacham, 2011a; 2011b).31

Another consideration is that the face of cultural resource management in Micronesia is changing. In fact, all Micronesian entities, save the territories such as Guam and the NMI, are State Party members of various United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) conventions such as the World Heritage Convention (World Heritage Convention, “State Parties: Ratification Status”). As such, they are actively participating in UNESCO tangible and intangible heritage activities. All, are also participating in regional cultural heritage activities, though at times in more limited degrees for Guam and the NMI. It appears that exposure to other cultural resource management systems is growing, which will impact historic preservation in Micronesia with the potential of encouraging Indigenous values. For example, the Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (1999), which has “four categories or types of cultural significance…historical, scientific, aesthetic, and social or spiritual values of place” (Australia ICOMOS, 1999, Article 1.2; emphasis added).263

A disparity of properties registered also exists between each island entity’s geopolitical divisions. Certain villages or island groups on Guam and the NMI have no registered heritage. While there are mitigating factors to consider, such as the challenges in conducting surveys in the sparsely populated or uninhabited northern islands of the NMI, these statistics demonstrate that registrations are likely driven by development and other considerations. Priorities such as registering properties by the richest resources, the significance of the site, or ensuring that the history of each locale is part of the island story
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31 This was communicated through email contact with NPS ethnographers. It may not have been readily conveyed to the Micronesian region otherwise. Hence, demonstrating the benefit of having some relationship with NPS ethnographers and other professionals in related fields.
becomes secondary. Another area of considerable proportional disparity for Guam and the NMI as noted above is between the percentage of total registered heritage from their pre-European contact time periods and the percentage of time that those periods represent.

In contrast, Palau had the least of these types of disparity. This is due to several factors, including having the lowest level of development pressures; having received the most recognition and support as Indigenous Peoples by academics and the US including the NPS; and having recognized rights for Indigenous Peoples within a multiethnic community (with strict limitations to citizenship and control over immigration). Additionally, this is also likely mitigated by having the most control over office organization and processes in meeting community needs, including the presence of representatives of each geo-political division sitting on the office’s Advisory Board as well as its Society of Historians, divisions which have been said for Palau to be the “core of what it means to be Palauan in terms of history, traditional culture, values, and identity” (Kesolei, Smith, Nero, and Society of Historians as cited in Kihleng, 1996, pp. 20-21).

*Strengthening Historic Preservation Efforts that Support Islander Values and Heritage*

*Understanding Each Other’s Successes*

The Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs each have strengths and successes. Guam’s historic preservation landscape includes having the GPT as an “arm” of the HPO to implement heritage management. Its socialscape also includes the largest number of public and private entities to help carry out cultural preservation. The NMI HPO was instrumental in developing the NMI Museum of History and Culture, has government-supported local HPO branches, and a strong publication program. The Palau HPO has the strongest degree of Indigenous value presence in its register—it’s office procedures and structure, and national register (as well as strong presence in their annual publications, see Appendix D).
Additionally, restoration/rehabilitation projects were found to occur annually in Palau and were noted as providing many positive benefits. This ranges from public awareness and appreciation of heritage to activating traditional community behavior, bonding, and transmission of Indigenous knowledge. Palau’s “restoration” projects and other known rehabilitation or restoration projects in Guam and the NMI have often been of Indigenous Islander heritage or heritage valued as meaningful parts of the story of Indigenous Islanders (though very public non-Indigenous heritage has also been so addressed). Each office gathers valuable pre-European contact and historic data and has knowledgeable staff committed to the cause, many of whom are Indigenous with native knowledge and language ability. Furthermore, there are the underlying island mores of reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation to others, and other cultural behaviors important in keeping the offices relevant within their island socio-cultural contexts.

As noted previously, the level and types of responses provided by experts in historic preservation and related fields regarding historic preservation issues and visions for its future demonstrate that each area has invaluable human resources at hand. There is the potential for more comprehensive island narratives which appropriately place Indigenous Islanders front and center of their histories, presented from their perspective, and HPOs that provide the appropriate level of responsiveness to, and representation of, Indigenous Micronesian values.

**Overcoming Challenges, Envisioning Sustainable Presence of Indigenous Values**

Historic preservation efforts and the presence of Indigenous values have significant challenges in Guam, the NMI, and Palau. Some challenges can be mitigated more directly than others. There are several issues that could be addressed relatively easily. These are the potential of a follow-up resources study, building on the current relationship with the NPS,
structuring staff development and training, and augmenting the capacity of underfunded, understaffed HPOs.

**The Potential of a Resources Study**

A resource study for Chamorros and NMI Carolinians following the same culturally-reflective objectives as the Micronesian Resources Study (MRS) would be a step toward addressing many of the challenges discussed herein. This study brought in specialists who collaborated with local experts and community members to identify the full array of island archaeological and ethnographic resources valued from the community’s perspective; establish socially and culturally appropriate office structure and protocol; and make recommendations to the local and US governments as well as the NPS as to how to best support island historic preservation (see, Parker, 1994; D. R. Smith, 1997; Snyder & Butler, 1997). The results of the MRS allowed for many of the HPF support allowances discussed above—documentation of intangible heritage, identification of ethnographic resources, and increased ability to follow traditional protocol when conducting research. These conditions appear to have allowed the Palau HPO to more successfully represent Indigenous values. In addition, such conditions better support the recognition and continuance of living cultures that exist throughout Micronesia, including Guam and the NMI. This is an even more important consideration as they have higher rates of development and immigration than their Micronesian counterparts as well as impending multi-billion dollar US military build-up activities. Formal recognition and authorization to work with ethnographic resources can offset the debilitating effects of Guam Chamorros being treated as a minority population within their homelands, a situation that, if it has not already occurred, could also possibly materialize in the NMI with the ongoing federalization of the island commonwealth (e.g., Agulto, 2007). This is important to address as the validity of appropriate consideration of Chamorros and NMI Carolinians is continuously, and often heatedly, challenged in Guam
and the NMI in public forums such as local newspaper editorial sections and in Guam’s self-
determination education efforts with the use of terms such as “discrimination,” “racism,”
and others (e.g., Bennett, 2008; J. J. N. Camacho, 2008; C. S. Perez, 2011; Reyes, 1999; Stephens Jr, 2008).

The challenges of being understaffed and overworked, along with other difficult
conditions, have led some interviewed experts to determine that Micronesian HPO staff
have not developed visionary goals. Such a study will augment the number of historic
preservation-related experts on hand who can potentially inspire and alleviate some of the
workload. Another set of challenges to the expression of Indigenous values are
considerations such as the presence of other ways of valuing heritage or perceiving rights to
it (e.g., demographically mixed populations, Western education, and “foreign” granting
entities), and the perceived need for development. Island cultural and social contexts also
provide their own sets of particulars to be considered and navigated. The efforts outlined
above can also assist in addressing these types of challenges.

Following the Palau HPO model of advisory bodies comprised of culture and
knowledge bearers may help the Guam and NMI offices be better understood and received
by the community and be guided in culturally appropriate ways. In Palau, HPO advisory
bodies have one cultural and knowledge bearer per state, thus assuring that the traditional
geo-political divisions are evenly represented. In Guam and the NMI, where similar
historical village autonomy exists, this may be a preferred method for determining board
membership (or membership of other advisory bodies). However, there are recognized
categories of traditional experts in various fields (such as history and medicine) throughout
the island entities, so there may be a preference for selecting membership based on some
criteria of expertise. Having boards comprised in such a way is not without its issues, but
those issues that tend to exist are based within the Indigenous Islander cultural context (e.g.,
Furthermore, it has been over 20 years since the MRS, and much has changed since that time. US-based historic preservation has striven to become more responsive to Indigenous and other sub-communities as well as to more holistically capture a sense of place (CRDP, “Program Overview;” e.g., Joyner, 2005; 2010; Kaufman, 2004a). A specialized resources study has the potential to benefit other Micronesian HPOs such as Palau by having updated expert reviews of what constitutes fitting historic preservation measures for Micronesian island situations. The study has the potential then, of revisiting Micronesian HPO conditions and allowances as a whole and for providing regional training and other opportunities.

For example, a recommended area to explore is expanding historic preservation beyond the current primary strategy of documentation to incorporating the support of transmission activities in Indigenous communities. This would build on Felicia Beardsley’s description of Micronesian HPOs as “the keepers of tradition” (Beardsley, 2006, p. 595), to HPOs keeping traditions by keeping them alive. The support of transmission activities as a means to safeguard heritage addresses the continually expressed concern that the intrinsically dynamic nature of much of what is considered intangible heritage runs the risk of being frozen into static, written form (Asang, 2004, pp. 105, 118, & 135; e.g., Hezel, 2006; Kihleng, 1996, p. 17; Nero, 2011; D. R. Smith, 1978, p. 11; Tonkinson, 2000, p. 172). To remove the organic processes of transmitting behavior, regard, and activities associated with intangible and tangible heritage is to have them “removed from the field of action,” whereby they become objectified and symbolic, becoming a “sign of history,” but no longer a “sign in history” (Nero, 1992, pp. 19-20; Parmentier, 1985, pp. 11-15; emphasis added).

This would help address a main concern in Micronesia, which is the passing of elders before they transmit their knowledge, life history, or observations. Furthermore, oral and experiential transmission was the traditional way that skills and knowledge were passed from one generation to the next, the method itself an ICH worthy of being safeguarded.
Encouraging transmission as a safeguarding measure also better meets the expressed Micronesian goals of preserving a *living* culture.

Preservation work can directly encourage transmission activities. In the long run, these may maintain the traditionally organic and fluid nature of a culture rather than challenge it. For example, concerns exist that HPO documentation processes challenge the continuance of culture in oral form. Consequently, the Palau HPO encourages documentation to be viewed as a guide to what was shareable at a moment in time but that up-to-date, authoritative information must be gathered from family and village elders and state leadership.

Further, increased ability for island HPOs to support transmission activities may be the best way to preserve or maintain NMI Carolinian and other Micronesian heritage in ways that are meaningful to them. NMI Carolinian cultural expert Lino M. Olopai stated that perhaps there could be some benefits from paying more attention to sacred sites and other heritage sites as he felt many people no longer even knew of their existence. Olopai believes that a lot of good can be done, stating, “we need to recognize those area[s] and have them protected” but, “not necessarily…[that the] federal government got to register it as a federal historical area, the Carolinian need to do that themselves” (Interview, 2 June 2007).

Regarding more traditional US-based historic preservation methods such as registering a site, “once you register that...you[‘re] going to run into red tape” or some agency would then claim that it has some rights to their heritage (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 21 May 2007). To illustrate his point, Olopai highlighted that Managaha Island, sacred to NMI Carolinians, while on the NRHP and protected within the NMI constitution, has been desecrated in a variety of ways. Commercial enterprises have been established there as well as activities not permitted on sacred NMI Carolinian sites (e.g., jet skiing, sports, and proposals for sports massages and night dancing). Also, a significant NMI Carolinian thatch roof structure was cleared without consulting the NMI Carolinian community (L M. Olopai, Interview, 21 May 2007; 2 June 2007). Moreover, for sacred/powerful areas, NMI Carolinians need to make
their community “know where that area is and its purposes as part of their culture” (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007). He relayed a story about someone who became severely ill, from chasing a chicken across a raang (defined by Olopai as “a sacred area that belongs to the spiritual world”). He and others in Guam and Palau have expressed concern that illness and misfortune can result if the knowledge about powerful sites is not preserved (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007; for similar discussion see Metzgar, 2004).

**NPS Pathways**

One thing that was quite clear when interviewing HPO staff is that they are grateful for the opportunity to conduct their work and receive support from the HPF and the NPS. As one interviewee noted, the support allowed HPO staff to “promote and preserve their own culture.” HPF grant conditions have been adjusted in the past and certain NPS staff have advocated for grant conditions/allowances that consider Micronesian cultural protocols with regard to the Freely Associated States (FAS). However, even given these considerations, there are many challenges to the presence of Indigenous values within territorial, commonwealth, and FAS Micronesian HPOs, as well as gaps between their efforts and community awareness. There is, for example, a perception in Guam that colonial heritage more readily fits into NPS forms and standards. And yet the heavier presence of traditional Islander heritage in the Palau register, whose nomination form is largely the same as those used in Guam and the NMI, demonstrates that this need not be the case, at least for the local registers, and perhaps not for the US national register either (though the approval process for the latter is quite stringent and many nominations from the islands have been deferred or rejected in the past (D. Look, Pers. Comm., 9 June 2012), thereby feeding into this perception).

NPS ethnography and archaeology professionals have proven track records for tailoring historic preservation efforts to better serve and represent the range of community
members, including Indigenous populations (e.g., Beacham, 2011a; 2011b; McManamon, 1999; Wray et al., 2009). A formal pathway for collaboration, in addition to or as part of NPS’s roles of oversight, between Micronesian HPOs and such professionals could be another step in addressing many of the challenges to Indigenous value presence in Micronesian historic preservation.

**Developing Regional Professionals and Para-professionals.**

Fostering the next generation of Islanders to serve as historic preservation experts was a concern that was expressed in each island area. Interviewees discussed ways to create interest among the youth, such as offering scholarships and tailoring local tertiary programs. “Key” in building self-sustaining HPOs within Indigenous communities is to not just develop programs that solve Indigenous issues using culturally appropriate solutions “but to develop programs that could be staffed and maintained” by the Indigenous themselves (Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 44), a concern also expressed in Palau (D. R. Smith, 1997, p.20).

Building a cadre of locals trained in historic preservation also mitigates the dilemma of the “revolving door” of outsider professionals, which has created at least three ramifications. First, regardless of how qualified, experienced, and well-intentioned these non-local, non-Islander professionals may be, many came aboard local HPOs with relatively little experience in the islands’ culture, history, local government, or HPO processes. Second, institutional memory, that is, lessons learned and acquired on-the-job, largely left with the professional. Although local staff have retained many of these lessons and work to pass them on to incoming professionals, these dynamics adversely diminished the potential of HPO efforts and products. Additionally, filling professional positions is difficult, resulting in months or years without professional staff. Offices are then perpetually behind in their work, continually striving to catch up, thereby severely impacting the quality of end products produced and their ability to meet community needs. Third, in observing the
revolving door of professionals and the ensuing impacts on the HPO, local staff have been given cause to be skeptical of the efficacy of the present system.

By serving as a stable base of professional and technical expertise, NPS professionals as collaborative and networking resources might greatly offset these adverse impacts. Procedures manuals per professional position could alleviate the steep learning curve for incoming professionals and ensure that professional knowledge continues to be accessible to local staff. Implementation of both approaches could be key in off-setting the lag time between the departure and replacement of professionals, the time it takes to acclimatize to the new work region and environs, and keeping critical hands-on knowledge within the offices.

**Answering the Call for Training**

Training is part of what the NPS offers, and it occurs somewhat regularly in Micronesia (see Spennemann et al., 2001, p. 3; discussion of this history in O’Neill 2005, pp. 258-260); it is coordinated by the regional office and provided by individual island HPOs, the UOG, and the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Guam (WAPA), among others. Adding structure to this training has the potential to create a well-versed cadre of para-professionals and professionals. One university and at least five colleges exist in Micronesia. Additionally, Micronesian HPOs interact with faculty from universities around the world on a regular basis. Professional staff within Micronesian HPOs hold graduate degrees, and thus are qualified to teach college-level courses. These circumstances provide fertile ground for a structured training program that could lead to certification or graduate degrees for local staff, which the NPS has been working towards but had not yet realized during the period under study.

For example, as sometimes occurs now, training can be offered through a college or university and, with additional requirements, can count as college courses. Certification or a
graduate degree can be earned while working for an island HPO, supervised by the professional(s) on staff. Developing a more organized approach has the potential to increase the number of Indigenous Islanders as historic preservation professionals operating within their homelands. In this way, a more localized approach, utilizing current means can answer the local staff challenges of the high cost of education, inability to leave their home islands and families, and other limitations. The program itself will benefit by having an office led by Indigenous and local professional staff who stay longer, build institutional knowledge, and have the ability to work more proficiently within the cultural context of their island. This in turn may make the field more appealing to island youth, thus helping ensure the long-term sustainability of the program in the island community. This recommendation mirrors one provided by the NPS Century Commission (n.d.), which recognized the potential in working to “[e]stablish a historic preservation conservation trades/crafts training and accreditation program available to Park Service employees and other federal agencies.” (p. 6)

If, for various reasons, there is a continuing need to hire professionals from outside the island communities, especially outside the Indigenous Islander communities, then Stapp and Burney’s (2002) and Patricia Parker’s (1987) statements seem apt: that professionals “brought in to help build the program need…training as well” (Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 101). While they state that “on-the-job training seems the most effective” (Stapp & Burney, 2002, p. 101), four years of experience inform this researcher of the benefits of both on-island and off-island mentors to guide the non-local, non-Indigenous professional through island socio-cultural, and political and HPO landscapes. Such pathways also offset real or perceived constraints in asking advice from outside professionals. In this way, both non-Islander and Islander professionals and other staff are better able to continuously build their capacities within their positions. This builds upon the Technical Review Committee concept, members of which currently primarily review Micronesian HPO products. These supports can also be helpful in combating the issues discussed below.
The devaluation of Indigenous staff as experts in their fields is another challenge. This devaluation further challenges the appeal of a career in the field, and also demoralizes island HPO staff. One solution noted by Stapp and Burney (2002) is the establishment of a task force that advises “on how to develop a better relationship with Native Americans” and provides advice regarding “the relationship between the archaeological community and Native Americans” (p. 58). While a task force may not be assessed by the island HPOs as necessary, potential exists in training or assisting the island HPOs in understanding how to engage the community in ways that overcome a multitude of issues. This would include securing the community’s appreciation of the ways that historic preservation efforts benefit the island and its people. One approach could be the development of entities—clubs, non-government organizations, societies, and so forth—that serve as the “arms and legs” of the HPO.

A final note regarding training, capacity building, and guidance for Micronesian HPO staff: to assist Micronesian communities still living largely oral cultures with the complexities of, for many, a foreign bureaucratic system, a visually recorded guide to NPS procedures and requirements may be useful. This builds on earlier NPS models that developed visual media (video and PowerPoint presentations) and well-structured websites to disseminate information32 (Shull, 1993; 2001, p. 45), as well as the model of an interactive informational CD to answer some similar issues related to World Heritage efforts within Pacific communities (A. Smith, 2007). Such guides would be on hand and eliminate the hesitancy of staff to make inquiries as well as the waiting time for responses (which can be quite substantial at times). Such guides have the potential to be more readily understood because they discuss and demonstrate how to work through an issue, unlike written replies

and manuals. These methods are compatible with island traditional education and transmission systems which are oral and experiential-based (F. J. Baker, 1991). However, the visual material needs to be organized thoughtfully according to Islander sensibilities so that it can be readily navigated.

**Augmenting Capacity and Funding**

Identifying and working with groups or entities that can advocate for historic preservation may resolve the challenges and issues noted in this study as well as foster community perception of the HPO as part of the solution. The cooperative effort between the GPT, the Guam HPO, the UOG’s Richard Flores Taitano Micronesian Area Research Center (MARC), and the Guampedia Foundation, Inc. serves as an example of this potential. In 2011, Guampedia, an online encyclopedia about the history, culture, and Peoples of Guam, “unveiled its new Archaeology of the Marianas section with an initial twenty-eight entries” which “expand access to knowledge gathered about ancient Chamorro lifeways encased within technical reports of limited distribution” (Marsh & Taitano, 2012, p. 147). These entries in Guampedia, which currently gets 20,000 visitors to its site each month (S. Murphy, Pers. Comm., 15 Dec. 2011), makes the community aware of the technical data gathered by HPO earthmoving requirements. Efforts such as this may help mitigate the tensions between traditional and modern conservation roles. Similarly, the HPOs could require that all studies submitted have an executive summary written for general readership, which could then be placed on HPO websites.

Further, partnering, networking, or helping build such entities could be a way to increase HPO capacity, as it allows for an increased level of supplementary tasks to occur. In the end this increased activity will also increase awareness and appreciation of island heritage. Augmenting the pool of people to address historic preservation in this manner also provides opportunities for the Micronesian HPOs. For example, they can manage heritage
conservation more holistically as they are not necessarily creating separate government structures to do this work as the US has done to deal with cultural conservation which essentially sits apart from historic preservation (this separation has been considered a challenge of sorts, even in Western countries such as the US).

Micronesian HPOs have, in varying degrees, augmented the number and type of capacity building and funding sources that support historic preservation activities. However, this is a time-consuming endeavor with many additional considerations, including interacting with entities that have their own priorities. HPO staff and expertise are already in short supply and certainly, identifying other historic preservation-like entities and reporting to them are additional demands on time. Regionally and internationally, there are movements to safeguard Cultural Rights (UNESCO, 1970), Cultural Heritage Rights (Hodder, 2010), ICH (UNESCO, 2003), documentary heritage via the Memory of the World program (Brandt et al., 1988), Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture (Secretariat of the Pacific Community et al., 2002) and more. Some of these have the potential for addressing Micronesia’s particular historic preservation situations and cultural contexts. This being the case, a generally receptive climate among cultural heritage management leaders is internationally expanding the definitions and boundaries of heritage conservation in ways that are appealing to living Indigenous cultures such as those of Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders.

