ABSTRACT

“21 million slaves worldwide is a great business” – as recently summarized by the special correspondent of the United Nations for slavery, Urmila Bhoola, on the situation of slavery in the 21st century. Beyond the usual measures, she emphasized the responsibility and the influence of individuals to fight against this most extreme form of inequality. Unlike that of ancient or modern times, slavery in the 21st century often appears to be invisible. It manifests itself in not only specific working conditions, lodging or wages but also in produced and consumed products. In comparison, the Monday demonstrations in the GDR in 1989/1990 are meanwhile a part of history. They are not only a part of the “revolutions” that occurred at the turn of the 1980s but are also a symbol for peaceful mass protests at specific places during certain times. Unlike the Berlin Wall, which enabled the creation of a materially existent, and above all symbolic and medial marketable place of remembrance, the protests in Leipzig, Dresden, Plauen and other places appear considerably more intangible at first glance. Thus, only photo, film and recorded documents seem to communicate the materiality of the protests. Can archaeology, therefore, during periods with so-called dense tradition even deal with such a topic as protest and resistance? In order to clarify this question, the following will cast a look at various times and collectives. On the one hand, a “slave prison” and settlements of self-freed slaves (“maroons”) from the 18th and 19th centuries are discussed. On the other hand, an analysis of a “peace-camp” as a form of resistance in the 20th century is presented. The examples are intended to finally identify the methods, problems and potentials of “archaeology of resistance” for historical epochs.

THE MATERIALITY OF RESISTANCE

When approaching this subject as an “historical archaeologist” for a timeframe during which the terms “revolt”, “revolution” or “resistance” were decisively conceptualized, it becomes clear that there is no uniform definition of these terms or comparable concepts such as “civil disobedience” or “right of resistance”. From a sociological perspective, the close connection between resistance in a broader sense and power has been repeatedly pointed out (LAKTISCH 2013). Resistance can develop on an institutional level, but is often understood to be extra-institutional. Moreover, dominance and resistance are profane practices of daily life. Thus, different impact levels and ranges can be designated – extending from “nonconformist behaviour” and “re-
fusal” to “protest” (Fig. 1). From this perspective, protests are to be categorized as a part of “social movements”. According to Felix Kolb (2002, 10), a social movement is

“[…] a network consisting of organisations and individuals bound on the basis of a shared collective identity, who attempt to initiate, oppose or roll back social, political, economic or cultural change primarily with the help of non-institutional tactics”.

Included in the social movements of the 18th and the 19th centuries are, among others, the abolitionist movement, the labour movement or the feminist movement at the transition of the 19th to the 20th century. Since the 20th century, these movements have expanded and the actors are no longer just operating within parties, institutions or unions. They are to be found in movements such as the anti-nuclear, the ecology and the peace movements particularly of the 1980s or the occupy-movement of the 21st century.

In the investigation of resistance, the contribution of an archaeologist lies both in an evaluation of its material characteristics and in comparative (cultural) studies. Leading from the materiality of resistance, manifestations of resistance can be scrutinized and related to the conception and legitimacy of resistance and domination. Social encounters implement a variety of forms of action in order to articulate and assert interests. These forms of action (“forms of resistance or protest”) can be passive or active and/or violent or non-violent. The assessment of the level of escalation of the respective forms of action is ultimately dependent on the respective socially accepted or established norms (Sharp 1973; Roberts/Garton Ash 2009). Regardless of such assessments, protests are initially “bodies in action”, in which vulnerability and the power to inflict injury are particularly clear. While there are a number of mostly sociological or ethnological studies on this topic (e.g. Pabst 2011), there are barely any analyses on the materiality of resistance. Although such resistance-studies are a special category within culture and social science research, they rely heavily on text analyses or empirical work without taking objects into account. How comprehensively “materiality” can be conceptualized is shown, for example, in the studies of Beverley Butler (1996) or Nélia Dias (2010). On the one hand, protests against the construction of a highway in Great Britain at the end of the 20th century were investigated and, on the other hand, infrastructural measures taken by France during the 19th century in its colonies and the associated resistance were discussed. Significant are not least the analyses carried out by the anarchy researcher and anthropologist James C. Scott (2009). In his work The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia, he was concerned with the region of “Zomia”. This is a highland region of ca. 2.5 million km² in Southeast Asia, where numerous ethnic and cultural minorities live. The region appears to have largely eluded state control. Scott identified the inhabitants as refugees from modernity, who resist the assimilation pressure of capitalistic societies and state systems, and live according to counter models. These counter models do not manifest themselves in complex, discursive processes but rather in life-world practices. Material objects that are tied to specific economic forms and infrastructures serve as active elements in resistance or stand for state influence. For example, according to Scott their insistence on shifting cultivation practices prevents the expansion of economic and political control systems.
With the introduction of wet rice cultivation and sophisticated irrigation systems, the social structures would have been permanently destroyed and replaced by “capitalistic regimes”.

Without going into the basics and the results of Scott’s study – it is quite