Guam and the NMI might be able to gain self-representation in UNESCO organizations in much the same vein as in the Olympics where their participation is separate from that of the US. This would likely be very appealing to the Guam and NMI communities, Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike, and would permit historic preservation communities a broader realm of approaches and possibilities. As noted earlier, all other Micronesian entities are State Party members of various UNESCO conventions and have been quite active participants in recent years.
Implementing the measures within this chapter has the potential to alleviate some of the challenges to historic preservation efforts and their degree of Indigenous value presence. However, these measures, in and of themselves, will not necessarily address in full the shortages of funding and personnel that Micronesian HPOs typically face. The hope is that challenges will be alleviated enough for the offices to strive beyond working in crisis mode and be afforded an improved ability to “imagine the creative possibilities” of ensuring the appropriate presence of Indigenous values in Micronesian historic preservation.
Chapter Eight  

Summary and Conclusions: 

Navigating the Currents and Shoals of the Future

Though management of the culture and environment has existed in the islands for centuries, historic preservation as a formal concept has only been present in Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and Palau since the 1960s and ’70s. Each of the offices in the areas under study has its own narratives of how it evolved and how it is situated within its particular socio-cultural and political context. Examining these three island entities provided for comparative analyses as the communities have distinct cultures, histories, and modern political identities, though there is some overlap. Further, conducting archival research, participant-observation, and interviews allowed for both quantitative and qualitative data, each of which provided first-hand information that could be integrated for deeper discussion.

Guam, the NMI, and Palau each receive United States (US) Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) support of which the US National Park Service (NPS) has oversight. Owing to the island entities’ distinct political statuses and relationships with the US, each have had a differing relationship with the NPS. These relationships, operating with other factors such as types and length of colonial administrations and other aspects of history, have impacted the ways that historic preservation offices (HPOs) operate within their island communities and the ways and degree that Indigenous values are present and expressed.

In Guam and the NMI, the HPOs are one of several governmental entities meant to safeguard and promote Indigenous and other community values. In Palau the HPO has essentially been the sole government entity tasked to safeguard and promote Indigenous
values, though one or two such entities were in the early stages of development as of mid-2012.\textsuperscript{33} The Belau National Museum (a semi-autonomous entity), state governments, and a handful of grassroots organizations were also present, though ultimately the impact of their presence was not as far-reaching as the number and type of entities in Guam and the NMI such as their humanities councils, Indigenous affairs offices, and art councils in addition to their museums. However, Palau has increased opportunities for direct participation in, and support from, regional and international entities that deal with cultural heritage.

The key findings of this study are that in many ways Indigenous heritage and values have a strong presence in the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs and their historic preservation efforts. Just as strong perhaps though are the direct and indirect challenges to that very same Indigenous presence. However, what was illuminated throughout this study was the commitment and passion exuded by island HPO staff to uphold and meet historic preservation goals. This impression was that much more powerful given the high number of challenges that the office and staff contend with on a nearly daily basis. Some of their strongest desires and visions were for ways to increase their capacity and efficacy.

Each office had a noteworthy track record of productivity, which was measured by the number of resources inventoried and/or registered. This fact held up when proportionately compared to other like entities within the US historic preservation system. In fact, refuting stereotypes that island government offices are typically less productive, Palau outperformed two of the US’s smaller states (Rhode Island and Wyoming) that were used for comparison. Guam’s HPO also outperformed Rhode Island and was fairly on par with Wyoming. Although the NMI did not compare quite as productively for the number of resources it has registered, a comparison of its inventory numbers may demonstrate that it performed favorably in that portion of its work. Certainly the NMI had far more resources in its

\textsuperscript{33} A language commission and a division of arts within Palau’s Bureau of Arts and Culture.
inventory than Guam or Palau. This likely illustrates some issue or issues at hand for the NMI, and perhaps the other islands, regarding the applicability of the US ways of conceiving of resources, historic preservation, and historic preservation work.

In fact, in the Guam and NMI offices, which are required to most closely follow the US historic preservation system, there has been a decline in the number of resources registered in more recent years. This may also point to increased challenges for their HPOs owing to levels of island development, economic decline, shifting demographics, and the like, much of which has resulted in Chamorros and Carolinians becoming smaller forces in their homelands. These conditions also lead to heated public challenges to what are considered appropriate levels of Indigenous heritage and values in community spaces and government offices such as the island HPOs. Many times such challenges have involved the use of terms such as “un-American” or “racist,” which demonstrates how contentious these challenges can be.

In Palau, where Indigenous rights have been recognized and supported more consistently over the decades—by researchers, the US government, historic preservation supportive entities, and modern international governments—the registry is the closest to having a proportionate level of Indigenous heritage to the length of time for each period of their history. However, this study demonstrated that for Guam and the NMI, where Indigenous Peoples are more likely to be treated as minorities, though in their own homelands, the opposite is true. For them, the only time period regarding the number of resources registered, meaning publicly declared as significant, that is under-represented, and deeply under-represented at that, are those of PreContact/Prehistory. This underscores that some issue or issues are at play. Similar findings also held true when examining the registered resources by traditional geographical division. Palau was the only entity in which each of these divisions had some representation.
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The more proportionate presence of Indigenous heritage and the fact that all traditional geographic divisions had some representation on resource registers may also be related to the fact that, with the higher level of Indigenous rights recognition, the Peoples of Palau have been allowed to more readily follow traditional protocol in their office procedures and organization. For example, the Palau HPO has been carrying out oral history and ethnography work as primary efforts (versus secondary), providing traditional compensation for interviews, and having advisory and advisory-type boards that follow traditional sensibilities of appropriate composition and function. These findings support that recognition of Indigenous rights and customary ways of conducting historic preservation might provide paths to more productive and effective Micronesian historic preservation programs.

However, even Palau’s registered resources were over-represented for World War II (WW II) and some colonial administrations, as were Guam’s and the NMI’s. This likely speaks to the strength of the issues that each office and their staff face in conducting their work. This includes Micronesians applying a strong sense of hospitality and consideration of others (i.e., Japanese and US visitors who come to pay respect to the former colonial presence and war effort); the high level of WW II debris that was not adequately cleaned up in their homeland (including an extremely high tonnage of unexploded ordinance); and other ways of commemoration that non-Islanders bring with them as community members, interested parties, or bring to the table when providing support for historic preservation efforts. National and international commemoration efforts, such as the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Guam (WAPA) and the American Memorial Park in Saipan, NMI also have a large impact.

Certainly, various efforts that are promoted within and outside the existing HPO structure do not fit in with Islander ways of conceptualizing significance, commemoration, or conservation/preservation. Adding to this is that HPOs also serve as cultural brokers of
sorts, having to balance wide ranges and types of community interests, needs, desires, and visions—from developers, expansionist military forces, and tour operators to those concerned with the socio-cultural environment being created for the next generation of island youth.

One clear set of findings was that staff and some of the office procedures of the Guam, NMI, and Palau HPOs operate according to Indigenous values, exuding reciprocity, interdependence, and a sense of obligation to others. In many ways this presence increased office efficiency, productivity, and efficacy. In the islands, these and other behaviors are pathways to knowledge, working with members of the community, having work accepted and valued, as well as pathways to contending with roadblocks that occur in island socio-cultural and political landscapes.

Concurrent with these values, offices were found to have a high level of Indigenous staff, including in the post of State Historic Preservation Officer. This presence benefits the office in important ways. Indigenous staff know the islands, the land, social practices, cultural concepts, participate in the culture (thereby having established pathways as described above), know traditional skills, speak the language, feel deeply connected to the land and the historic and cultural resources, and are heavily invested in the success of the offices as it is their homeland, culture, and cultural identity that they are striving to uphold. Additionally, Indigenous and other local staff stay longer, providing a deeper bank of technical and local skills and institutional knowledge, which one interviewee noted was “priceless.” Further, this presence empowers the community and enables the programs to be embraced to a degree that no other attribute of the office could achieve. To not have or foster this presence would eventually make the program seem to be, no matter how sensitive or laudable its goals, a foreign imposition (see similar type of discussion in Parker, 1987, p. 18).

More than half, if not all, of the strengths of the island HPOs listed by interviewees, directly and indirectly, promote the presence of Indigenous values. Over half of these
strengths revolve around the offices operating in an *inafa‘maolek* approach (a Chamorro word but a Micronesian foundational concept, meaning to work together to make things good). That interviewees could enumerate as many strengths as they did is that much more remarkable given the relatively high level of challenges that the offices and their staff face, some of which deeply impact the presence of Indigenous values.

These challenges include severe funding issues, overwhelming workloads, and limited locally-based pools of needed expertise. All have kept the offices, in some way, operating in perpetual crisis mode. As a consequence, HPOs are less likely to take chances by pushing grant requirement boundaries, or perceived boundaries, whether the boundaries truly reflect island epistemological or cosmological ways of viewing their heritage or not. At times they have to figure out how to adapt or adhere to certain historic preservation methods or particular types of projects required to be conducted. They contend with dilemmas such as office-produced publications sitting unread on shelves in largely oral societies; certain types of documentation altering the very heritage they are trying to preserve by removing it from its natural, fluid and perhaps owned state, making it, instead, static and public; and attempting to find a viable balance between traditional and modern methods of caring for heritage.

HPO staff very clearly believe in the work they do and are grateful for the funding and other support they receive, some of which directly and indirectly supports Indigenous values. However, with their convictions comes the desire to strive to make things better—to carry out projects that would be more effective and meaningful for their communities; to increase staff capability; to have more efficient processes for accomplishing work and reporting it; and to encourage island youth to be the next generation of archaeologists, anthropologists, and historic preservationist specialists. There are those on-island who want to see their island entity’s HPO work to tell more complete histories within the context of the island’s social and physical landscape and across modern political divides, thereby
providing more accurate depictions of the communities being publicly represented. When this does not occur, the health and well being of the Indigenous community and the community at large is at risk as has been shown in recent studies. Moreover, Micronesians still consider many sites to have power that can cause harm if not remembered or respected.

Forging a path ahead for western Micronesian historic preservation may involve broadening existing relationships with entities such as the NPS, which has worked with and alongside the HPOs of Guam, the NMI, and Palau for decades. These relationships have put into place structure and systems that have resulted in many successes—exchange of local and professional expertise, community outreach and engagement, and a variety of information and products that serve as tools for a wide range of audiences and circumstances. Expanding HPO horizons regionally and internationally is another way to buttress working through island shortages, needs, and visions for the type of historic preservation or historic preservation-like efforts that are fitting for island communities. Each island entity has a pool of committed experts in historic preservation and related fields with visions for building upon the foundation that exists. Visions are inherently in flux and consequently are moving targets. Therefore, it is not unexpected that interviewees feel the time is ripe for refining and shifting emphases, methods, procedures, and goals. Movements in the field of historic and cultural conservation attest to this. Worldwide, including within the US, lines are being redrawn in an attempt to ensure that community members and their varying ways of perceiving history and connection to the landscape are part of the public story. Indigenous perspectives regarding their heritage are increasingly being recognized as valid, as deserving public space, and as a resource that the non-Indigenous can learn from. Further, the world will be less rich without its current levels of diversity.

One might ask: What does one’s heritage mean if it is not alive, if it does not retain its “soul,” its essence, and if it becomes “of” society rather than functioning “in” society? What lessons are being learned from historic preservation that does not save historic and cultural
resources in ways that are meaningful to the community members that value it, are informed by it, and root their identity in it? Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders interviewed and encountered during the course of this study are striving to realize a future path of historic preservation in western Micronesia paved with: increased consideration of intangible heritage that is just as, if not more, meaningful to them as tangible heritage; written HPO work occurring more so in the vernacular; transmission being supported as the way to maintain certain heritage; and, traditional Indigenous Islander protocol being upheld as part of the heritage being conserved.

This study is but a stepping-stone in that path. It strives to be part of the movement occurring within the NPS and worldwide, to align historic preservation practices to a heightened responsiveness to communities and their epistemologies by exploring the degree of presence of Indigenous Islander values in the HPOs and efforts in Guam, the NMI, and Palau. What has become clear is that this exploration has only just begun to scratch the surface of the multi-layered and complex issues that are at hand. Three political entities and four culture groups were examined, providing an overview of some of the larger issues. This study found that less apparent issues, such as community cultural attributes and demographics, colonial histories, recognition of Indigenous rights, political systems, and national and international relationships interconnect with historic preservation concerns. All were found to impact whether an HPO succeeds in serving its community appropriately.

Each of these cultural groups and their issues related to historic preservation deserve continuing and more detailed examination. The stakes are high if issues are not further teased apart and understood. Numerous stereotypes have existed about Peoples within Micronesia for centuries: their productivity, their efficiency, and the efficacy of their processes. This creates negative connotations about Peoples and their efforts, which can become internalized, causing those same People to view themselves and their activities through those negative lenses. These stereotypes do not take into real consideration that
other valid ways for conceiving goals and achieving them exist, valid ways based on thousands of years of knowledge gained through experience, as were the cases here. Further explorations like this study provide opportunities to refute those stereotypes, explain why differences do and should exist, and identify actions available for consideration. Considered information is extremely important given that societies in Micronesia are contending with a fast-changing socio-cultural and political landscape due to globalization, modernization, development, and other forces.

Certainly there are other ways to examine the presence of, and the challenges to, the support of Micronesian values in their homelands (and abroad). An in-depth understanding of each cultural group’s range of types of Indigenous heritage would be valuable. Further, within each type will be complex issues at play that will also be important to understand. Additionally, an invaluable historic preservation tool will be the exploration of how each type of Indigenous heritage has been safeguarded and transmitted over time and understanding what core values are embedded in such activities. And certainly, there are many questions to explore in figuring out the ways Micronesian historic preservationists and their communities should navigate through the currents and shoals of the future. Within that journey, what is appropriate, and who should decide what is appropriate? What is feasible? What will serve as the rudder that guides them? An informative exercise might be gathering what HPOs would look like if developed from scratch given today’s understandings of traditional and modern conservation systems. This could inform areas to tailor or redevelop, as well as be a guide for training which shows island HPOs how to fulfill identified community needs and desires through the systems already in place.

Other types of issues important to explore would be those that impact Micronesian workplaces in general for they also dictate the types of needs the island communities have and significantly affect their HPOs ability to perform. For example, disparate research has assessed Micronesian community health, demographic changes, and other concerns as
issues in their own rights. However, what may be lacking at this point is a study, or series of studies, that assess how these conditions impact the ability for Micronesian communities to fulfill program requirements that work well in developed countries that have larger pools of specialized human resources, well-developed infrastructure, significantly better community health and health care, but perhaps less well in areas which, among other situations, are still developing basic of infrastructure and regulations, have some of the highest rates of certain types of health issues in the world, much lower life expectancies, and family first-extended family cultures in which these high rates of health issues affect people directly and indirectly as they attend to their extended family members.

Some of the challenges continuing to face the presence and expression of Indigenous values in island historic preservation will be more controllable than others. Yet they will have the potential to greatly impact island socio-cultural and political landscapes, including the ways of viewing, valuing, and carrying out the tasks of historic preservation. Figuring out the range of ways to mitigate these challenges and determine the attendant costs are issues that can be addressed not only through further academic study and public policy review, but also by introspective dialogue within island communities themselves.
Appendices

Appendix A: Terminology

I. The terms below are provided in the order as follows:

a. Micronesia/Western Micronesia
b. Indigenous
c. Indigenous Values
d. Tradition/Traditional
e. Cultural Resources
f. Historic Preservation and Heritage Conservation
g. Associated Indigenous Names and Indigenous Terms

Micronesia/Western Micronesia

It has been debated whether a region labeled “Micronesia” exists in reality or is imagined by historians and researchers (Hanlon, 1989; 2009b; Petersen, 2009). Certainly it is a term developed by non-Pacific Peoples, Europeans specifically (Clark, 2003; Hanlon, 2009b, p. 93). The usage of the term Micronesia has also been “adjusted this way or that” over the years to accommodate a particular focus (Hezel, 2001, p. 1). Oftentimes it is used to refer to those islands that made up the former United States (US) Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) or the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). Adjusting Micronesia’s boundaries and definition creates stereotypes of which Peoples and islands do or do not belong to that geographical marker or cultural region. To be considered is that challenges to the existence of Micronesia as a reality, or adjustments of its boundaries, silence or exclude Peoples that presently refer to themselves as Micronesians and proclaim their islands as belonging to Micronesia.

For this thesis, the term “Micronesia” is used as a geographical marker and does not enter the debate as to whether it exists as a cultural region or not and if so, to what extent. However, the thesis will discuss certain Micronesian islands’ shared (or similar) features, as well as their differences, be they cultural, historical, or other. A real divide exists in academic literature regarding the island entities that have had an affiliation with Spain, Germany, Japan, and the US and those that have had affiliations with Australia, Great
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Britain/the United Kingdom, and New Zealand (namely Nauru and Kiribati for the latter), though there has been some colonial administration overlap in this divide. Although this thesis recognizes the importance of discussing issues at a more inclusive, “regional” level, it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the cultures, traditions, and historic preservation activities of Nauru and Kiribati whose programs and funding exist quite differently, although a limited amount of information regarding those areas is provided (see Table 6).

This thesis examines the modern day political entities of the US Unincorporated territory of Guam (Guåhan), the US Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), and the Republic of Palau (Belau or ROP) which exist in western Micronesia. Many of the islands that comprise the state of Yap, FSM are also located in western Micronesia and will be discussed to a limited degree. However, the FSM is a rich subject of study in its own right. To examine and discuss its richness deserves more attention than would be possible given the time constraints of this thesis.  

Indigenous

Formal recognition of Peoples as Indigenous has at times been contentious in the islands under study. Tensions about which of the Peoples are Indigenous have also existed between some of the Islanders of differing ancestry and migration histories. Further, as Diaz and Kauanui (2001) note, “there is a whole range of classificatory politics of the terms Native, aboriginal, indigenous, First nation...[wherein] these terms hold different currency and resonance in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and beyond.” (p. 33)

This study uses the term “Indigenous” to recognize those Islanders who identify themselves as cultural descendants of the ancient or historically recognized settlers of their island/s where they became distinctive cultural groups. The most salient points for the discourse of this study are that Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders: consider themselves Indigenous or Native to their islands; have respective governing statues and regulations that recognize them as Indigenous or
characterized as “the most frequently invoked and widely accepted definition of ‘indigenous peoples’” provided in 1986 by U.N. Special Rapporteur Jose Martinez Cobo, who conducted the first comprehensive U.N. study on the situation of indigenous peoples globally” (Aguon, 2012, pp. 54-55). That is,

Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invansion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems. (Cobo, 1986, as cited in UN, “Resource kit on indigenous peoples’ issues,” p. 7)

This study’s usage differs from the above in that Micronesian Indigenous situations do not always “form at present non-dominant sectors of society,” though they may be said to be having to contend with the pressures of dominant (some of which are neo-colonial or neo-colonial-like) outside forces within an increasingly globalized community. Further, it should be kept in mind that an internationally accepted definition of the term does not exist (UN, “Resource kit on indigenous peoples' issues,” p. 7). Characteristics that are said to identify Indigenous Peoples include that: their “status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;” they are descendants from populations present prior to colonization or the establishment of current state boundaries; and they self-identify themselves as such (UN, “Resource kit on indigenous peoples’ issues,” p. 7).

Native to their islands; and have significant and symbolic connections to their ancestral homelands. One might discuss a possible variance between the Indigenous groups of this study which will not be explored as such, though some background information regarding their varying situations is provided in Chapter Two. In Palau, during the course of this study, there was some discussion as to whether the Peoples of Palau should start referring to themselves as “Native” rather than “Indigenous” given the growing usage of the term “Native” to refer to marginalized Peoples whose homelands were subsumed by colonial nations and societies (see discussion of such usage in Ross et al., 2011, pp. 21-24).
The term “Indigenous” “internationalizes the experiences, the issues and the struggles of some of the world’s colonized peoples,” though there is also recognition “that there are real differences between different indigenous peoples” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 7) given their unique cultures and histories. Indigenous ways of knowing, understanding, and perceiving are understood to exist in comparison to other cultural groups (e.g., Kovach, 2009, pp. 56-58). As such, in this study, the term “Indigenous” is capitalized, following the same rules that call for the recognition and capitalization of cultural categories such as “Asian,” “Renaissance,” and “Western.” Each of the island entities under study have at least one or two formally recognized groups of Indigenous Peoples and informally recognized sub-cultural groups as well.

Indigenous Values

As this study examines four cultural groups (themselves comprised of sub-groups), the concept of Indigenous values is most often used as a general category unless explicitly specified otherwise. Many cultural facets can be understood to make up a group’s set of values—their understanding of the ways that the universe and society function, what in those settings are significant and why and how they exist, and what constitutes appropriate behavior and actions. In some ways Indigenous values are conceived of as the ways of thinking, perceiving, or valuing developed in the islands during pre-European contact times (also referred to as PreContact/Prehistory, ancient times, early history, or other such alternatives). However, Robert Underwood (n.d.) contends that Indigenous values can exist beyond these early historical periods in two respects. First, a People’s core values can continue to thrive in what may appear to be a very altered society. In other words, it is incorrect to assess that a cultural group no longer exists as an Indigenous People or are no longer guided by Indigenous values because they appear to the untrained eye to be altered from their earlier forms. Second, over time, new values can be adopted and adapted as part
of the Indigenous panoply of values. As noted in Ross et al. (2011), some make the error of applying “what are often Western-imposed stereotype[s],” when interpreting the “‘creativity and flexibility of a dynamic [culture]’” as “‘the decay of a pristine culture’” (p. 99).

This can make generalizing what constitutes Indigenous values somewhat difficult. Nevertheless, what constitutes Indigenous values is largely understood by the society within which they exist. The concept of Indigenous values is used within this study to incorporate what are perceived by the Indigenous Guam and NMI Chamorros, NMI Carolinians, Palauans, and Palauan Southwest Islanders as both those ways developed during pre-European contact times of thinking, perceiving, or valuing as well as those new values that they have adopted, adapted, and utilize in modern times.

**Tradition/Traditional**

The terms “tradition” and “traditional” are often used as a markers to differentiate beliefs, behavior, and practices that have developed within a culture and/or have been passed on for generations (Tonkinson, 2000) versus those that are considered foreign, deriving from or representing different epistemologies and cosmologies (e.g., Parmentier, 1987, p. 55). Far from being static, traditions according to Charles Smythe (2009), a National Park Service (NPS) ethnography program manager, “continue to shape the contemporary community’s lifeways, values, and beliefs and to have importance in the ongoing cultural identity of the community” (p. 18).

Additionally, cultures are dynamic—developing, reacting, manipulating, influencing, adapting, adopting, and incorporating (see such discussion in Owen, 2011, p. 162). Further, as Linnekin (1997) states “‘tradition’ now means a model of the past that is symbolically constructed in the present and reflects contemporary agendas. The content of ‘tradition’ is politically charged, changeable, often ambiguous and hotly contested” (p. 14). Differing
assessments exist then within societies as to what constitutes a cultural group’s tradition and which elements are traditional (Tonkinson, 2000, pp. 169-174). Consequently, this study uses these terms following general island community assessments as to what constitutes their cultural tradition.

It could be useful then to have a term that specifically refers to behaviors and practices that are accepted elements of a culture regardless of their origin or period of existence. Perhaps the term “cultural content,” which, as used by the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (UNESCO) “refers to the symbolic meaning, artistic dimension and cultural values that originate from or express cultural identities” could be useful here; as could “cultural expressions” (“Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions,” 2005). The term “customary” might also be developed to serve this function. However, here it is used on occasion in essentially the same sense as the term “traditional.”

**Cultural Resources**

As cultural heritage studies specialists (Lockwood & Spennemann, 2001 as cited in Spennemann, 2006b) points out,

> [o]bjects, places and resources have no intrinsic value per se. Individuals project value onto an object, place or resource based on their own needs and desires and shaped by their current social, cultural and economic circumstances, which in turn are informed, and to a degree predisposed, by an individual’s personal history of experience, upbringing and ideological formation. (p. 35)

Thomas F. King (2004, p. 8) and Tuggle and Tomanari-Tuggle (2006; 2008) note that the term “cultural resources,” can mean different things to different Peoples, professionals, and entities. King (2004) further notes that such terms can become narrowly construed to be the province of a certain field of study and gain attendant connotations over time. This has happened in regards to the terms “cultural resources” and “cultural resource management,” which some have tended to equate with “archeological site” and “as an endeavor in applied
archeological research,” respectively (p. 10). However, in this study, the terms refer more broadly to the range of natural or built, tangible and intangible cultural and historic heritage as understood to exist in Guam, the NMI, and Palau, and several similar terms are used interchangeably.

Though the term “cultural resources” and related terms are commonly used within the cultural and heritage sectors, they may categorize resources in ways that Islanders traditionally do not. While not directly addressed during this study, gaining a deeper understanding of ways in which Islanders have conceptualized what professionals currently refer to as tangible and intangible cultural and historic resources would be valuable. A powerful concept, for example, used by Indigenous island community members has been to discuss such resources as their inheritance. The NPS has also developed the term “ethnographic resources,” which could be a very valuable term for Indigenous Islanders.

One of the ways in which they have been defined is,

those sites, structures, objects, cultural and natural landscapes, and human dimensions that would be defined by contemporary people as being meaningful, significant, and crucial to their sense of their own past and who they are. The term refers to places and objects that could not be fully understood if they were disengaged from the people who made them or used them. (Wray et al., 2009, p. 47)

**Historic Preservation and Heritage Conservation**

This study examines issues related to identifying, documenting, safeguarding, preserving, conserving, and promoting island cultural and historic heritage. The term “historic preservation” is used throughout much of the thesis inasmuch as it focuses on each island entity’s historic preservation office (HPO). As such, these offices are recognized as conducting historic preservation work though other cultural and historic management entities use other terminology and likewise conceptualize their endeavors somewhat differently.
As with cultural resources, historic preservation is defined differently by various people (King, 2004, p. 13). Historic preservation is defined by the NPS (which provides much of the office’s funding and, as such, determines much of the office’s type of work) to include the,

- identification, evaluation, recordation, documentation, curation, acquisition, protection, management, rehabilitation, restoration, stabilization, maintenance, research, interpretation (and) conservation (of historic properties), and education and training regarding the foregoing activities or any combination of the foregoing activities. (King, 2004, p. 13)

As an example of some of the real or perceived conceptual differences in terminology, heritage conservation, as discussed by archaeologist Jennifer McKinnon, who has worked within the NMI, is defined as being situated somewhat differently. She notes:

-as Logan and Reeves (2009:13) have communicated so well, ‘Heritage conservation is a form of cultural politics; it is about the links between ideology, public policy, national and community identity formation, and celebration, just as much as it is about technical issues relating to restoration and adaptive re-use techniques’ (2011, p. 92).

Associated Indigenous Names and Indigenous Terms

Each island polity has officially recognized languages270 as well as terms for its Indigenous Peoples in both the vernacular and in English. The Indigenous names for Peoples and island entities, as well as terms used for cultural and historical issues, follow the spelling utilized or promoted by government sanctioned sources as available. Namely, these were existing statutes or government entities tasked with the responsibility of orthography or for overseeing cultural and historical concerns. It is, however, recognized that factions within each of the island communities studied at times interpreted sounds of certain Indigenous terms differently, followed other orthography rules, or assessed that alternative wording would be more appropriate.271 Further, when more than one Indigenous population existed in an island entity, there could be assessments that the incorrect Indigenous language was officially being used. There continues to be some flux within the Islander orthographies and,
in fact, several of the languages within this study did not yet have formally adopted orthographies during fieldwork. In Palau, for example, an updated Palauan orthography was being promoted and taught in schools but had not been officially adopted. Similarly, official orthographies were not in existence for other Indigenous island languages such as those spoken by the Peoples of Palau’s southernmost states of Sonsorol and Hatohobei. Although this situation is linked to ancillary issues of island orthography or Indigenous politics, it has not been the task of this dissertation to promote a position on such issues. Island communities and their experts alone are empowered to make those decisions.
Appendix B: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands Historic Preservation Office

Organization Chart

Source: Division of Lands and Surveys, 1978
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Appendix C: Site Labeling Systems

The Guam, NMI, and Palau resource inventory numbering systems differ somewhat from those found in US states. In a US state, resource numbering consists of three elements. First is a two-digit number representing the particular state. Second is the designation of the county within the state. The final number represents the order in which the resource was entered into the state inventory (R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 16 Feb. 2008).

Guam’s system is similar to that of the US states, with Guam represented by the number “66.” Guam, not having counties, located its resources on the basis of nine island regions. The third portion of Guam’s site labeling system represents the order in which the resource was entered into its inventory (see Table 15).

The NMI HPO, on the other hand, identified cultural resources with an island specific prefix. For example, cultural resources on Saipan are identified with the prefix “SP.” Inventoried resources existing on Pagan, Rota or Tinian (the latter including the island of Aguiguan) are given the prefixes “PN,” “RT,” and “TN,” respectively (other islands have yet to be inventoried). The NMI’s second set of numbers classifies them by the site’s chronological association—meaning the historic context with which the artifact is associated. This is followed by a final set of numbers denoting the order in which a resource was entered into their inventory (see Table 15) (J. D. C. Camacho, Pers. Comm., 4 March 2008; R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 27 May 2008). However, some problems have arisen with assigning chronological association. Experience has shown that most sites, according to their staff archaeologist, do not have just one temporal or type of resource component (R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 16 Feb. 2008).

Palau developed its current four-part site numbering system in 1981 (Snyder & Butler, 1997, p. 10) (see Table 15). First is the country code “B” for Belau. Second is a two-letter designation for a state according to more traditional spellings. Third is the number
representing a village or a state region. The fourth part of the labeling system is an assigned number for each site, while the final portion of the labeling system refers to particular features.

Prior to this current system, various researchers assigned their own identification systems. Part of the challenge for the HPO archaeological section has been to compare current findings with past reports in order to create consistent, standardized labels and references for cultural resources. An important feature of the inventory is in cross-referencing these varied labels to provide a clearer picture of the inventory (C. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 7 March 2008).
Appendix D: Other Historic Preservation Office Outputs

Though historic preservation offices (HPOs) create many types of public outputs, due to time and other constraints, this study limited itself to cursory reviews of the HPOs’ re-internments and publications. Mention is made of some of the known DVDs and other materials to provide a more comprehensive understanding of material produced by the offices.

Re-internments

Re-internments are an indirect output of HPOs relating to the office’s regulatory functions regarding human burial treatment. For this reason, fieldwork addressed re-internment sites and their respective markers. For each marker found, general details were recorded, as were their conditions, sizes, and locations. Commemorative text was also recorded, though some marker texts were too damaged to be read or were missing altogether. Issues surrounding legislation, executive orders, and guidelines for human burial treatment were also contentious. Protests against current practices have been held in Guam and, to a lesser degree, in the NMI (J. D. C. Camacho, Interview, 18 April 2007). In 2011, a bill was introduced to amend Guam’s legal guidelines regarding treatment of encountered human remains and burials (Guam “Bill 1-31,” 2011). In Palau legislation to update statutory guidelines, Title 19 of the Palau National Code (PNC), has been introduced. An important element in this update would be to formalize guidelines for human burial treatment.

There were five completed re-internments on Guam as of June 2007 (Table 42). Other internments had been negotiated to occur but were unfinished (W. Hernandez, Pers. Comm., 9 Nov. 2007). Guam historic preservation staff provided the locations of extant re-internments. Providing feedback to the office regarding the conditions of the re-internment sites appeared to have strengthened attention to this issue. Shortly thereafter, HPO staff inspected re-internment sites to assess their condition. Further, staff communicated later in
2007 that the office was devoting some effort to encouraging the finalization of incomplete re-internments (W. Hernandez, Pers. Comm., 9 Nov. 2007).

Table 42. Completed Internments on Guam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internment locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Nikko Guam, Tamuning/Tumon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Westin Resort Guam, Tamuning/Tumon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyatt Regency Guam, Tamuning/Tumon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onward Hotel, Tamuning/Tumon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agana Beach Condominium, Tamuning/Tumon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007.*

One re-internment site consisted of a manicured lawn with surrounding vegetation, a local artist’s depiction of an ancient Chamorro village etched into a commemorative plaque, and a reconstructed *latte* set\(^{35}\). Ancient Chamorro burials were often associated with *latte*, and contemporary Chamorros sometimes refer to them as gravestones or tombstones of sorts. Another re-internment had steps and decorative plants. The other re-internments were simple markers, however (Figure 15). One was badly damaged (located in the sand on a beach mere feet away from the waterline) while another was missing its commemorative marker.\(^{274}\) Guam Public Law 21-104, passed in 1992, provided for a “Chamorro shrine to be called ‘Nåftan Mañaina-ta’ (Burial Place of Our Ancestors) for the entombment of ancestral remains accumulated by the Guam Public Library and any government of Guam agency,” though it was not yet in place as of mid-2012.

In May and June of 2007, three out of the four known extant re-internment sites in the NMI were visited (Table 43).\(^{275}\) Three were located on Saipan and one on Tinian. Two of Saipan’s re-internments exist in very public locations. The third is located in the inner portion of a hotel compound. At least one ancient Chamorro artifact, such as a *latte* and/or a *lusong* (stone mortar), is part of these commemorative sites. There is also what is referred to

\(^{35}\) House columns of stone.
as a “re-internment vault” at the House of Taga on the island of Tinian. The NMI Archaeologist, Ronnie H. Rogers, describes it as a large “walk-in semi-subterranean structure.” Plans also exist to establish other re-internment sites so that re-burials occur closer to their original burial sites (R. H. Rogers, Pers. Comm., 14 May 2009).

Table 43. Completed Internments in the NMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internment locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands Club (PIC), Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Free, Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court House, Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Taga Latte Site, Tinian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of May 2007.*

An unexpected finding was that text discussing the associated internment was virtually verbatim on both a NMI internment marker and a Guam marker. While the text seemed thoughtful in many ways, it was not truly reflective of the particular individuals, conditions, or knowledge gained from the two distinct archaeological studies. No indication existed that the two uniform internment markers were referring to two politically distinct ancient Chamorro villages and sets of clans inhabiting two different islands. Given that these markers exist in two separate political entities, it is uncertain whether either island community, including their HPOs, was aware of this occurrence. If island communities determine that such duplication detracts from the spirit of real commemoration of interned ancestors, perhaps the HPOs will address this issue in the future. Some of this concern for specificity is manifest in Guam Public Law 21-104, which states that the text for Nåftan Mañaina-ta is to “[reflect] information on the ancient villages where the human remains originated, death rites, burial practice, and life around the immediate area” (lines 8-12, p. 3; emphasis added).
Figure 14. Re-internment site at Hotel Nikko Guam, Tumon. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)

Figure 15. Re-internment marker at Hyatt Regency Guam, Tumon. (Photo taken by Kelly G. Marsh, 2007.)
As previously noted, human burial issues were not initially addressed in Title 19 PNC. However, the Palau HPO had guidelines that it followed. The standard practice for the office was to consider all human remains as “Palauan unless proven otherwise” (R. Olsudong, Interview, 4 April 2008). In Palau, deciding the disposition of uncovered human remains rests with the owners or representatives of the land, often family. The Palau HPO generally encourages the family to re-inter found remains at their traditional stone burial platform located on family land (in past times, Palauan houses were built with associated stone burial platforms, many of which remain in-situ today). This is not only in accordance with traditional practices but potentially induces contemporary Palauans to maintain and interact with their cultural resources. The desire is that this will encourage the transmission of the oral history and knowledge that surrounds family and stone platforms to future generations (R. Olsudong, Interview, 4 April 2008).

**Public Education Materials**

Each of the HPOs has generated a broad range of distinct historic preservation related public information, education, and awareness materials. Self-produced materials are distributed to schools, libraries, and organizations. Further, the Micronesian HPOs often share these products with each other. Given that Guam, the NMI, and Palau HPOs have existed for some 30 years, and bearing in mind the relatively brief fieldwork time allotted per area, this study was limited to gaining copies of listings of office publications, copies of readily available publications, current brochures, posters, and newsletters rather than conducting a comprehensive examination of all related office products. The listings may not have always been complete and institutional memory was limited.

The Guam HPO initiated a publication series entitled, “*Latte*: Occasional papers in anthropology and historic preservation.” By early 2007, the office had produced two publications (see Table 44). Both of these crossed the modern political boundaries that divide
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Guam and the NMI. They focus on Chamorro pre-European contact sites, or Indigenous heritage. As the latte is an icon for contemporary Chamorros—replicated contemporarily on pieces of jewelry, license plates, buildings, and much more (Cunningham, “Latte structures”)—there has been relatively heavy interest in understanding the quarrying and function of latte. This HPO series addresses those interests.

Table 44. Guam HPO Publication Series “Latte: Occasional Papers in Anthropology and Historic Preservation”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investigations of the As Nieves Quarry and Taga site: Rota, M.I.; Conservation archaeology report: Toguan Bay archaeological investigation, Guam; and Ylig archaeology assessment—Marine and riverine archaeo-survey</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Latte quarries of the Mariana Islands</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of 2008.

In 2007, Guam State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO or GHPO) Lynda B. Aguon stated that she was interested in having the office publish more research materials and was actively encouraging people to submit proposals to further this objective (L. B. Aguon, Interview, 23 March 2007). One of the goals stated by both Guam’s SHPO and its State Archaeologist was to find more ways to publish the archaeological data they collect on a regular basis. Aguon (Interview, 23 March 2007) further noted, “very few people get to see [the archaeological data], the archaeologists...and maybe teachers.” Office staff wanted to have “somebody start writing and coming over here, look at the reports and write the results and publish them in these local magazines or newspapers” (V. N. April, Interview, 22 March 2007).

The Guam HPO has provided various types of support to written and video productions over the years. It had recently begun awarding grants to projects producing DVDs concerning Guam’s historic districts and the significance of registered resources (see Table 45). These educate the public about Guam’s historical contexts. These contexts provide
an understanding of resource significance within the dynamics of the area’s particular history or the nation’s larger history. Thus, this sort of work serves as an important planning tool for the office and helps spread awareness and appreciation of resources and their historic importance.

Table 45. DVDs Produced with Support from the Guam HPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DVD no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year of DVD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hagåtña historic district</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Historic context: Oral history overview of Guam and Micronesia: Featuring Manenggon march and concentration camp survivor accounts</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Historic context: Umatac historic sites</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cornerstone: Story of the Guam Congress building</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of 2008.

Guam HPO Historian Toni Ramirez was largely responsible for public exhibits, presentations, and guided tours of historic sites, though others in the Guam HPO have performed these functions as well. Public education events have included commemorating and sharing information about Chamorro PreContact times, the internment of a German ship during World War I, and Chamorro and US veteran experiences during World War II (WW II). Ramirez stated that he works to “connect people” to the history by examining a broad array of themes and interpretations for Guam’s diverse community (T. Rameriz, Interview, 29 June 2007). Guam’s HPO has also published numerous posters, brochures, and calendars that are widely distributed throughout the island community. Several of these are available on their website (http://historicguam.org).

In addition to the impetus for archaeological research as outlined earlier, for Guam, a number of these activities have been cooperative efforts with the University of Guam (UOG) or have been funded by the Guam Preservation Trust (GPT). In 2007 and 2008, the GPT and the Guam HPO worked with the Richard F. Taitano Micronesian Area Research Center (MARC) to create a digital Guam archaeological database. The NMI SHPO and the Director
of MARC have discussed expanding the database to include the NMI archaeological reports as a possible second phase (J. Peterson, Pers. Comm., 15 Aug. 2008).

The NMI HPO produced two publication series—one focused on ethnographic works and the other concerning archaeological survey reports and overviews. NMI HPO staff and Board members identified these series as office strengths. NMI HPO Review and Compliance Specialist Juan Diego C. Camacho (Interview, 18 April 2007) said that both locals and visitors visit the HPO specifically to acquire copies of those publications. NMI HPO Archaeologist Ronnie H. Rogers (Interview, 17 April 2007) further noted that they “are very popular.”

The NMI Ethnographic Collection is comprised of translations, the reprinting of primary ethnographic work, and new research and analysis of cultural resources and the NMI’s historical contexts and themes. The Ethnographic Collection consisted of 26 publications as of June 2007 (see Table 46). Twenty-three of the publications are printed in English with the office guide additionally available in Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. This series has been active for over 23 years with the first book rolling off the press in 1986.

Both NMI HPO publication series help inform Indigenous Chamorros and Carolinians about the cultural histories of their ancestors and the contexts within which these histories occurred. This is especially important since, as discussed in Chapter Two, they have been disconnected from much of this history. Both NMI series discuss people, events, history, and cultural resources throughout the various Mariana Islands, crossing the modern day political boundaries that now formally separate Chamorros (Farrell, 1994; see Farrell, 2006b). One Ethnographic Collection publication branches out further, surveying the typhoons of Micronesia. The most recent book presents an overview of the NMI historic and cultural sites.
In June 2007, 34 books comprised the NMI HPO’s Micronesian Archaeological Survey Reports series (see Table 47). One of the publications was an overview of the NMI’s “raw archaeological data...put into a form...that can be understood by the lay person” (J. D. L. Guerrero, Jr., Interview, 31 May 2007). Nearly half (11) of these publications focus on the

Table 46. NMI HPO Ethnographic Collection Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subject area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Chamorro: A history and ethnography of the Mariana Islands</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>From conquest to colonization: Spain in the Mariana Islands 1670-1740</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Operation Forager: The battle of Saipan</td>
<td>Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A time of agony: Saipan 1944</td>
<td>Saipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tinian: The final chapter</td>
<td>Tinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Carolinians in the Mariana Islands in the late 1800s</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Protecting our past: A guide to historic preservation requirements in the CNMI (English)</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Protecting our past: A guide to historic preservation requirements in the CNMI (Japanese)</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Protecting our past: A guide to historic preservation requirements in the CNMI (Korean)</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Protecting our past: A guide to historic preservation requirements in the CNMI (Chinese)</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>History of the mission in the Mariana Islands</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Tiempon Aleman: A look back at German rule of the Northern Mariana Islands, 1899-1914</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Aurora Australis: The German period in the Mariana Islands, 1899-1914</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The German annexation of the Caroline, Palau &amp; Mariana Islands</td>
<td>Caroline Islands, Mariana Islands, Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Problems of resettlement on Saipan, Tinian and Rota (originally published 1950)</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>A campaign for political rights on the island of Guam, 1899-1950</td>
<td>Guam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The island of Rota: An archaeological and historical overview</td>
<td>Rota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The Chamorros of the Mariana Islands: The early European records, 1521-1721</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>An account of the Corvette L'Urance's sojourn at the Mariana Islands, 1819</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Typhoons of Micronesia: The history of tropical cyclones and their effects until 1914</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The secret Guam study</td>
<td>Guam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The life and martyrdom of Diego Luis de San Vitores [sic], SJ</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Historic and cultural sites of the CNMI: The National Register sites</td>
<td>NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>German sources on the Marianas: An annotated bibliography</td>
<td>Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of May 2007.
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NMI specifically while the other reports and surveys explore other areas of Micronesia (Table 48).\textsuperscript{277} This series embraces the concept of the NMI as belonging to and serving regions of which it is a part—Micronesia and the central Pacific. In part, this broad perspective is a consequence of being part of the US-administered Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI).\textsuperscript{278}

The NMI HPO newsletter, Protehi I Kuttura’ta (Protect Our Culture),\textsuperscript{279} was identified by interviewees as another strength of the NMI historic preservation program. Interviewees commended the NMI HPO for furthering heritage preservation efforts within the Carolinian communities of the NMI alongside the Chamorro communities, though some noted that they would like to see more attention spent on the Indigenous Carolinian communities.

At the time of this study’s field research, the various NMI HPO staff shared the responsibility of providing exhibits and presentations for the public as well as giving guided tours of historic sites. Many of the exhibits and presentations appeared to revolve around Mariana Island “Prehistory” while at times staff provided tours to a variety of sites, including prehistoric and WW II sites (R. H. Rogers, Interview, 17 April 2007).

The NMI HPO had produced some video documentation\textsuperscript{280} over the years as well as DVDs providing overviews of their office’s annual accomplishments (P. Sablan, Pers. Comm., 12 April 2007). The Acting NMI SHPO, Pedro “Roy” C. Sablan, Jr., expressed interest in producing other historic preservation related DVDs and perhaps creating a system for digitizing their office’s publications to increase their accessibility. In fact, the most recently produced NMI HPO publication was available online.\textsuperscript{36, 281} In this vein, the NMI HPO had supported an online resource effort, the “Annotated bibliography of German language sources on the Mariana Islands,” a digital library project.\textsuperscript{37, 282} One topic that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{36}] See: http://www.cnmihpo.com
\item[\textsuperscript{37}] See: http://marshall.csu.edu.au
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Sablan discussed (Pers. Comm., 15 Aug. 2008) was editing previously captured video documentation (such as that of crafting a traditional Chamorro canoe) into DVD format and then making it available to the public.

Table 47. NMI HPO Micronesian Archaeological Survey Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Field survey of Truk: World War II features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Archaeology in the Tonaachaw historic district, Moen Islands 1817-1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Of wooden ships and iron men: An historical and archaeological survey of Brig Leonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Archaeological survey of Innem, Okat and Loal Kosrae Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The European discovery of Kosrae Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Russian exploration in the Mariana Islands 1817-1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Carolinian contacts with the Islands of the Marianas: The European record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Traders, teachers, and soldiers: An anthropological survey of colonial era sites on Majuro Atoll, Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>From Arabwal to ashes: A brief history of Garapan Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Home of the superfort: An historical and archaeological survey of Isley Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Archaeological investigations on the north coast of Rota, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>HMS Centurion at Tinian, 1742: The ethnographic and historic records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Archaeological survey on the leeward coast of Saipan: Garapan to Oleai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>An archaeological survey of Aguiguan, NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Archaeological investigations in the Achugao and Matansa areas of Saipan, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>An overview of NMI Prehistory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><em>Tiempon I Manmoto'na</em>: Ancient Chamorro culture and history of the NMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Archeological excavations in the Uyulan region of Rota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Koror: A center of power, commerce and colonial administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>An archaeological investigation of the Prehistoric terraces of Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Peleliu revisited: An historical and archaeological survey of WWII sites on Peleliu Island, report number 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Field survey of Ponape &quot;World War II features&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The discovery and archaeological investigation of Nan Madol Ponape, eastern Caroline Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>An annotated bibliography (revised edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ponape archaeological survey: 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>From Mesenieng to Kolonia: An archaeological survey of historic Kolonia, Ponape, eastern Caroline Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Sapwtakai: Archaeological survey and testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Master part of heaven: The ethnohistory and archaeology of Wene, Pohnpei, eastern Caroline Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ponape archaeological survey: 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Archaeological settlement pattern studies on Yap: Report number 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Settlement pattern studies in Nlul Village, Map Island, Yap, western Caroline Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>The catalogue of Prehistoric Micronesian artifacts housed in Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of May 2007.*
The office had also helped produce other publications such as the printing of eight volumes “containing 136 oral histories regarding the political history of the Northern Marianas since the conclusion of World War II.” According to Compliance Section Supervisor, Juan Diego “J. D.” Palacios, the office was also interested in making some of their Geographic Information System (GIS) database work available to students during office presentations and demonstrations.

The Palau HPO produced the newsletter, Ibetel a Klebelau, on a bi-annual basis. Additionally, Palau has produced three series of publications. The annually produced “Traditional and customary practices” series was printed in both Palauan and English (Table 49). The “Anthropology research” series had produced three publications by 2008 (Table 50). And, finally, the “Oral history research” series had printed two seminal publications—volumes one and two of Rechuodel (translated as “Traditional culture and lifeways long ago in Palau”) (Table 51). The Palauan version of the latter publications set the foundation for ensuing “Traditional and customary practices” series booklets. The practice was for a

\[38\] See: [http://www.cnmihpo.com](http://www.cnmihpo.com)
booklet to expand on chapters from *Rechuodel* volumes. As of 2008, they had published 11 booklets in both Palauan and English. Palau’s HPO had steadily been making these publications available since 1995, typically publishing at least one booklet a year (the more recent format is to publish one booklet with both Palauan and English versions in it). All of these publications centered on Palau, dealing with the nation’s historic preservation, archaeology, and ethnography efforts as well as Indigenous tangible and intangible heritage issues (Table 52). Additionally, state survey reports were generated annually by both the Archaeology Section and the Oral History and Ethnography Section.

### Table 49. Palau Traditional and Customary Practices Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palauan version booklets</th>
<th>English version booklets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ulekerreuil a Kidiiul Ma Cheroll</em></td>
<td>Pregnancy and birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ulekerreuil a Kodall Ma Kemeldiiil</em></td>
<td>Death, funeral and associated responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ibetel a Udelidi e Ulekerreu el Omerredd er Belau</em></td>
<td>Traditional leadership in Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Klisich el Oeak a Cheroll</em></td>
<td>Hereditary status and strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Omengerker ma Kerruul</em></td>
<td>Economy and trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kar ma Ukeruul</em></td>
<td>Medicine and therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Klalo ra Blai, Kebliil ma Beluu</em></td>
<td>Traditional items of a household, clan, and village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ongelaod</em></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Deleuill er a Beluu</em></td>
<td>Relationship between villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Llach er a Belau</em></td>
<td>Traditional laws and principles of Palau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cheldecheduch er a Kodall</em></td>
<td>Settlement of a deceased person’s estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of 2008.*

### Table 50. The Anthropology Research Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rechuodel</em>: Traditional culture and lifeways long ago in Palau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology and historic preservation in Palau: The Micronesian resources study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for the preservation of historic and cultural resources in Palau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of 2008.*

39 This listing does not include the annual survey reports.
Table 51. The Oral History Research Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No. of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rechuodel volume I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechuodel volume II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of 2008.

Table 52. Palau HPO Publication Series by Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication series</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>No. of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology research series</td>
<td>Palauan cultural issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palauan archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic preservation in Palau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral history research series</td>
<td>Palauan cultural issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional and customary practice series</td>
<td>Palauan cultural issues</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of April 2008.

The Palau HPO received fairly regular requests for class presentations and guided tours of historic sites. These were typically for students from elementary school through to college level (F. Carabit, Interview, 17 April 2008). However, this same educational service had been provided to government agencies and other organizations (provided for in 19 PNC § 131). Requested topics tended to be overviews of the Bureau of Arts and Culture/Palau Historic Preservation Office (BAC), along with different traditional aspects of Palau’s past—historical and cultural, tangible and intangible.

Interviewees noted that one of the office’s successes was its restored/rehabilitated sites program. Each year the BAC provides a grant for which states are encouraged to compete. Typically these have been traditional Palauan sites such as customarily constructed stone docks or traditional villages.

Another part of their public outreach is its annual symposium. The Palau Public Education Officer noted that they generally have over 80 attendees. Traditional leaders, state governments, and related industry agencies and organizations are invited to attend. Each year the symposium has a theme, invited speakers, panelists, and sometimes work groups to
Appendices

tackle issues important to the community. The symposiums further serve as opportunities for the BAC to provide information about the HPO, encourage historic preservation activities, and listen to community priorities of interest.
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Appendix E: Project Information Statement

INFORMATION STATEMENT

Research Project  | Indigenous Values and Historic Preservation Management

The Project

This project is being carried out on three island groups—Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau, which are each independent homeland. Chamorro, Carolinian, and Palauan culture & history are important to showcase & preserve.

This project wants to find out more about the different ways that indigenous values may exist in Micronesian historic preservation activities & efforts. It proposes to listen & give voice to local expertise from traditional & elected leaders/knowledge-holders and other specialists about island history, culture, philosophy, economic development, tourism, cultural maintenance, and historic preservation. It is also interested in how the historic preservation offices are set up, function, and deal with other entities and the types of funding & legislation that have been developed to help them meet their goals.

Participation in the research is voluntary. Participants are encouraged to only discuss what they feel comfortable talking about and may stop their participation in the research at any point without penalty. Interviews are estimated to take an hour but may run longer, especially if the participant has special views he or she wants to share. Observation & participation in historic preservation workplaces & events will be limited to the permission given by the heads of the institutions. Participants have full right to decline being photographed or having their interview voice recorded. Findings will be published and placed in a thesis. Copies of the thesis will be donated to the local Historic Preservation Office and island's main library.

The Researcher

I grew up and still live in Guam, where I have taught the History of Guam for eight years at high schools and for four years at the University of Guam. I also served as a Board Member for the Guam Historic Review Board and the Guam Preservation Trust Board for seven years.

It was while working alongside the other board members, trying to balance our community's many issues & concerns, that I saw this topic of ensuring that Micronesian indigenous communities remain a strong presence in historic preservation activities & efforts as an important one to explore. I want to help us in historic preservation share our success stories with each other.

Thank you for your time & interest!

Researchers:
Kelly G. Marsh
Micronesian Studies, MA
Post-graduate Student
Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (02) 6051 6027
Fax: (02) 6051 9897
marsh@cssu.edu.au

Supervisors:
Dr Dirk HR Spennemann
Associate Professor of Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (02) 6051 9697
Fax: (02) 6051 9697
dspennemann@cssu.edu.au

Dr Anne Perez Hattori
Associate Professor of History
College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences
University of Guam
History Division
University Station
Mangilao Guam 96923
Ph: (671) 735 3526
Fax: (671) 735 7350
ahattori@uoeg.edu

NOTE: Charles Sturt University's Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this project. If you have any concerns or reservations about the ethical conduct of this project, you may contact the committee through the executive officer.

The Executive Officer
Ethics in Human Research Committee
Academic Secretariat
Charles Sturt University
Private Mail Bag 20
Bathurst NSW 2795
Ph: (02) 6335 4029
Fax: (02) 6335 4194

Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully and you will be informed of the outcome.
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Appendix F: Institutional Consent Form

INSTITUTION CONSENT FORM

Research Project | Indigenous Values and Historic Preservation Management

Name of Institution: ___________________________________________________________

Name & title of head of Institution: _____________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>initial to Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree to let the researcher interview staff that are under my authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the staff are free to stop the interview at any point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to let the researcher spend time at the institution &amp; with its staff in order to observe and participate in our work &amp; events. I retain the right to withdraw or alter such permission at any time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to let the researcher take pictures of our work &amp; events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the research has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research &amp; received satisfactory answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I permit the researcher to identify me &amp; show appropriate acknowledgement of my contributions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My personal details are to be kept confidential. My name or any other identifying information should NOT be used or published.

Charles Sturt University’s Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this study. I understand that if I have any complaints or concerns about this research I can contact:

Executive Officer
Ethics in Human Research Committee
The Grange, Charles Sturt University
Bathurst NSW 2795
Phone: (61) (2) 6338 4628
Fax: (61) (2) 6338 4194

I agree to participate in the above mentioned research project.

Signature ___________________________ Date __________

Researcher:
Kelly G. Marsh
(Micronesian Studies, MA)
Postgraduate Student
Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 788
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (61) (2) 6051 9927
Fax: (61) (2) 6051 9995
kmash@csu.edu.au

Supervisors:
Dr Dirk HR Spennemann
Associate Professor of Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 788
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (61) (2) 6051 9847
Fax: (61) (2) 6051 9897
dspennemann@csu.edu.au

Dr Anne Perez Hattori
Associate Professor of History
College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences
University of Guam
History Division
University Station
Mangilao Guam 96923
Ph: (1) (671) 735 2818
Fax (1) (671) 734 7930
ahattori@uog.edu

263
Appendices

Appendix G: Interviewee Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Project</th>
<th>Indigenous Values and Historic Preservation Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Initial to Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree to let the researcher interview me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can stop the interview at any point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the research has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research &amp; received satisfactory answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to have my interview voice recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to be photographed in my professional environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I permit the researcher to identify me &amp; show appropriate acknowledgement of my contributions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My personal details are to be kept confidential. My name or any other identifying information should NOT be used or published.

Charles Sturt University's Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this study.
I understand that if I have any complaints or concerns about this research I can contact:

Executive Officer
Ethics in Human Research Committee
The Grange, Charles Sturt University
Bathurst NSW 2795
Phone: (01) (2) 6338 4028
Fax: (01) (2) 6338 4184

I agree to participate in the above mentioned research project.

Signature

Date

Researchers:

Kelly G. Marsh
(Micronesian Studies, MA)
Postgraduate Student
Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (61) (2) 6051 9827
Fax: (61) (2) 6051 8897
kmash@csu.edu.au

Supervisors:

Dr Dirk H. Spennemann
Associate Professor of Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (61) (2) 6051 0047
Fax: (61) (2) 6051 8897
dspennemann@csu.edu.au

Dr Anne Perez-Hattori
Associate Professor of History
College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences
University of Guam
History Division
Mangilao Guam 96923
Ph: (1) (671) 735 2818
Fax: (1) (671) 734 7930
ahattori@guam.edu
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Appendix H: Transcription Guide

TRANSCRIPTION GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code/Informal Responses</th>
<th>Used to indicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Kelly Marsh’s interview discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent initials</td>
<td>Respondent interview discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[..]</td>
<td>Unintelligible discussion (word or phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tense word or phrase here?)</td>
<td>Words or phrases transcriber is unsure of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information other than oral discussion, descriptive terms, finishing incomplete sentences is placed here between parentheses)</td>
<td>Information other than oral discussion—such as, if one of our cell phones rings, or one of us pursed the interview to speak to someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pause)</td>
<td>Noticeable pauses or sighs indicating meaningful hesitation or perhaps reluctance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(laugh)</td>
<td>Laughter; other utterances such as coughing, sneezing, etc. are not indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note:)</td>
<td>Interviewer’s thought regarding some point in the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” “” Capitalized word follows a comma</td>
<td>Speaking as if they are talking to someone else; as some one else or a group of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (single dash) An interrupted or incomplete word; example, inter-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (single dash between letters) something being spelled out; example, s-p-e-l-l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initialized words</td>
<td>Emphasized word, idea, phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initialized words</td>
<td>Non-English words spoken (e.g., Chamorro, Carolinian, Palwan, Latte, French, or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn Ah</td>
<td>Sound uttered for active listening and/or the recognition of a point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn, hmm Uh, umm Huh, ah Yesh</td>
<td>Sound uttered for agreement, active listening and/or the recognition of a point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh</td>
<td>Sound uttered for surprise and/or the recognition of a point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cause, gonna, wanna, I’ll, we’ll, it’ll and like conjunctions used conversationally</td>
<td>Spoken informal forms of Because, Going, Want to, I will, It will and so forth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE

Hafa Maa ya Nirew/Ali,

Thank you again for your time. I appreciated and enjoyed meeting you very much and got to enjoy our interviews a second time as well when I transcribed them and typed them out.

I have enclosed a copy of your consent form and two copies of your transcript(s). One transcript is labelled ‘Personal Copy,’ please keep this and the consent form for yourself. The second transcript is labelled ‘Return Copy,’ please present this for return by DATE. Transcripts not presented by that date will be considered accepted as they are by you and will be given the same status as a signed and returned transcript.

The transcript labelled ‘Return Copy’ is for you to review. It is only right to provide you the opportunity to review your interview. I have included the transcript format guidelines that I used (see next page).

- Interview information will mostly provide context and knowledge, only occasionally will I make direct quotes. Information will only be quoted from those who have given me permission to quote them and only for the information people have given me permission to quote them on. If there is information that you prefer not to be directly quoted or cited for, please underline it and present the underlined transcript to me.
- In reviewing the transcript, please do not worry about grammar. Speaking is a casual form of communication, so there is no need to correct grammar.
- Write right on the transcript. I have double spaced it to provide you some space. Because I want to make sure to capture your thoughts accurately, please make your responses as legible as possible.
- Please feel free to explain your response further, add new information, or correct a response if you decide that something else is more accurate. If the double spacing is not enough room for you, attach a paper and refer to the line number (line numbers are on the left-hand side of the paper). For example, if you need a separate sheet of paper, on it write:
  Line 63: And write your thought after the line number.
- It is impossible to get away from a small margin of error in transcripts. Please feel free to correct the transcript if you feel I have typed in your saying, ‘Can’ instead of ‘Can’t’ or some other mis-hearing of what it was you meant.

Thank you for your generous help. I learned so much from each of you and I hope to see you again soon. My contact information is below, I would be more than happy to explain anything further, keep you updated, or just hear a “hello” from you.

With regards,

Kelly G Marshall
Cultural Heritage Management
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Ph: (61) (2) 6051 8827
Fax: (61) (2) 6051 9897
kmmarshall@csu.edu.au
Appendix J: Typical Guiding Interview Questions

Typically, around 10 questions from, or similar to, these choices below would be asked:

- Please provide your name and background (years working in office, training, traditional or formal education, etc.)
- Please describe your job/duties
- What are the HPO’s greatest strengths and challenges?
- Are there opportunities or challenges in dealing with the US federal government, especially the NPS?
- What are the ways that the NPS helps or prevents the HPO from meeting its office goals?
- Are there any issues that come up in serving [island entity] communities (family, village or other different groups)?
- How much does serving a mixed population ([specific Indigenous group] and non-[specific Indigenous group]) come into consideration?
- Is the HPO affected by:
  - its political relationship with the US or other countries;
  - its current economic situation;
  - tourism;
  - development?
- What HPO projects do you feel best serve the [island entity/island Indigenous group/s] community/ies?
- What benefit do you think exists by having [specific Indigenous group/s] in the HPO office?
- What types of displays and presentations does the HPO offer?
- Do you think working in the office has made a difference for you?
- In what ways do you think the office could improve/do more?
- How did the [island entity] HPO board composition come about?
- In what ways do you think archaeology has made a difference in [specific Indigenous group]’s understanding of itself?
- What do you see in the HPO that best represents Indigenous values?
- What do you think the [island entity/island Indigenous group/s] community/ies want most out of the HPO?
- How do you think the office has best served Indigenous communities?
- If the slate were clean, is there an ideal way you can envision setting up a cultural heritage management organization?
- What do you think are [island entity/island Indigenous group/s]’s most important sites and why? Do you know of sites in [island entity] important to other ethnicities?
- What Indigenous values do you think are present in the HPO processes?
- Are there challenges and opportunities in promoting the presence of Indigenous values when working with the NPS?
- Are there things that you feel are Western in working with what the NPS wants versus the way [specific Indigenous group/s] would do it?

Questions were tailored per interviewee. These questions are more typical for HPO staff and experts familiar with HPO work. Community members were asked somewhat different questions relating to what they knew of and desired from historic preservation offices.
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- What are the ways you have tried to promote Indigenous values as HPO staff?
- What kind of Indigenous resource management has existed over the years?
- What do you think have been the driving forces behind nominations?
- Is there anything that you would like to add or feel that I did not cover?
### Appendix K: Possible Registration Form Incorporating Indigenous Values for Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural resource name</th>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Spiritual/Sacred</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Attributed to god/demi-god/s</th>
<th>Attributed to supernatural beings/s</th>
<th>Attributed to the power of nature</th>
<th>Associated with lyrics, folklores, and traditions</th>
<th>Significant in</th>
<th>Place of power</th>
<th>Ancient/Customary practice</th>
<th>Daily Living</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Provides an identity</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Architecture/Engineering</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture/Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

**Notes:**

a. It explains why something is the way it is—for example, why people today know turtle egg-laying cycles.

b. It provides a name or a status for something or someone.

c. It symbolizes something as in forging or strengthening a relationship, for example, a particular stone given from one village to another.

d. As in where people traditionally sourced particular kinds of fish, clay, basalt, and so forth. In modern times there may be two values here: 1. The value ancients held toward its helping fulfill daily or ceremonial/ritual needs; 2. The revered or sacred value it potentially has today as these were places where we know ancients actively used the resource/area (e.g., ancestors tread there) hence, a potential spirit/spiritual feeling of ancestral presence and the values of,
   a) being more connected to their ancestors through the understanding of the existence of this place and,
   b) being more connected to their ancestors through knowing about the practices of their daily lives.

---

41 This is not to say that these attributes could not be potentially ascribed in a standard form but that their visible presence in the form would encourage nominations of resources which hold these types of attributes. See Apple (1972, pp. 9-10) for discussion regarding possible ranking criteria and other discussion that could be incorporated into nomination forms.
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1 The spelling of the name and language of the Indigenous people of the island as “Chamorro” has a lengthy history and was, for a period of time, the official government of Guam spelling. However, over the years, some have considered spellings such as Chamoru and CHamoru to be more correct according to the Chamorro standard orthography (G. E. Taitano, “Chamorro orthography,” “Chamorro vs. Chamoru”). This study follows the common practice of using the spelling Chamorro while writing in English and CHamoru when writing in the vernacular of the Chamorro people which is considered by some an acceptable compromise to the controversial issue (G. E. Taitano, “Chamorro vs. Chamoru”).

2 The US Department of the Interior has provided the guideline that, “Under Federal law U.S. insular areas are divided into two categories: incorporated insular areas which use ‘Territory’ with a capital ‘T’ and unincorporated insular areas which use ‘territory’ with a lower-case ‘t’” (Office of Insular Affairs, “Definitions,” “Palmyra Island”).

3 CNMI is perhaps the more common shorthand reference to the island entity. However, for purposes in this research, NMI will be used to make the reference more in line with the other two area names used, which do not refer to their political statuses.

4 Yap State within the island nation of the FSM also partly exists within western Micronesia. Although it was examined during this study to some degree, it is part of a nation that largely exists in central and eastern Micronesia and was, for that reason and others (as discussed in Appendix A), not an integral part of this study.

5 See also such discussion in Michael Lujan Bevacqua (2010).

6 See endnote above concerning the spelling of the name of the Chamorro/CHamoru People and language.

7 These conclusions follow the line of reasoning presented by Marsella et al. (2005) who provide that: Human health and well-being are not simply medical problems to be solved by physicians and health services. Rather, they are closely tied to sociocultural and political processes. We cannot have health and well-being where there is cultural destruction, because this breeds confusion and conflict. We cannot have health and well-being where there is oppression, because this breeds anger and resentment. We cannot have health and well-being where there is powerlessness, because this breeds only helplessness and despair. We cannot have health and well-being where there is poverty, because this breeds only hopelessness. We cannot have health and well-being where there is racism, prejudice, and sexism, because this restrains opportunity and limits choice (Marsella, 1997). (p. 274)

8 This study will use the term “US” as it is a more precise descriptor than the term “American” since there are many Indigenous peoples and other nations located in North, Central, and South America. This also falls in line with writing style guides such as the 2009 version of the American Anthropological Association.

9 The latter of which was shared by reliable sources.

10 Hau’ofa (1993) has noted that, “Europeans did not invent belittlement. In many societies it was part and parcel of indigenous cultures” (p. 3).

11 Liebowitz (1989, p. 5) provides some discussion regarding what types of perceptions exist between the US federal government officials and island actors as well as the negative consequences that can result.
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12 Similarly, Evans et al. (2001) note that NPS “as the nation’s lead agency for defining cultural resources preservation standards and policies, has a great deal of influence on the development of the cultural landscape concept, and its application to land management practices.” (p. 53)

13 Some authors have argued that Indigenous heritage inherently has more intrinsic value:
   As a start, we should consider the thesis that indigenous Micronesian sites—Nan Madol, the latte stones [house foundation columns], the megaliths and the petroglyphs, the villages waiting to be unearthed—have far more intrinsic value to the world, and not only to Micronesians, than do the run-of-the-mill structures left by the colonial landlords and more certainly than the decaying detritus of war. (Maddex, 1975, p. 9)

14 Historic preservation expert Thomas F. King (2002) also brings up numerous questions regarding Indigenous Peoples and their roles in the management of heritage significant to them within US historic preservation. He notes “there is still a great deal of uncertainty” about these issues with answers to the types of questions he raises “rang[ing] all over the map” (pp. 101-102).

15 A textbook entitled, “Island ecology and resource management” (Furey, 2006) also provides a description of NMI historic preservation processes and introduces the reader to the commonwealth’s HPO (pp. 625-637).

16 Other references worth noting are those by David Hanlon (2009a; 2008). “Nan Madol: A Micronesian example of heritage and history as innovation” was the title for papers presented at the ESfO Verona 2008 Session 1, Cultural Heritage and Political Innovation: Relations of the State and Alternative Social Movements in Oceania, as well as at the Pacific Alternatives: Cultural Heritage and Political Innovation in Oceania conference held in the Hawaii Imin International Conference Center, East-West Center, Honolulu in 2009. At the latter conference, a paper regarding Palau historic preservation efforts and issues was presented by Stephen Wickler (2009). However, these papers were not accessible during the course of this research. A project researcher stated in 2011 that progress was being made toward publishing this material as a book.

17 For example, Falgout et al. (2008) describe how Micronesians perceive the WW II material left behind in their homelands (pp. 32-33). For other Pacific perspectives, see also White (1996). Additional sources that discuss local and other perspectives and efforts include Spennemann, 1992a; 1998; Look & Spennemann, 1994a; 1994b; Spennemann & Look, 1993; Spennemann et al., 2001).

18 In this article, the author goes on to develop a case wherein non-Indigenous heritage can also be considered heritage under threat.

19 Another early piece entitled, “Guam historical monuments,” was written by Vicente L. G. Perez (n.d.).

20 Another former Guam HPO staff member, Ricarda P. Cepeda (2002), wrote “Disaster mitigation and recovery planning for historic buildings: Guam as a case study.”

21 Olsudong wrote annual archaeological surveys for the Republic of Palau and presented papers at gatherings and published other work from time to time. Some of these other publications are: “Oral traditions and archaeology in Micronesia: An attempt to study past ideology in a built environment” (2002); “Sustainable development in the Pacific Islands: From ideas to action—Brief summary of archaeology of Palau” (1998). She also published work with others, such as, “A chunk of change: Tourism, economics, and archaeology” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2001).

22 For discussions regarding the nature of such situations, including conducting research, see references such as Linda Tuhuiwai Smith (1999, p. 5) and Vicente Diaz and J. Kehaulani Kauanui (2001, p. 324). See also Ross et al. (2011) who discuss that Western science, such as archaeology, “does not, and cannot, operate outside a sociopolitical framework, especially when the past of Indigenous others is the focus of research.” (pp. 40-43)
Before entering the field, the research proposal received several reviews. Select members of the historic preservation communities under study reviewed the proposed research topic. The formal research proposal was evaluated by the Ethics in Human Research Committee of Charles Sturt University (Protocol No. 2006/314; see p. xiv), which reviews all research methodologies for the aspects of the study in which human participants are to be involved, such as in conducting interviews. Additionally, an application to conduct research in the country was sent to Palau and approved months before entry.

In this regard, Glenn Petersen aptly states, “most practitioners still consider it their job to help their subjects to speak, not speak for them. I would qualify this: my intention is not to help Micronesian to speak—they tend to be as articulate as any other people—but to try to promulgate what they say to those not likely otherwise to hear them” (Petersen, 2005, p. 317).

Obtaining community input regarding their goals for research regarding historic preservation was especially important. This was so, not only to understand the community needs and desires at hand, but because for some within the Pacific the research process, including its design and goals, has been disconcerting. Specifically for Micronesia, this researcher has heard for years that Islander communities often feel like they have given much to research efforts but at best have received very little in return, or, at worst have in fact been negatively impacted by the research (e.g., Marsh-Kautz et al., 2003, p. 82; D. R. Smith, 1978, pp. 4-5). In other places in the Pacific, some have more starkly stated that, “research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 1).

Petersen specifically referred to “ethnographic competence.” This concept is expanded here as potentially applicable to all researchers conducting studies within or regarding Micronesia.

Studies utilizing these approaches often involve the examination of power between island entities and other bodies. This is apropos given that Guam, the NMI, and Palau have lengthy histories of colonization, are either territories or a new independent nation, and currently receive their historic preservation funding from various regional, national, and international bodies. Additionally, Micronesian societies have a range of power relationships within their communities (Petersen, 2009, p. 200).

Certain literature was identified as important preparatory reading in readying for field research in Micronesia: Kesolei (1977), Kottak (1999), McLean (1983), Participants 1989 Women in Research Methodology Workshop UOG (1992a; 1992b), D. R. Smith (1978; 1990), L. T. Smith (1999), and Workman (1993). Further, recognized experts were identified in the areas under study for guidance in how to best approach research in each island state. On Guam, consultation occurred with someone who had held a position within the island government system for decades and was experienced in interacting with local government agencies as well as Guam’s Indigenous Chamorro and ethnically diverse community members. In the NMI, guidance was sought from a long-recognized Carolinian cultural expert recommended by the NMI Humanities Council and others in the community. In Palau, research approach and appropriate Palauan interview protocol was discussed with three people who had over 16 years of combined expertise in those fields. Previous training, cultural guidance, and research field experiences in Micronesia further guided the process.

Though there are extremely capable experts in the islands, these resources can be small in number in relation to various heavy demands that the islands under study are facing. Each expert often serves on several committees and boards and is constantly sought for their expertise in addition to holding very demanding full-time jobs. See some similar discussion in A. Smith (2007).

Laws related to historic preservation were gathered at various stages of the project. Each HPO under study does make collections of relevant legal documents available to the public via website or handout. However, it was more difficult to sort out certain interpretations of the actual procedural framework by which these offices operate than first envisaged owing to the mixture of statutes, executive orders, office guidelines, and pending legislation produced over the years. Communication with HPOs after fieldwork and other factors impeded gathering a
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A comprehensive set of all relevant statutes. Island statistics were gathered from each island’s government tourist authority or bureau, other government offices, statistical yearbooks, state of the nation or territory addresses, and various island government websites.

31 Five interviews were conducted from 19 June to 3 July owing to availability of interviewees and the researcher’s recovery from injury earlier in the year.

32 The researcher was asked by the former Director of the Palau HPO to serve in a full-time capacity as their Cultural Anthropologist/Ethnographer. Owing to the unexpected passing of the only other “professional” staff member (NPS terminology) in the office and what turned into a lengthy replacement process of that position, this became a four-year experience.

33 For some freely associated states in Micronesia, “proposals for anthropological research must now be reviewed and approved by the Micronesian governments themselves” (Falgout, 1995, final paragraph; Kiste & Falgout, 1999, p. 47).

34 Similar sentiments seem to occur elsewhere in Micronesia as well (e.g., Falgout, 1995).

35 My father first traveled to Guam in 1961 to live with his older brother and sister-in-law for a couple of years while attending the Territorial College of Guam. My father and mother returned to the island in 1967 with myself in tow.

36 This review board oversees both the GHPO (also known as the Historic Resources Division of Guam’s Department of Parks and Recreation) as well as the Guam Preservation Trust (GPT).

37 An online encyclopedia of the history of Guam and culture(s) of its peoples.

38 In addition to staying on Guam for many years, my father’s older brother and sister-in-law lived in Palau for a time adopting a son while there. My cousin was adopted as a means to broaden his family’s network and relations. After growing up in the mainland US, my cousin returned to Palau and resides there now with his family. I also have several nephews and nieces living in Saipan who are the children of my former brother-in-law.

39 Smith was speaking of anthropologists as researchers. This thesis expands that consideration to all researchers.

40 Voyaging today consists of a range of options from traditional canoes to speedboats.

41 Just as there has been debate as to whether the region of Micronesia exists culturally or otherwise (see Appendix A), it should be noted here that the recognition of the archipelagos as groupings and their names can be more recent constructs and may be situated very differently within the epistemologies of the different Islanders. They are offered here to provide the reader geographical orientation.

42 See above endnote for discussion of the spelling of unincorporated insular areas with a lower-case “t” (Office of Insular Affairs, “Palmyra Atoll”).

43 Peoples of Carolinian descent who settled into what politically became the Republic of Palau’s SWI states of Sonsorol and Hatohobei, also known as Dongosaro and Tobi, respectively (Hosei, 1991, p. 4), are often generally referred to as “Southwest Islanders” (Nero, “Culture of Palau”). Fana, Bul (Pulo Anna), Merrir, and Helen Reef (Hotsarihie) also comprise these SWI.


45 Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding off of figures. Chamorro and Carolinian population counts in the “Two or more races or ethnic groups” category were added to the Chamorro and Carolinian total counts. The NMI population percentages are likely quite different than those reported in the US 2000 Census owing to US federalization of immigration laws there. However, official updated figures were not available.
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47 As noted by Farrell (1991),

The Caroline Islands stretch from the Palau group to Kosrae. They were given the collective name Caroline Islands by Spanish explorers. In 1686 Francisco Lazcano discovered an island that he called La Carolina in honor of King Carlos II of Spain. When more islands in the region were discovered at later dates, they were given the collective name Islas de Carolina. The people of those islands came to be called Carolinians. (p. 191)

48 Islanders in the central Carolines are said to credit the creation of their island worlds to Ligoububfanu, a woman married to Anulap who “dwelled in the heavens” (B. Flood et al., 2002, pp. 98-99). Contemporarily many Islanders in the areas under study have mixed thoughts as to how their ancestors interpreted these explanations—as literal accounts, mythohistory (a term borrowed from Petersen, 1992, p. 206), or as metaphorical explanations. However these creation narratives are interpreted, they convey important societal values and prescripts (Denoon, 1997, p. 37; for examples, see Hattori, “Puntan and Fu’una,” Smith 1990, pp. 13-14).

49 See earlier endnote for discussion regarding the spelling and usage of the term Chamorro.

50 As spelled in the Carolinian-English Dictionary: Trial Version CD (CARLA Project, 2006) provided during the fieldwork visit to the NMI in 2007 by the then Executive Director of the Chamorro Carolinian Language Policy Commission. The dictionary defines the term as, “people of the central Caroline Islands; people of the reef.” It is also sometimes spelled Re-Pagılıwosch, or Rafalawasch (e.g., as found in W. Flood, 2002, p. 51), or other variations thereof. William Flood (2002) refers to the two main groups of peoples from the Caroline Islands who first came to Saipan as either “Rapagoor,” “people from outside the reef,” who now largely reside in the north of Saipan and are locally known as “the northerners,” and a second group referred to as “Rafalawasch,” “people from the lagoon” who are considered “the southerners” of the Saipan Carolinians (p. 51).

51 The states of Sonsorol and Hatohobei did not have official orthographies during this study. The vernacular spellings used here were approved by the governors of those states in 2011 for another project.

52 The pre-European contact portion of this discussion is limited to Chamorros and Palauans and Palauan Southwest Islanders who colonized and settled these islands during this time period. Widely understood Carolinian migration to the NMI occurred after sustained European contact (OHP, 2011, p. 2). This does not preclude thought that Carolinians travelled to, traded with, and perhaps inter-married with Chamorro ancestors or had other connections to the Mariana Islands.

53 Dates were presented in “BC” and “AD” verses “BP” for two key reasons. First, the HPOs under study used this format for presenting dates to the public. Second, a long-time, in-the-field researcher assessed that presenting dates in this format resonated best with the island community members in strong contrast to the usage of “BP.” Both of these reasons feed into this study’s aim to introduce the reader to the Micronesian HPOs and their work as well as to present the information in this study in an accessible and meaningful manner to members of the communities under study.

54 See Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999, pp. 1-2) for discussion of how Indigenous Pacific Peoples might frame their past through a different lens.

55 For some of this discussion, see Olopai and Flinn (2005, pp. 9-12), Alkire (1984), and Pacific Worlds website (http://www.pacificworlds.com). See also Hezel (1983, p. 106), who states that permission for the settlement was not received from Manila until after this date.

56 Some, such as one NMI community member spoken to during this study, note what are considered other creation points in the NMI, though the story of Puntan and Fu’una remains the same (Taitingfong & Marsh, “Fouha Bay”).
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57 The spellings for these states of Palau follow those provided in the Republic of Palau’s Constitution.

58 According to oral history and other evidence, the Peoples of Sonsorol and Hatohobei states in Palau voyaged from what are now outer islands in the state of Yap, FSM (Petersen, 2009, p. 31; Tibbetts, 2002, pp. 11-12).

59 The term “Palauan Southwest Islander” was developed for this study. It combines the concept that the Peoples of the SWI are, according to the Constitution of the Republic of Palau, Indigenous Palauans, together with the descriptor commonly used in Palau in reference to the Peoples of those Islands, “Southwest Islander.”

60 The time periods for Palau are taken from the archaeological literature as the Palau HPO was in the process of drafting their first “State”/National historic preservation plan. I was advised by the National Archaeologist who referred me to other work to gain an understanding of Palau’s pre-European contact eras. Those references note, “These ‘eras’ are archaeological labels used in organizing long time periods and have no inherent meaning in Palauan culture” (J. Liston, Pers. Comm., 14 May 2011; 18 Dec. 2008; Liston, 2009; Masse et al., 2006). Understandings of cultural sequences for Palau’s SWI were still in development.

The time periods for Guam were taken from the Historic Preservation Review booklet produced by the Guam HPO, the most current publication available at the time that this table was created in 2008 (HRD, 2006). See Hunter-Anderson and Butler (1995, pp. 26-27) for discussion and illustration of temporal units and alternate cultural sequences for Mariana Island PreContact timelines. The Guam HPO was in the process of modifying its historic contexts in October 2007, and was still doing so as of January 2012. However, it did issue updated historic contexts with timelines to be used in the interim (Belt Collins & Associates Ltd. 2007, p. A-1; “Proposed guidelines,” 13 Jan. 2012, p. 15). These categories are largely the same as those utilized here with some differences. Based on the recently circulated draft guidelines for conducting and reporting cultural resource surveys on Guam, the following working historic contexts and timelines are proposed:

Historic Contexts: (Before Common Era (BCE) Common Era (CE)
1500-1000 BCE, Early Pre-Latte
1000-500 BCE, Middle Pre-Latte
500 BCE-800 CE, Late Pre-Latte
500-800 BCE, Transitional
800-1100 CE, Early Latte Period
1100-1350 CE, Mid-Latte
1350-1521 CE, Late Latte Period
1521-1668 CE, Pre-Colonial European Trade Period
1668-1700 CE, Spanish Missionization/Chamorro Spanish Wars
1700-1898 CE, Spanish Colonial Period
1898-1941 CE, First American Colonial Period
1941-1944 CE, World War II/Japanese Military Occupation
1944-1950 CE, Post-World War II/Second American Colonial Period
1950-1970 CE, Organic Act/Guam Elected Governor Act/First Elected Governor

Within the NMI HPO’s 2011-2015 historic preservation plan, the time period for the Prehistoric Era was updated to “c.a. 2000 to AD 1668” (OHP, 2011, p. 20).

61 The New Palauan-English Dictionary definesolangch as a “sign; distinguishing mark; signal; indication; anything functioning to give directions (e.g., lighthouse); marker” (Josephs, 1990, p. 230).

62 For example, discussion of Palau and “mainland” Palauans (not including Palauan Islanders from the SWI), “Before the first major contact with foreigners” can be found in History of Palau: Heritage
of an Emerging Nation, which describes an interactive, and perhaps competitive, but essentially singular People culturally and linguistically (Rechebei & McPhetres, 1997, pp. 35-48).

Anthropologist Peter Black as cited in Tibbetts (2002, p. 10), has noted that due to the Peoples of Sonsorol and Tobi states living in close proximity for decades in Echang (the “ch” is a glottal stop) hamlet in the state of Koror, a hybrid “Echangese” language has developed.

Chamorros are formally recognized as the Indigenous People of Guam by the US federal government (e.g., USGAO, 1997, p. 19).

For Guam, Chamorros are defined in GCA Title 3 which establishes the Chamorro Registry as:

1. all inhabitants of the Island of Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the Island on that date and who were Spanish subjects; and
2. all persons born on the Island of Guam prior to 1800, and their descendants, who resided on Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the Island on that date, and their descendants; (i) descendant means a person who has proceeded by birth, such as a child or grandchild, to the remotest degree, from any Chamorro as defined above, and who is considered placed in a line of succession from such ancestor where such succession is by virtue of blood relations (“The Chamorro Registry, Guam Code Annotated Ch. 20;” emphasis in original).

Northern Marianas Descent is defined in Article XII of the NMI Constitution as, a person who is a citizen or national of the United States and who is of at least one-quarter Northern Marianas Chamorro or Northern Marianas Carolinian blood or a combination thereof or an adopted child of a person of Northern Marianas descent if adopted while under the age of eighteen years. For purposes of determining Northern Marianas descent, a person shall be considered to be a full-blooded Northern Marianas Chamorro or Northern Marianas Carolinian if that person was born or domiciled in the Northern Mariana Islands by 1950 and was a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands before the termination of the Trusteeship with respect to the Commonwealth.

A Palauan citizen according to Article III of the Constitution of the Republic of Palau hinges upon having at least one parent of “Palauan ancestry.” See Osorio (2001) for discussion of issues dealing with non-racially or non-ethnically based definitions of populations and modern self-identification within the US system.

This figure is extrapolated from J. H. Underwood’s statement that for Guam, “the total population identified as ‘native’ or ‘Chamorro’” was “99.5 per cent in 1901.” (p. 30)

This pluralization may be meant to refer to both regional and other linguistic differences within and between the languages spoken by mainland Palauans and Palauan Southwest Islanders.

Alternate versions of the spelling of his name exist. However, the preface to a biography on San Vitores states that, “The Blessed Diego Luis always wrote his patronymic as two words” (McDonough in Garcia, p. xiii).

History accounts, such as Rogers (1995), or discussions of historical and cultural issues, such as Underwood (n.d.), showcase that much of what is commonly glossed over as “Spanish” presence during the Spanish administration of the Mariana Islands were in fact individuals from places such as other European countries and locales including Sicily, the area that is now Mexico, and the Philippine Islands.

With the exception of Nauru, which was occupied by Australian forces, and which eventually became a Mandate of the League of Nations administered by Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

It should be noted here that Japanese settler numbers differed from island group to island group. For example, the Japanese population was far higher in the NMI, “especially during the earlier years,” as compared to Palau though higher in both areas as compared to other Micronesian

There have, however, been many efforts over the years to mend this divide. For example, during the period of research there were various annual Chamorro conferences and cultural and language-based events meant to bring together Guam and NMI Chamorros such as Konferensian Chamorro and Dinaña Minagof festivals.

The re-invasion of Guam was also different for the US soldiers. There, Islanders spoke to them in English and warmly offered them food and hospitality—even during sniper patrols in the jungle if the troops happened upon a Guam Chamorro farming or ranching family (Cespedes, n.d., pp. 25-26 & 39).


In fact, at one gathering during the period of study, this researcher heard a public speaker state that in response to such federalization the people of the NMI may have the right to ask the UN to place it into the listing of “Territories to Which the Declaration on Decolonization Continues to Apply.” This is not to imply, however, that this would or could be the case.

One of the side aspects of the increasing federalization of the NMI is the mainstreaming of immigration laws, which may result in a dramatic reduction of non-US/US-Greencard holding foreigners.

As such, or to create such impressions, Guam is referred to at times by names such as “America in Asia,” “Where America’s Day Begins,” and the “Chicago of the Pacific” (Bevacqua, 2010; “This is Guam,” ca 1947, p. 7) More recently with contemporary militarization of the Island, it has also been referred to as the “Tip of America’s Spear” (Bevacqua, 2010).


Michael Phillips (1996, p. 14) notes that less than one-third of Guam’s land is owned by Chamorros.


At the time of the study, national land was virtually non-existent, though in principle the national government had the ability to own land and the heritage upon it as well (19 PNC, Chp. 3, § 134).

As opposed to a higher proportion of Guam respondents who selected that it “Possibly” and “Probably” can.

For example, Parmentier (1987) has assessed for Palau that it “is not only one of the most studied island groups in the Pacific but it is also one of the best studied.” (p. xviii)

This is not to imply that their presence has not challenged Indigenous identity and expression at the same time. During the years of field study, members of various Micronesian cultural groups often communicated that they felt that much of the documentation was incorrect, unflattering, and harmful. This has been part of the reason that Micronesians are often wary of social science and other research being conducted in their islands and shared with the rest of the world without their explicit consent and review.

There are some references to the Governor of Guam holding the traditional title of Maga’låhi, though this is a departure from its more localized traditional usage (see Marsh, “Maga’låhi”). The lack of overt reference to traditional political systems causes its own host of issues as customary
cultural and societal ways do continue to exist in Guam and the NMI which are then often misinterpreted as, somehow or in some way, being incorrect ways of operating within a modern society.

87 Though less formally recognized, there is also strong government and community support for the continuance of female counterpart titleholder roles as well (Society of Historians, 2009).

88 Many of these same sorts of examples are said to have occurred in Palau as well.

89 A contrary example is provided by the short-lived German administration of the Mariana Islands (1899-1914), which regulated that the language of instruction in schools was to be Chamorro (and later also Carolinian), while German, the language of the colonial power, was taught as a second, and foreign language in the higher grades (Spennemann, 2007a, pp. 217 & 327).

90 More commonly on some islands than on others.

91 Chamorro, NMI Carolinian, Palauan, Sonsorolese, and Tobian, respectively. See prior endnotes for discussions regarding the spellings of some of these terms in the vernacular.

92 In contrast, it has been more recently assessed that Chamorro women, though they may have married non-Chamorros over the centuries, have been “cultural preservationists” to degrees, being responsible for teaching their children customary Chamorro cultural behavior (Soudor, 1992, pp. 58-61 & 150-151). Certainly Chamorros fit the “most frequently invoked and widely accepted” definition of “indigenous peoples” provided by UN Special Rapporteur Jose Martinez Cobo (see “Indigenous” in Appendix A).

However, the type of assessment noted by Underwood, though erroneous, still has currency among many, which triggers tensions between Chamorros and others.

93 This is not to imply that certain resources were never altered, damaged, or depleted.


99 Although there is now some signage promoting the Department as, “Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation,” Speaker of the Guam Legislature Judith T. Won Pat (Pers. Comm., 19 June 2011) confirmed that no legislation has been passed to officially change the name of the department.

100 Kiribati: According to an archaeologist working within the region, no HPO or office akin to an HPO existed there as of June 2008. Likewise, no legislation akin to US or Micronesian types of historic preservation legislation existed at the time, though it did contain a museum/cultural center. However, a country report for Kiribati stated,

The Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs (MISA) was the principal government agency responsible for cultural affairs of Kiribati, and aims to ensure that a favorable and healthy cultural environment was maintained for the preservation, protection, promotion and development of cultural diversity and to support the unique aspects of Kiribati traditional culture. (Ioane, 2010)

101 Nauru: This study was unable to gather firm data on Nauru’s situation. An archaeologist who was working in the region had not heard of work akin to formal historic preservation efforts being conducted there but that is not to say that historic preservation-like efforts do not exist. Nauru was reported to have a government Department of Culture and Tourism in a 2005 publication (Treloar & Hall, 2005a, p. 225).

102 Source: http://www.cnmihpo.com
According to the NPS, a resource study, or historic resource study, provides a historical overview of a park or region and identifies and evaluates a park’s [or region’s] cultural resources within historic contexts. A historic resource study employs both documentary research and field investigations to determine and describe the integrity, authenticity, associative values, and significance of resources in the park [or region]. It synthesizes all available cultural resource information from all disciplines in a narrative designed to serve manager, planners, interpreters, cultural resource specialists, and interested public, as a reference for the history of the region and the resources within a park [or region]. (NAPA, 2008, p. 35)

When the US Congress enacted legislation (US Pub. L. No. 99-658) that approved the Compact of Free Association between the US and the Republic of Palau, Section 104(b) of this bill directed the National Park Service to conduct ‘a comprehensive inventory and study of the most unique and significant natural, historical, cultural, and recreational resources of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.’ (Parker, 1994, p. v)

The US Congress “appropriated $750,000 from the Historic Preservation Fund to allow the National Park Service to undertake this study, which came to be referred to as the Micronesian Resources Study.” (Parker, 1994, p. v)

This section was established in 1984 when Moses N. Sam was the Division Chief of the Division of Cultural Affairs (Kihleng, 1996, p. 2), predecessor to today’s BAC.

Mid 2012, a statement was issued by the NPS that this annual requirement would be increased to two surveys a year.

Guam additionally had a local register while the NMI had not developed one.

In response to the changing socio-cultural and political landscape as a young nation and the announcement that the annual required number of surveys would be increased from one to two a year, this strategy may have to change to conducting smaller surveys in one or more states a year.

Correspondingly, a neighboring island nation, the FSM, also has a national HPO and four state offices. In Palau, the national government is the sole recipient of the HPF grant while in FSM, each of its five offices receives a portion of HPF funding (O’Neill & Spennemann, 2006).

Robert A. Underwood (n.d.) notes two dynamics related to the development of the Institute of Spanish-Chamorro culture. First (though he does not overtly connect this particular dynamic to the creation of the Institute), that for a time in Guam Chamorro history, upward mobility in Chamorro society could be achieved by linkage to Spanish lineage. Therefore, for at least some Chamorros, there was a certain prestige in association with Spanish ancestry and perhaps culture. And, second:

Frequent characterizations of Chamorro culture emphasize the Spanish connection as being dominant rather [than] the reformulation of earlier patterns and the Chamorro people are typically described as a Mestizo population. This perception is clearly evident in the island’s perception of its past. When the Guam legislature felt that Chamorro culture was in need of institutional support it created not the Chamorro Institute, but the Institute of Spanish-Chamorro culture. (p. 23)

This researcher’s experience however is that more contemporary advocate/identity-construction efforts largely look back to pre-Spanish influences.
Guam HPO guidelines stated that during earthmoving activities burials were to be avoided, minimally disturbed (including disturbance by research), or if exhumed, re-interned as close to their original burial site as possible. The guidelines also discussed places where ancient Chamorro burials were likely to have occurred.

The Na’ Nina’ Etunen Linahyan ni’ Mammaloffian, Connecting the Community to the Past: A Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan for Guam 2007-2011 (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, p. 18) provided an article on this topic titled, “Remembering our ancestors Memorias para i Manainata.” The article provides the HPO’s involvement in these events and notes the Guam law and executive order that the office followed. It also informs the public that, “Soon after the remains were discovered, the hotel developer allowed Chamorro cultural groups to perform a “Respetu i Manainata” [Respect our elders] ceremony. Chamorros and other Guam residents gathered to observe changes and blessings for the ancient remains.” A powerful image of the ceremony is also included.

As a community member of Guam, this researcher provided written testimony regarding the Bill.

GPT, however, was recodified in 2004 by Guam Pub. L. 27-89.

Informally shared by NMI HPO staff was that such guidelines were necessary owing to the Japanese efforts over the years to gather the remains of Japanese WW II personnel and local concern that Indigenous ancestral or other remains might inadvertently be gathered.

The terms “intangible heritage” and “intangible cultural property” are used.

However, in the 2011-2015 NMI preservation plan, the HPO is cited as the “Office of Historic Preservation.” It is unknown whether the reference represents an official governmental organizational change.

Both the NMI and Palau governments have placed their HPOs under community and cultural sectors while Guam’s HPO is placed with a parks and recreation department. However, this was not because Guam did not at one point consider aligning its HPO with other culture related agencies. On Guam, there is a Dipåttamenton i Kaohao Guinahan Chamorro, Department of Chamorro Affairs, meant to “assist in implementation of integrated programs for the preservation; development; and promotion of the Chamorro Heritage of the People of Guam” (DCA, 2000). There had been efforts on Guam to bring all government organizations with cultural mandates under the DCA in the early 2000s (see, Guam Pub. L. 25-69, Pub. L. 25-72, and Pub. L. 27-89). However, this was only realized in a limited fashion. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there was concern that not all such government organizations exclusively focused on Chamorro culture and that such movement might cause some entities, including Guam’s HPO, to violate federal funding guidelines for government programs meant to serve the larger community.

The Deputy SHPO left in 2010 however, and had not been replaced by 2012.

Sources: Guam HPO organization chart and NMI HPO personnel chart, each provided in 2007 and Palau HPO organization chart provided in 2008.

Although that member was anecdotally said to be a likely candidate for a title in time. In Palau, women and men have an equal number of titles. For each male title, there is a female counterpart title (Society of Historians, 2009; The Palau Society of Historians, 1997, p. 27).

However, this recognition was not officially in practice during the time of research.

Though the Palau HPO had also directly and indirectly begun receiving a certain amount of funding and other support for staff training, projects, and in-country workshops from other entities such as UNESCO, the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands, the Pacific Island Forum, and the Federal Republic of Germany. This is likely true for all the other Micronesian island nations in free association with the US. However, as domestic political entities, Guam and the NMI currently do not qualify to directly receive some of this type of regional and international funding or would need to do so through the US Department of State.
Islander epistemological and cosmological considerations are imperative aspects of exploring and understanding island issues. Such discussion, therefore, is essential in studies discussing a wide array of Pacific Islander topics. For example, key references used during this research that explore topics such as historiography, periodization, and time-reckoning from Indigenous Islander perspectives (Bevacqua, “Mona”; Cabrera & Tudela, 2006; Klee, 1976; Nero, 1987; Parmentier, 1987, pp. 4-19; A. J. Ramirez, 2002) were, in many ways, discussing Islander epistemological and/or cosmological issues. These ways of thinking about history and time are some of the concepts central to thinking about historic preservation in Micronesia.

Thomas F. King (2009a) similarly notes, individual staff members at each of the oversight agencies often sincerely want to prevail on the federal establishment to do right by the requirements of the heritage laws. But the organization of the oversight agencies, their leadership, and the political pressures that bear on them create institutional cultures that are averse to risk and prone to pettiness. (p. 92)

Discussed as Native American/tribal and non-tribal by Stapp and Burney (2002).

These follow the use of the terms within the HPOs under study.

These files at times also held other related documentation (e.g., pictures, updates, and notes from Guam HPO staff).

By June 2008, Guam’s HPO had in place a newly hired librarian. As of June and a later discussion in August 2008, she had made great progress in sorting the register and other files. She switched the filing system to a chronological one, from the first cultural resource in the inventory to the last (P. P. Lujan, Pers. Comm., 20 June 2008; 8-16 August 2008).

This was also the number of registered sites reported in the CNMI 2011-2015 preservation plan (OHP, 2011, pp. 16-17)

The Palau Registrar shared that state-level registers, or listings, do exist to varying degrees. However, no states were known to have a formal, functioning local-level register of historic places at the time of Phase II fieldwork. Palau’s Registrar mentioned at the time that most states follow what is on the national register since states are still young governments with much office infrastructure to develop.

These resources were registered during the TTPI period.

For Guam these were: WAPA (66-01-1091; site), Falcona Beach Site (66-02-0009; site), Umatac Outdoor Library (66-02-1662; object), Orote Historic Complex (66-03-1009; district), SMS Cormoran (3-1037; object), Mabini Prisoner of War Camp Site (66-03-1040; site), Ypao Beach Archaeological Site (66-04-0156; site), Torre Water Catchment (66-08-1135; structure), and Talagi Pictograph Cave (8-1965; site).

A project to provide NRHP nomination forms in PDF format online was ongoing during this study. However, owing to the sensitivity of certain NRHP sites, some nomination files may not be made accessible online. Therefore, there is no guarantee that pertinent data to this study will become more accessible via this format. Effort was made to track down some of the missing files online but as of mid-2012, the files were not yet available online.

In this case, Kaufman (2004b) was discussing such issues in the US and therefore specifically referred to “other Americans.”

Some of this may be due to the deferment or rejection of nominations to the NRHP.

Tinta was registered 27 years after the largely painful WW II occupation of the Island by enemy Japanese forces. The massacre was still very much in the mind of the community with Chamorros and other community members able to recollect their experiences—“living history” as Guam HPO’s Historian Toni Ramirez (Interview, 29 June 2007) referred to it. Perhaps this was the first registered site for two reasons. First, the war and such massacres were the most traumatic event
in their recent (living) history. Second, enough time had passed after the war for the people of Guam to come to terms with public discussion and recognition of some of the more painful events of the occupation.

142 The Pågat, Yigo NHRP nomination form is held in the Guam HPO files. This site became an extremely controversial part of the US military build-up slated for Guam. The US Navy had planned to develop a live firing range immediately adjacent to the ancient cultural site which contains, among other heritage, ancient Chamorro burials (GPT, ―Pågat;‖ Turner, 2012). In 2010, this same site was placed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation on their “11 Most Endangered [US] Historic Sites List” (NTHP, 2010). As noted by Marsh and Taitano (2011), despite assurances by US officials that public access to the site would be ensured, there continued to be an outcry by those concerned with keeping “Pågat open and free from what they feel are culturally insensitive and offensive impacts of a live firing range” (p. 178). In 2011, the government of Guam signed a Programmatic Agreement with the US Department of Defense approving the project in return for written guarantees for public access to the cultural site (Stars and Stripes, 9 March 2011). However, a lawsuit filed by the GPT, the NTHP, and the We Are Guahan advocacy group continued to be fought in federal court through much of 2011. In early 2012, an article in the NTHP Forum Bulletin announced that that the Navy “filed a declaration with the court indicating that it will conduct a two-year supplemental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and commit to full public participation in its decision-making process,” which was “precisely the outcome the advocates had asked for” (Turner, 2012). Turner’s conclusion was that it would be “unlikely that the Navy would ultimately choose the same location for weapons training after the outcry” and further, that “the legal validity of the PA” as of writing is now considered “in flux” (Turner, 2012). In 2012, Guampedia provided an archaeological entry on the ancient Chamorro village of Pågat (see Craib, 2012).

143 This was the number published by the Guam HPO around the same time as the fieldwork for this study (Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007, p. 12).

144 Another NPS register is the NNL. Guam, with four natural landmarks on this register as of February 2007, was the only area under study that had sites on the NNL during fieldwork (see listings on http://www.nature.nps.gov). While this register is part of NPS, listing sites on this register is not tasked to HPOs in Micronesia. Therefore, it is not included in this study.

145 NHLs are part of the NRHP (NPS, 1997, p. i).

146 Many resources exist simultaneously on more than one register.


148 Many resources exist simultaneously on more than one register.

149 The NMI did not have a local register during fieldwork.

150 The Palau Registrar shared that state-level registers, or listings, do exist to varying degrees, though that data was not readily available and was not gathered.

151 The latter of which focused specifically on resource identification and survey.

152 In fact, during this study’s fieldwork period in 2007, a former NMI SHPO was in the process of reporting the existence of a WW II plane on the main island of Saipan that he did not think was in the HPO inventory.

153 For examples of this work in progress, see http://www.cnmihpo.com

154 The northern Mariana Islands were largely depopulated during the Spanish era reducción (defined by Rogers (1995) as Spain’s “conversion and collection of pagans into Christian congregations” (p. 347)). Those islands served more as outposts during much of that colonial administration.

155 As noted elsewhere, owing to some potential changes in granting requirements and the nation’s changing socio-cultural and political landscapes, this practice may have to change.
The Peleliu Battlefield was listed as a US NHL in 1985 though determining the landmark’s boundaries was still unresolved (see http://tps.cr.nps.gov). According to a NPS website, “The Peleliu War Society was given a $44,750 grant from the NPS American Battlefield Protection Program in FY 2006 to establish a boundary and develop a preservation plan for the Peleliu Battlefield National Historic Landmark” (<http://tps.cr.nps.gov>). In 2008, the Peleliu Battlefield was not part of the Palau national register although there was later consideration regarding the possibility of entering it into the PRHP or declaring all Palau sites in the US NRHP to automatically be in the PRHP.

These were the Yapese Stone Money Sites in Palau and Yap, and the Rock Islands Southern Lagoon (Palau National Commission for UNESCO, “Palau World Heritage Tentative List,” names have been updated according to those used in the nomination dossiers).

No contemporary site label for the latter site was found in the Registrar’s files. While the site label could likely be tracked down in the Survey and Inventory/Archaeology Section’s GIS system, the system was not operating for much of the period of this study.

See Force, 1977, pp. 13-18 for discussion regarding the early work of the Palau Historic Preservation Committee, including assessment of the first sites registered.

It was decided to compare nominations to national registers for two reasons. First, in Micronesian HPOs, there is an NPS requirement to nominate at least one site per year into a national register. Also, common to all three island entities is their participation in national registers. It was determined that it would be misleading to weigh Palau’s US NRHP register output because its last entry into that register was almost three decades ago, in 1985. One way of providing a more accurate evaluation of Palau’s registration activity, then, was to consider the Palau national register.


There are several possible reasons for these patterns. For both Guam and Palau, there has been a fair amount of attention given to surveying and identifying cultural resources. In Guam, there has been relatively intense archaeological work conducted there from at least the 1920s by US Commander Joseph C. Thompson USN (L. Thompson, 1932, p. 3), including hands on interest from the Bishop Museum and an active archaeology department at the UOG. Such efforts added up to a solid foundation of historical site data for use by Guam in developing their state plan, inventory, and nominations to the NRHP.

In contrast, during the 1970s, when the TTPI HPO servicing Palau and the NMI was created, the working staff of this office were inexperienced and lacked formal training in historic preservation though the NMI experienced some of the same early archaeological attention as Guam. In the late 1970s, an historic preservation expert was brought in to help the TTPI HPO with operations (King 2006, p. 507). However, some of this different background was offset for Palau, which later benefited from a fairly comprehensive Micronesian Resources Survey (Parker, 1994). Additionally, Palau may also have received more intensive research over the years as it is
considered more culturally intact by many researchers and thereby holds appeal as a research area.

Three other factors help explain the NMI’s level of NRHP activity, as noted by the NMI’s former Deputy Historic Preservation Officer Scott Russell (who had worked with the NMI HPO since TTPI times). First,

In the old days there was [value to putting resources on the national register] because...if you put something on the register, then you could apply for a separate pot of money that they [NPS] offered called...acquisition and development... The acquisition and development [funding] was to be used on buildings that were on the national register... And so, there was no longer any money to do anything, like we did that canoe from Polowat, back in ‘78, but that was because we had this other money. So, we put it on the national register. Why put something on the National Register? Why spend all that time putting together a nomination to submit it in and have it on a register when you can’t really do anything (S. Russell, Interview, 7 May 2007).

Second, in regards to the protection of historic and cultural resources offered by the US Historic Preservation Act, Section 106,

From a Section 106 standpoint, it doesn’t need to be on the register, it just needs to be eligible to be on the register. So, all you have to do is reach an agreement with the federal agency that you’re dealing with.” (S. Russell, Interview, 7 May 2007)

Third, as was noted by more than one interviewee, certain key personnel within the office and in high political offices appeared to have differing priorities as to what should be accomplished.

These positive findings for Guam and Palau’s national register are that much more stark, and for the NMI, that much more understandable, when one considers that US state offices have perhaps operated US historic preservation programs for quite a bit longer than the three island communities, nearly a full decade before, or 20% longer, than the areas under study.


165 The NMI HPO staff have been able to conduct at least one survey in the northern islands, however. In 1996 they carried out “a reconnaissance archaeological survey of several locations in the Northern Islands” (CNMI DHP, 1997b). More recently, owing to the potential US military build-up in the archipelago, the military sponsored archaeological surveys within the NMI, including the Northern Islands municipality prior to 2011. Limited ability to communicate with the NMI HPO staff meant that this study was unable to determine whether the historic and cultural properties documented during these surveys were included into the register.

166 Politically, the NMI is comprised of four municipalities—the individual islands of Rota and Saipan are each one, Tinian and Aguijan (Agiguan) constitute a third municipality, while the remaining 11 islands to the north of Saipan make up the Northern Islands Municipality. This analysis holds true if one examines the NMI registers according to these political divisions.

167 Each of these states has other distinctive history as well.

168 Though this was not the case during Palau’s early historic preservation history. During TTPI times, three of the six sites registered on the NRHP were located in Melekeok.

169 Examples of the latter are: B:BE-1:1, a natural formed cave called li er a lirur that was where the “monster” Meluadelchur “lived long ago” or B:IM-3:29, “a naturally sculpted rock like human head...called lechaderengel” (PRHP nomination forms).
170 See Chapter Two, for other discussion of these time categories. The time periods in brackets are those that are fairly conventionally used by the Palau HPO. However, they have not been formally reviewed or accepted as such by the Palau HPO as of mid-2012.

171 According to Guam HPO Historian, Toni Ramirez, contemporary Guam Chamorros use the terms “Tiempo Españót” (Time of the Spanish), “Tiempo Chapanes” (Time of the Japanese), “Tiempo Amerikånu” (Time of the Americans), and other similar labels for Guam Chamorro time periods when speaking in the Chamorro language of Guam (2002, p. 21; Ramirez’s spellings have been changed in an attempt to follow Guam’s official orthography adopted by the Chamorro Language Commission in 1983 (DCA, 2003, pp. 17 & 18)). Rameriz interprets the Chamorro perception regarding these administrative periods to be one of “tiempo,” “resident colonial government[s], temporary through time” (A. J. Ramirez, 2002, p. 21, emphasis added). See endnote above for other discussion regarding Guam periodization.

172 Within the NMI HPO’s 2011-2015 historic preservation plan, the time period for the Prehistoric Era was updated to “c.a. 2000 to AD 1668” (OHP, 2011, p. 20).

173 When speaking in their Indigenous language, mainland Palauans (as opposed to Palauan Southwest Islanders) use the phrases “Taem er a Sebangiol” (Spanish period, 1886-1898), “Taem er a Dois” (German period, 1898-1914), “Taem er a Siabal” (Japanese period, 1914-1945), “Taem er a Merikel” (American period, 1945-1994), and “Dokurits” (Independent [status/period], 1994-present). The latter is a “Japanese term for independent” (Pacificworlds.com, “Language”). The usage of these phrases was confirmed by a historic preservation specialist in the Palau BAC (S. Kloulubak, Pers. Comm., 6 Oct. 2008). One of her tasks is to translate material from the Palauan language to English and vice versa. There may be differences, however, in understandings as to the length of time these phrases refer to. The lengths of time were not tested or verified. They appear to largely correlate to beginnings of foreign administrative periods. It must be kept in mind, however, that Palauans may hold a very different way of thinking about time/periodization. Understanding this view is a rich area that will take time to figure out how it best applies to the work of the Palau HPO. For example, Karen Louise Nero (1987) has discussed in her dissertation, Palauan elders, in recounting a story, or history, do use linguistic markers to frame the story, to place it in a conceptual framework of understanding that we might roughly gloss as markers of time, or ‘eras.’ The listener thus knows the category of story and how it should be interpreted…The linguistic markers, Er a Ititiumd, Er a Rechuodel, Irechar, Elechang, Cherechar, can be roughly glossed as ‘The Mossy Past,’ ‘The Olden Times,’ ‘The Past,’ ‘Today,’ and ‘The Future.’ (p. 38)

Nero (1987) then cautions that, time must here be understood in the Western sense of ‘duration, continued existence’ (Concise Oxford Dictionary 1974:1357) rather than chronological sequence, for in Palauan the linguistically-related concept of sedimentation more closely evokes the image of the Palauan words. Time, a chronologically marked passage of time, is not the critical image of the Palauan ‘Eras.’ Instead what is evoked is the duration, continued existence, and nature of this existence. Palauan eras do not easily correspond with the three types of time identified by many anthropologists: timeless time, cyclic time, and linear time (Vansina 1985:128), for both the earliest era and the past/present are also incorporative—the key quality of cyclic time. (p. 38)

Further related discussion is found throughout Nero’s work.

174 The term “PreContact” was not used in the Guam historic preservation 2006 or 2007 publications (HRD 2006; Belt Collins Guam Ltd., 2007). However, it was the term discussed as perhaps being appropriate during a conversation with one of the office’s historic preservation experts in 2007.

175 Operation Sail was meant to be a flotilla of ships representing different regions of the US sailing together during its 1976 commemoration of 200 years of independence.
Endnotes

176 This pattern holds true whether the cultural resources are significant in just “One Time Period,” or whether a resource has significance in “Shared Time Periods,” meaning two or more time periods, such as with the _Waherak Maihar_ example.

177 The other being the more contemporary TTPI administrative period.

178 The time periods in brackets are those that are fairly conventionally used by the Palau HPO. However, they have not been formally reviewed or accepted as such by the Palau HPO as of mid-2012.

179 Calculated to the first year of fieldwork, 2007.

180 Smith (2007) cites her earlier work from 2006, also noting that increased attention to more contemporary or colonial history may be tied to “origins of present multicultural societies in the Pacific” and “[a]ppreciation of the historical and architectural significance of now rare nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings in the Pacific” (“Background”).

181 See some similar discussion in Apple (1972). Apple developed two precepts for his ranking of historic sites in Micronesia:

1. Historical significance to Micronesians because of Micronesian history and culture; that is, as if foreign occupations never occurred, and as if Micronesian history and culture had not been affected by foreign influences, events and persons which were of lasting importance to Micronesians.
2. Historical significance to Micronesians which acknowledge foreign influences, events and persons which were of lasting importance to Micronesians.” (p. 9)

He developed a third category, “Historical significance only to foreigners or of more importance to foreigners than to Micronesians” (p. 9) for which he proposed foreign governments would be invited to support _though not to staff_ (p. 18).

182 Inhabitance is used here to reflect the time in which Chamorros are currently known to have inhabited the Mariana Island archipelago through the dating of artifacts and remains. Older dates relating to the existence of Chamorro gods or demi-gods, or Chamorros themselves, obtained through oral history or archaeology, may extend back further.

183 Inhabitance is used here to reflect the time in which Chamorros and Carolinians are currently known to have inhabited the Mariana Island archipelago through the dating of artifacts and remains. Older dates relating to the existence of their gods or demi-gods, or Chamorros and Carolinians, obtained through oral history or archaeology, may extend back further.

184 The time periods in brackets are those that are fairly conventionally used by the Palau HPO. However, they have not been formally reviewed or accepted as such by the Palau HPO as of mid-2012.

185 This table does not take into consideration the categories of “Traditional” and “Historic” as there are currently no time periods ascribed to them. Inhabitance is used here to reflect the time in which Palauans or their demi-god predecessors are currently known to have inhabited the Palauan archipelago through the dating of artifacts and remains. Older dates relating to the existence of Palauan gods, Palauan demi-gods, or Palauans obtained through oral history or archaeology may extend back further.

186 Provided by the “National Register Bulletin Part A: How to complete the national register registration form” (Cultural Resources, 1997, p. 15):

- **District:** “possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.”
- **Site:** “is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself
possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.”

- Building: “is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. Building may also be used to refer to a historically and functionally related unit, such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn.”

- Structure: “the term ‘structure’ is used to distinguish from buildings those functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter [e.g. bridges, tunnels, etc.].”

- Object: “is used to distinguish from buildings and structures those constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment.”

187 It is important to note that there can be issues related to the concept of “Sites” such as that discussed by Tuggle (2009):

[Text from Tuggle (2009)...

188 Some registered resources in Palau are listed with more than one type. For example, a traditional village might have a significant feature; therefore, the presence of both is noted on the nomination form. In this manner, 168 resources had 178 noted type classifications.

189 These resources were selected based on appearing to fit in the category of being Palauan-made or valued as being meaningful within traditional Palauan cosmology.

190 “Klikm” was the spelling used in the nomination forms. However, according to the staff at the BAC who publish regularly in the Palauan language, “klidm” is currently considered the proper spelling (see, e.g., Palau HPO, 2011).

191 According to “Omesodel a Beluu er a Belau er a Irechar, Features of a typical Palau traditional village,” published for distribution by the BAC in 2011 (Palau HPO, 2011), odesongel is “both an action and descriptive word: to construct something using stones; something constructed of stones.” It is this researcher’s understanding, however, that in these particular cases, the term was used to refer specifically to odesongel er a blai, which is defined in that same publication as a “burial platform; platform associated with family/clan house.”

192 In this case it was a stone fortress.

193 Parmentier (1987) differentiates elements being “of” history and being “in” history.

194 In fact, knowledge can be considered so powerful that “[H]olders of traditional knowledge are sometimes viewed as having supernatural power” and it has been said in some parts of Micronesia that “if one transmits one’s knowledge to another inappropriately, the result may be death” (Parker, 1987, p. 18).

195 For example, Nero (1989, p. 145) cautions that ethnicity can determine the tone and type of responses a researcher may receive. This was kept in mind and was part of the reasoning for opting to work within an island HPO for a time as this researcher is from the US, had worked within historic preservation, and was an outsider—all features that could potentially keep interviewees from comfortably discussing strengths and challenges of their island historic preservation.
A certain amount of time was spent becoming familiar with relevant locally-based cultural heritage entities and activities—museums, cultural exhibits, visitor’s centers, cultural tradition-based youth programs, cultural festivals, fish and wildlife refuges, cultural tours, humanities councils, conferences, and Indigenous cultural dance competitions. One of the more memorable events attended was the Chamorro “Mimorias yan Respetu para I Manâina-ta, Tåotao I Gok-îia,” a memorial ceremony for those ancestors of Gokna Beach, which had been badly disturbed by illegal earthmoving activities (Catahay, 2007a; 2007b; Pacific Daily News, 2007).

A limited number of local cultural events and activities were also attended: rosaries; funerals; ngasech (Palauan first childbirth ceremonies); taro and breadfruit harvesting; the conferring of a traditional title and more. Time was spent with a traditional Carolinian masseuse-healer as well as a traditional Carolinian fishing workshop.

Heritage sites and re-internment sites were documented. Sacred sites and other powerful sites recognized and valued by Micronesians as discussed by Poyer (1992) were sought after permission was granted to do so. Visiting these landscapes and heritage sites was, in part, an attempt to understand the range of what exists or could exist in historic preservation inventories and registers first hand. Another aspect was to “feel” the essence of a place, experience the sites in their social and environmental settings, observe historic preservation or other signage, assess first hand the condition of the sites, examine the ways that locals and tourists interacted with the sites, and appreciate the sites themselves.

For example, for periods of time, non-Micronesians were historic preservation officers in Guam and the FSM (e.g., Parker, 1994, p. 3).

Sources: office organization/personnel charts and information gathered during surveys held in 2007 and 2008.

For the purposes of this portion of the research, Filipina/o is considered Pacific Islander though they are more commonly labeled as “Asian” in US systems.

This position had been vacated some months before the 2008 fieldwork so the ethnicity of the previous staff member was used especially as that staff member was listed on the organization chart provided by the office.

This understanding is based on this researcher’s observation of and participation in the Palau HPO’s efforts to hire an archaeologist between 2009 and 2011.

These have been Mike Fleming, Rita Olsudong, and Victoriano April for the islands under study while Dr Rufino Mauricio long served as the Chief Archaeologist for the FSM’s National HPO.

Professionals sign one-year contracts though the expectation is that they are hired to serve for a minimum of two years.

The actual phrases are: “Encoded within tales of the starvation, privation, and fear of the [WW II] years is an important contrast between the people of Palau, who continued to share food, to share their humanity…” (Nero, 1989, pp. 117 & 119) and “Real human beings know that they have obligations and responsibilities to others and that these are cemented in certain roles and functions” (Underwood, n.d., p. 10).

At the same time, having Indigenous personnel does not guarantee that the person will perform their work well, have appropriate cultural insights, or what are considered Indigenous perspectives. From observation and one person’s insight, there can be “shame if you were a local Indigenous native here and you hear a westerner or somebody not from here telling you about your history.”

Respected Carolinian community leader and cultural expert, Lino Olopai, also identified places in the NMI where powerful rites and ceremonies, or even the preparations for them, take place, such as a fîrourow reef where one fishes to prepare for a particular ceremony or where a tughumayûl (container that holds belongings of a loved one who has passed away) are burned at low tide so
that the ashes may wash away with the outgoing tide (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007; 21 May 2007).

The latter is so emotionally intense that those gathered, “will cry and they will wail, probably worse than when the deceased was at home during [the] wake” (L. M. Olopai, Interview, 2 June 2007).

In this researcher’s experience, this was information that was shared given the particular relationship between people, under certain circumstances. Information was not volunteered merely as a matter of fact. For example, this researcher only found out that a historic preservation expert, who had been a colleague/friend for numerous years, had close relatives working in other Micronesian HPOs just before setting off to travel to other offices to conduct this study. The expert very generously provided this information as a way to provide an understandable and reassuring identity for me since staff in those offices did not know me or my family or community reputation in Guam (the importance of such identification processes were shared by C. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 1 July 2010, and other fellow Palau HPO staff; for written discussion of the importance of such identification processes, see Iyechad, 2001, p. 77; D. R. Smith, 1978 similarly discusses the importance of being “adopted” in Palau so as to have a family/local/discernable identity).

For example, proper behavior, such as “being humble” and acting respectfully were stated as some the ways that could elicit support for a project (C. Emesiochel, Pers. Comm., 1 July 2010).

For example, this researcher attended UOG and attended classes with at least one Palau HPO staff member, and took classes from many of the same professors as other staff in various Micronesian HPOs.

“Created” is used here rather than “fictive” or “perceived” for kinship relationships that are not blood relations (see also, Hezel, 2001, p. 85). It seemed important to do so as the latter two terms, which are used by others, seem to imply a standard that blood relations are “real” and other relationships recognized by various societies are to some degree “not real.” Further, it has been this researcher’s experience in Micronesia that some created relationships can in essence be stronger than blood relationships because of activation of the relationship, meaning that interaction and exchange occur to a degree that gives the relationship strength. This also holds true that blood relationships that are active can be stronger than those that are not kept active (see similar types of discussion in Flinn, 1992, p. 70; Hezel, 2001, p. 85).

He did add, “Except land, and food equals land.”

In Guam, the Guam Historic Preservation Review Board is comprised of experts in the fields of archaeology, architecture, culture (traditional Chamorro society and culture), historic preservation, and history. It has purview over both the Guam HPO and the GPT. In the NMI, members with different types of expertise can serve on the advisory board and at times resided off-island.

Office promotion and usage of the Palauan language would have been compromised by using the English language as a primary work environment language. It should be noted that all Palauan staff were fluent in the mainland Palauan language, while working with SWI languages had some challenges.

For perhaps the first time in a Palau HPO publication entitled, “Visual documentation of the states of the Republic of Palau: Creating a sense of the social, cultural and infrastructural landscapes of Palau’s states,” provided text in the languages of the People of Sonsorol State and Hatohobei State (ramari Dongosaro and ramari Hatohobei, respectively).

Especially insightful to the issue of language loss from the Indigenous Islander perspective is Palomo’s (2004) statement, “‘Sadly…I find a dwindling number of people on island with whom I can use and practice my childhood language. In many instances I have found myself lost in a crowd because the conversations around me are in languages other than Chamorro’” (p. 18). This point becomes more poignant when one remembers that this is occurring within his homeland.
The anthropologist needed US Navy permission to return to the island as one needed a security clearance to enter Guam from 1938/1941 until 1962 (R. F. Rogers, 1995, pp. 157 & 237).

Though some authors have used the term “Chamorrocized,” this study follows the spelling in the DCA publication entitled, Chamorro Heritage. A Sense of Place – Guidelines, Procedures and Recommendations for Authenticating Chamorro Heritage (DCA, 2003, p. 107).

Similarly, Robert A. Underwood (1998) wrote:
I was once told by a person who taught Guam history for several decades that Chamorros are really just a bunch of Mexicans and Filipinos who have only a romantic link to the indigenous Chamorros. The view of Chamorros for decades [wa]s that they were in fact not the same people as the original inhabitants and that the neo-Chamorro people could be distinguished from the old by virtue of their civilized status, their willingness to wear clothes, their Christianity and the fully Hispanicized nature of their culture in everything from diet, to livelihood, to belief structure to language. (p. 6)

Regarding acts of validation, for example, anthropologist Laura Thompson’s work (1941; 1947) has been said to, [have] had a significant impact on many history of Guam authors and is cited in many Guam history texts. Although her work has been criticized (see Stade 1998, pp. 18-23), it has been important because it was one of the first works to ‘affirm’ i Mañamoru siha [Chamorros]. Her work stated that i Mañamoru yan i kestumbren-ñiha (Chamorros and their culture), continued to exist (though she also indicated that some of the culture was in danger of being ‘lost,’ (see Thompson, 1947, p. 29, for an example of such discussion). These affirmations have been considered very important since the idea that i Mañamoru siha no longer existed had taken such a hold on the island (Underwood, personal communication, January 22, 2002). (Marsh-Kautz, 2002, p. 57)

Regarding the Peace Corps presence in Palau during TTPI times Rechebei and McPhetres (1997) state, the volunteers were “generally anti-establishment,” “brought their own ideas about human rights,” and “frequently took political positions against official American policies” (pp. 251-252). Referring to anthropologists in Micronesia, Falgout (1995) comments that it was their “role…to listen to what the Micronesians had to say and to make suggestions about how they might improve their position” (para. 31). She went on to note that some were critical of the TTPI administration and were so close to Micronesians that they were “suspect in the eyes of other expatriates, even administrators.” Fischer (1979) supports these assessments by stating, The fact that the district anthropologist was often seen by both Americans and Micronesians as a representative and defender of Micronesian interests sometimes led to the anthropologist’s being regarded by some of the Americans as subversive or excessively softhearted and softheaded. (p. 244)

While ultimately this may be the case as stated in publications such as Falgout et al. (2008) who state for Guam, “long a U.S. territory and a base for U.S. Navy forces, shares American modes of public memory more than the other islands. Commemorations of the war on Guam are of a sort and scale familiar to mainland Americans” (pp. 33-34). However, Robert Underwood (1977) reminds us that at least some of this expression is because “these are the symbols,” the language if you will, that others in their island are speaking. In this researcher’s perspective, in such a competitive social environment, it may be considered a necessary language to speak in order for Chamorros to be heard and considered among the cacophony of public voices that drown out traditional modes of commemoration.

Interviews were first conducted in the island areas and with experts that the researcher knew well, saving the communities the least familiar to the author for last. Fieldwork began on Guam, building on years of personal experience with the island historic preservation experts there. This approach allowed for refinement of the interview questions and process before continuing on to
other areas. It also allowed for building up networks within the HPOs in the NMI and Palau. Experience has taught this researcher that these sorts of personalized introductions are important in island culture and among island Indigenous activist communities. Other research efforts conducted at a more grassroots level, for example, have discussed the importance of familial connections, the right introductions, and taking years to build up the rapport needed to conduct interviews that would gather meaningful data (e.g., Asang, 2004, pp. 19-20). Lilli Perez Iyechad (2001), a Chamorro researcher, notes that while conducting her dissertation fieldwork, the primary interest of [Guam Chamorro] informants was my family’s association (clan affiliation). This entailed a delineation of my parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles until key family members were recognized...Once they recognized my clan affiliation, I was identified by such affiliation and introduced by my informants to other members of their families accordingly. (p. 77)

Despite the efforts outlined above, a few significant experts on Guam and in the NMI were unwilling to be interviewed for this study. There may have been various reasons for this, for example, they may have felt that the author did not have the appropriate stature to interview them or they may have been wary that the end result would be ineffective or negative.

The core set of questions were pilot-tested with community experts and revised before going out into the field. The questions were provided prior to the interviewee upon request. In Palau, the questions were provided to the HPO, which then presented them to the interviewees prior to the interview. Providing copies of the interview questions beforehand may have intimidated some participants owing to the phrasing of the questions (which may appear more intimidating when seen in print than when spoken) or owing to the themes and issues being explored in the questions. During certain interviews it became apparent that some interviewees were concerned that their statements might be misconstrued, misrepresented, or appear negative.

222 Fewer people were initially interviewed in Palau for three reasons. First, most of those encountered had been in their positions a long time, so there were fewer former directors, staff, and board members to include. Second, there were fewer counterpart organizations or agencies as compared to Guam and the NMI because Palau’s public and private sectors are set up differently. In Guam and the NMI, a select number of directors and staff for various NGOs and government agencies were interviewed. Third, one significant interviewee began working elsewhere just before the scheduled interview and was unable to meet for an interview. However, two additional key people were able to be interviewed while working in Palau.

223 A few individuals were interviewed more than once creating a total of 48 interviews. This added up to over 56 hours of interview material which took an estimated 441 hours to transcribe and created over 753 pages of single-spaced transcripts (See Appendix H for transcription guide). Forty-four of the interviews were digitally recorded while the remaining five were recorded by handwritten notes. Interview lengths ranged from 31 minutes to three hours and 22 minutes with an hour to an hour-and-a-half being typical.

The research project’s policy was to provide copies of the project information statement and signed consent forms to each interviewee (see Appendix E, Appendix F, Appendix G). Both papers contained contact details and people were encouraged to contact the Ethics in Human Research Committee of Charles Sturt University if they had “any complaints or concerns” about the research.

Transcription generally allows for some omissions such as the non-typing of “uh,” “um,” and similar sentence fillers, affirmations meant to indicate active listening and interest, and sometimes repeated words or patterns of speech like “you know,” “right,” and “okay.” These omissions allow the interviewee’s information or points of view to be presented with clarity and are not meant to alter any of his or her intended meaning. However, feedback from interviewees has elicited a further aspect that should be noted. A fine line was found to exist between desiring not to alter their statements and creating an off-putting feeling about the interview by having them read through verbatim text replete with false starts, partial sentences, and the like.
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Transcripts of the digitally recorded material were sent to those interviewed to provide participants an opportunity to further clarify their statements and ensure that what they meant to impart had been accurately captured. Eight interviews, or 16.7% of the digitally recorded interviews, were listened to a second time, from beginning to end, to verify the accuracy of the transcript process. For those interviews, certain corrections were necessary, though they were largely non-substantive. The corrections for two interviews were quantified with just 1.7% and 0.8% of the text needing to be corrected. It is understood within the research community that there is inevitably an unavoidable amount of inaccuracy (Poland, 2002).

Two typed transcripts of digitally recorded interviews and a copy of signed consent forms were sent to interviewees via postal service (with one exception who was only sent PDF copies)—one copy for the interviewee to keep, one copy to potentially send back with comments. These interviewees were provided with an addressed, pre-paid envelope and a copy of the transcript guide, and were encouraged to make corrections, clarify statements, or make sections of the interview either confidential or not attributable to them (see accompanying letter Appendix I). They then had generally two to two-and-a-half weeks to work with the transcripts although extensions were granted. By request, some transcripts were additionally emailed in PDF form.

Transcripts were then placed in a QSR NVivo software program file. Interviewee corrections and the like were entered into the database as they came in. Transcript data was coded and placed in NVivo folders and subfolders.

224 It was assessed that certain community members and traditional experts would better respond to note-taking rather than an audio recorder. Two of these interviews were to be conducted as a series of conversations led by a respected cultural expert. Note-taking for these two interviews occurred in a second location after the conversations and the notes were verified with the cultural expert who was present during the conversations. For these two interviewees, the cultural expert also recommended that the consent forms be presented after a relationship had developed from the conversational encounters. Their approval or disapproval of the consent forms dictated whether the information shared was kept or not.

Two other community members were interviewed together. It was determined with guidance from a cultural expert that this would be how they felt most comfortable. This different interview circumstance was kept in mind when analyzing their material, none of which was quantified into weighted values.

Interviewing in groups is not uncommon in parts of Micronesia (Knecht & Mersai, 2006; Participants, 1992a). Though considered culturally appropriate at times, Mersai notes that the method can potentially create an atmosphere where the group defers to the opinion and authority of individuals with status. This can mean that the full range of responses or perhaps even more knowledgeable information may not be obtained (Knecht & Mersai, 2006, pp. 57-58).

To avoid any misconstruction, interviews conducted in restaurants or other informal settings did not involve the consumption of alcohol or other stimulants that could impair the respondent’s ability to respond in a considered manner.

225 The author, name of the publication, and name of the island entity have been removed to protect the identity of those revealed within the publication. Copy available upon request.

226 It is an underlying value in Micronesian cultures and is part of the “webs of connections that provide them with profoundly adaptive social insurance” (Perez-Iyechad, 2011; Petersen, 2009, p. 226).

227 As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss HPO strengths, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

228 Source: DCA, 2003, p. 26; see also Perez-Iyechad, 2011.
See also similar recent discussions by former RMI archaeologist Mary Jane Wright Naone (2011), researcher Jon G. O’Neill (2005, p. 4), and O’Neill and cultural heritage specialist and former RMI archaeologist Dirk H. R. Spennemann (2006).

The concept of looting can be a complex one. The term is placed in quotation marks here as one person’s definition of looting may be another person’s definition of culturally appropriate acquisitioning, or it may have another definition. Determining which is the case is beyond the scope of this study.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss HPO challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss HPO challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss HPO challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss HPO challenges as a cultural broker, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss these challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

Similar statements have been made for other Micronesian areas such as Kosrae. Archaeologist Felicia Beardsley (2006) states that local or national government funding “is subject to other priorities—economic development, maintenance and improvement of infrastructures, health, security, and education needs. Anything beyond these most critical needs of a country are often the first items to be slashed from a budget” (p. 595). Beardsley further states that, “[t]he arts, heritage preservation, the intangibles that define a culture are relegated to the lowest tiers of need in prioritized budgets—they have usually been the recipients of excess money, but are never seen as having the same needs for funding and support as other so-called fundamental elements in an economy (p. 596).

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss NPS benefits, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

Traditional compensation is outlined according to FAS grant special conditions in this way: “The grantee is allowed to reimburse persons who assist the program in areas of recording traditional knowledge and oral history through a traditional form of compensation. This traditionally based reimbursement, provided in lieu of money, should have a nominal cost.”

Entities, such as the NMI, were said to have been more able to apply for US historic preservation funding for rehabilitation and restoration projects or other types of projects such as documenting the crafting of a traditional canoe in the past. However, limitations in such available funding appear to have severely curtailed the occurrence of those types of projects.

See also Isebong Maura Asang (2004) who notes that such activity “silence[s] the voices of others [in her discussion, essentially applying this to Palauans] by evoking meanings that may or may not be relevant” (p. 6). Ross et al. (2011) note issues such as:

Indigenous peoples must often ‘translate’ their knowledge into ways of understanding that are familiar to those trained in modern scientific ways of thinking (Stevenson 2006). Such translation leads to the compartmentalization of Indigenous knowledge…ignoring those aspects that do not easily resonate with scientific ways of knowledge construction. (p. 101)

Spennemann (2003) discusses somewhat differently that in regards to activities such as HPO public education, “the direction historic preservation takes today will have a major influence on the attitudes of the adult generation of tomorrow” (p. 52). As one more additional note, in an interview given to Jon O’Neill in 2001, Paula Falk-Creech “raised the…issue of difficulties that
oral societies such as those of Micronesia experience in meeting very different communication standards set by a non-oral and strongly bureaucratic culture such as exists in U.S. government departments” (O’Neill, 2005, p. 257).

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss NPS challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss NPS challenges, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

There was also concerted, long-term effort being carried out by the Cleared Ground Demining to clear unexploded ordinance throughout the archipelago, especially in Peleliu and Angaur. This appeared to be an effort strongly supported by the Peoples of Palau. As of 2011, over 8,400 pieces of unexploded ordinance were reported to have been demined throughout Palau (http://www.clearedground.org/projects_palau.aspx).

Similarly, King (2009b) notes “power of place” (p. 30). He discusses the concept this way:

Traditional cultural properties are deeply significant to those who view them as parts of their cultural heritage. That’s a statement of self-evident fact, which we are in no position to rethink. This sort of significance—commonly referred to as the ‘power of place’—has been recognized for thousands of years, by philosophers from at least Plato onward, and in cultures all over the world. (King, 2009b, p. 30)

As in other areas of the world, this does not mean that there is not a range of community knowledge or valuation of these same sites or challenges in transmitting the significance of these sites to upcoming generations.

Additionally, the Guam legislature and the GPT were working collaboratively to rehabilitate the Guam Congress building, a multi-year and costly venture (Hart, 2008). This building was constructed just after WW II in the 1940s. It is where an essentially Chamorro governmental advisory body staged a walkout that was a catalyst in removing the status for the People of Guam, in effect, Chamorros, as wards of the US, and in conferring them the US citizenship that they had been petitioning for, for some 50 years (Guam HPO, 2001; Hattori, 1995; 1996). Part of the nomination form and supporting documents state that, “The ‘walk out’ was an act of defiance against the almost absolute and arbitrary rule of the naval governor. The ‘walk out’ created a new political beginning that changed the political status of Guam and its people.”

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss visions for HPOs, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

These statements were gathered years before a very public rehabilitation of the Lujan House and Guam Institute. The response may have been different if the interview had occurred following its rehabilitation. However, it is but one of many very public historic sites.

As not all interviewees were specifically asked to list or discuss visions for HPOs, these listings cannot be seen as comprehensive.

Though it was cautioned that this possibility needed to be thought through very carefully for adverse repercussions.

This is assessed to be a sound direction for Micronesian historic preservation efforts (e.g., Marsella, et al. 2005, pp. 100-101). However, it must be kept in mind that these processes are “complex and lengthy” with “difficult” aspects to them that will likely have “complications and issues that follow” (McKinnon, 2011, pp. 100-101). See similar discussion in A. Smith (2007).

Recording the text existing upon signage for Indigenous heritage was not a part of the research design. However, signage text for most, if not all, NMI and Guam marked re-internments and much of the Spanish heritage that had signage was recorded and placed within a coding system. Without systematically canvassing the Mariana Islands heritage, the impression is that much of the inventoried and registered Indigenous heritage of the Marianas is without descriptive
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signage. There may, however, be many signs that were not taken proper note of during the research process.

Signage text that was found to convey some of the Mariana Island’s unpleasant colonial history:

- The NMI’s Saipan Judicial Complex reburial had a sign that noted, “Based on early historical records, it is possible that the site was a part of the traditional village of Catanhuda that was occupied until the forced abandonment of Saipan in the mid-1700s.”

- Guam’s Angel L. G. Santos Memorial Park containing relocated latte contained a sign which stated, “[Latte] use in the Chamorro culture vanished when the Spanish devastated the islands in the 1600s” and, “These latte, relocated in 1956, are from the former village of Mepo in the Fena Valley of the current Ordinance Annex, U.S. Naval Activities, Guam. The village site was destroyed by military construction after World War II.”

253 During fieldwork, the NMI and Palau HPOs were housed in historic buildings from colonial/Trust Territory administrations. The GPT moved into the rehabilitated Jose P. Lujan House and Guam Institute (66-01-1115).

254 See Beardsley (2006, p. 598) for similar desires for youth.

255 This recognition of them being human rights versus sovereign rights is discussed in reports such as the 1989 House Report 101-877 issued by the US House of Representatives (in Bruning, 2006) which produced statements such as, “The majority believed that ‘Respect for Native human rights is the paramount principle that should govern resolution of the issue when a claim is made [regarding consideration of the ‘discovery’ of older or ancient human remains]…’” (pp. 504-505). However, final legislation to address issues is considered by some to have instead been compromised. It has been “tailored to address specific aspects” of particular situations or has been said to be dependent upon having a sovereign relationship with the US (Bruning, 2006, p. 506). These types of actions by the US illustrate the country’s piecemeal approach to the different Indigenous groups both within its borders and with which it has special relationships.

In light of the earlier note in which Aguon (2009) states, “the U.S. Department of the interior has adopted rules stating that NAGPRA protection shall ‘not [apply] to territories of the United States’” (p. 2), it seems that legislation like NAGPRA does not apply, not because it is not recognized as a human right, not because it is a special consideration only given to sovereign nations, but because the territorial and commonwealth statuses are considered as properties of the US and, as such, are not “the US.” But one must question whether this was the original Congressional intent, that is, to only respect human rights of Peoples in lands of the US and not lands owned by the US.

See also Laughlin (2006) for discussion of Indigenous rights within US territories, including Indigenous rights to cultural preservation.

256 This is not the place to discuss in detail whether the MRS achieved its aim. While the array of study reports is impressive—in total 11 volumes were produced and published (NPS, “Micronesia and American Samoa”)—the long-lasting effects of capacity building have been mixed. For example, the site inventory database provided to each of the states, at the time touted a key management tool, was obsolete after 18 months as it was based on a custom-coded database design (rather than utilizing off-the-shelf software) that could not be maintained by even the IT professionals in the islands (Spennemann, Pers. Comm., 23 Feb. 2012).

257 Ethnographic resources are described by the NPS Ethnography Program as, those sites, structures, objects, cultural and natural landscapes, and human dimensions that would be defined by contemporary people as being meaningful, significant, and crucial to their sense of their own past and who they are. The term refers to places and objects that could not be fully understood if they were disengaged from the people who made them or used them. (Wray et al., 2009, p. 47)

The concept was created within the NPS Ethnography Program because they,
‘...are traditionally valued by present-day people because they contributed to their history and their life. So...an archeological resource to which the Hopi traveled and where they pray is not just an archeological resource, we call it an ethnographic resource because...present-day people value it in special ways and the park needs to have their attention drawn to that human dimension’ (Crespi 2002:42). The concept of ‘ethnographic resources’ piggybacked on existing, and familiar, concepts such as ‘archaeological resources,’ ‘historic resources,’ and ‘natural resources.’ It was intended to bring visibility to the human dimensions of sites, structures, objects, and landscapes (Crespi 2003:42). (Wray, et al., 2009, p. 47)

258 Indeed, the NPS Ethnography Program has specifically worked to serve as a “means for NPS to understand tribal perspectives and needs,” (J. L. Rogers, 2009, p. 7), perspectives and experience that could be very valuable to areas with Indigenous populations such as Micronesia.

259 Though not specifically asked, most seemed to be moderately to fully fluent in their mother tongue.

260 However, there do appear to be systemic challenges in considering these types of issues.

261 One known exception might be the development in Guam of a site of an Indigenous narrative, Puntan Dos Amântes (Two Lovers Point), a public–private partnership (KUAM, 2009). However, this site is not listed on either the Guam or the US Register of Historic Places though it is a US NNL and one could argue that the site has been developed more as a commercial enterprise to benefit from the cliff-side view than to truly commemorate the spirit of this Indigenous narrative. However, also on Guam, US-era houses representing a local village that survived WW II have been restored, the Jose P. Lujan House was recently rehabilitated, and plans for rehabilitating the Guam Congress building have been announced.

262 Though there has yet to be a Micronesian TCP entered into a register, there has been discussion for years to do so, and at least two recent trainings in 2011 and 2012 within the region that focused on cultural landscapes.

263 This researcher developed additional possible categories of significance that could be placed on nomination forms to represent Islander ways of conceptualizing cultural resources. The form was then informally reviewed by four cultural-, Indigenous-issues and historic preservation experts for review. Feedback was then implemented (see Appendix K). The form is not final, but it may serve as part of the conversation of refining current identification and nomination forms should island HPOs so desire.

264 Training observed during this study focused on archaeological methods, understanding Section 106, and in cultural landscapes. At other times, training has been organized for grant administration, metal and concrete conservation, and the like. Plans were initiated for training in oral history but were not realized during this researcher’s four-year period of employment, though there has been at least one ethnographic training (visual ethnography) in the past.

265 Yap is one of four states within the FSM, a political entity comprised of more than four distinct culture groups which are each outside the focus of this particular research endeavor. An HPO exists within each FSM state which falls under the purview of a national HPO. One FSM state cannot be meaningfully tackled without discussing its dynamics with the other FSM states or its state–nation dynamics.

266 Linda Tuhawi Smith (1999) further notes,

The term has enabled the collective voices of colonized people to be expressed strategically in the international arena. It has also been an umbrella enabling communities and peoples to come together, transcending their own colonized contexts and experiences, in order to learn, share, plan, organize and struggle collectively for self-determination on the global and local stages. Thus the world’s indigenous populations belong to a network of peoples. They share experiences as peoples who have been subjected to the colonization of their lands and cultures, and
the denial of their sovereignty, by a colonizing society that has come to dominate and determine the shape and quality of their lives, even after it has formally pulled out. As Wilmer has put it, ‘indigenous peoples represent the unfinished business of decolonization.’ (p. 7)

Similarly, the term is capitalized by Ross et al. (2011):

For us, ‘Indigenous’ is a category of identity, itself recognized by modern bureaucratic states, that emerges as much from current feelings of oppression and marginalization as from actual history...we capitalize the term ‘Indigenous’ in order to bestow on members of these communities the same dignity as is given to the other citizens of such modern states as Australia, the United States, India, and Thailand. (p. 24)

Tangible heritage are those cultural resources that have a physical presence, that is, they can be touched. The “Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage” defines intangible heritage as “the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills—as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith—that communities, groups and in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage” (Article 2(1)). It is heritage that does not, in and of itself, have a physical presence and is manifest in the domains of “oral traditions and expressions, including language; “performing arts; social practices, rituals, and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; traditional craftsmanship” (Article 2(2)).

Anecdotal evidence within Micronesia suggests that community members have been unsure at times of the meaning of the concept of intangible heritage as much of it can be applied to items that have a physical presence or are otherwise associated with tangible items. For example, songs can be written down onto paper or recorded onto audio cassette tapes, records, and CDs which have a physical presence. However, the songs themselves and the tradition responsible for their composition, existence, and oral transmission remain intangible as they themselves cannot be physically touched.

Guam recognizes Chamorro and English in the Guam Code; NMI recognizes Chamorro, Carolinian, and English in its Constitution; while Palau recognizes both Palauan and English in its Constitution (see Chapter Two for specific references).

While cultural leaders do admit that there are reasons to “legitimately disagree” with official Islander orthographies, there have been appeals by those such as former Guam Congressional Representative and self-proclaimed Chamorro activist Robert Underwood (2003, p. 106) that “having an orthography is useless if it is not used.” He further promotes that, “[i]f Chamorro is to be preserved, it must be seen in print and it must be written in uniform fashion.”

The locations are on or near the property listed.

This reconstruction appears to include adhering the capstones to the columns which was not a traditional practice. Additionally, anecdotally it is said that these latte are from more than one set.

Though the general location of the internment was imparted, it was not located with any certainty as no visible traces were found.

It is not that this fourth internment was difficult to locate; rather, it was an error in understanding that it existed while conducting fieldwork.

Locations are on or near the property listed.

Rudo (2001) explains that, From 1974 to 1985, the annual HPF grants administered by the U.S. National Park Service (NPS) were given to the Territorial Historic Preservation Office, which conducted archeological and historical projects throughout the TTPI. Much of that work was documented by the Micronesian Archaeological Survey report series
(MAS) published by the former TTPI Historic Preservation Office and now published by the Historic Preservation Division of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. (p. 5)

During TTPI years, the HPO was centered in Saipan and served all TTPI-administered Micronesian islands until they began transitioning to their current commonwealth and independent political statuses.

See http://www.cnmihpo.com for two editions.

For example, former NMI SHPO, Jesus “Jess” Baza Pangelinan (Interview, 24 May 2007) referred to video documentation of the traditional production of a canoe—recording the types of tools used, traditional terminology and construction methods.

Another publication, “A time of agony: Saipan 1944,” http://www.nps.gov is available online.

This digital library was a joint effort by Charles Sturt University, the NMI Division of Historic Preservation and the NMI Council for the Humanities. In May 2007, Robert H. Hunter, Director of the NMI Museum of History and Culture and Scott Russell, Assistant Executive Director/Program Officer of the NMI Council for the Humanities, mentioned a then on-going project to create a similar digital library of primary Mariana Island-related Spanish colonial documents.

Assessment based on limited examination of reports owing to time constraints, as noted earlier.

This newsletter began to be published quarterly in 2011.

Written in Palauan.

Written in both the Palauan and English languages. The more recent format is to publish one booklet with Palauan and English versions in it—the Palauan version starting from the front cover, the English version starting from the back cover.

In addition to the Palau HPO restoration/rehabilitation grants, states and other entities also conduct some of their own site rehabilitation projects.
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to three times of those in the Guam or NMI registers. The NMI stood out for having the highest percentage of “Districts,” though both the NMI and Guam have six districts in their registers while Palau has registered just one. Some of this may be explained by the types of Indigenous heritage crafted or valued by Islanders. The types of heritage commonly registered are tied in some ways to the emphasis on time periods (e.g., buildings are typically from colonial eras).

**Figure 10.** Guam registered resources by type (as of March 2007).

**Figure 11.** The NMI registered resources by type (as of May 2007).
Figure 12. Palau registered resources by type (as of April 2008).

Table 26. Guam, the NMI, and Palau Registered Resources by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island entity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam (n=157)</td>
<td>6 (3.8%)</td>
<td>83 (52.9%)</td>
<td>18 (11.5%)</td>
<td>39 (24.8%)</td>
<td>10 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMI (n=35)</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>13 (37.1%)</td>
<td>10 (28.6%)</td>
<td>5 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau (n=178)</td>
<td>1 (0.06%)</td>
<td>108 (60.7%)</td>
<td>5 (2.8%)</td>
<td>44 (24.7%)</td>
<td>19 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: As of March 2007 for Guam, May 2007 for the NMI, and April 2008 for Palau.

In the Palau national register, the emphasis on “Traditional” (Indigenous) heritage became readily apparent. It was theorized that examining the “Traditional” heritage by Palauan type might reveal patterns in types of heritage registered and provide an understanding of the ways that Palauans categorize or think about their cultural resources. Further, such an examination might shed light on ways current nomination forms could be tailored to better meet Indigenous Islander/Palauan needs.

The most common type of Palauan cultural resource to be registered was “Beluu” (Traditional Villages) (see Table 27). Beluu comprise 28.2% of Palau’s registered “Traditional” heritage and 23.6% of all of Palau’s registered resources. “Oublallang” (terrace/s) have been registered second most often, making up 9.4% of the traditional registered resources with “Diong” (water areas/bathing pools) and “Bai” (community/chief meeting structures or their stone platforms) following closely behind.
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Appendix B: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands Historic Preservation Office

Organization Chart

Source: Division of Lands and Surveys, 1978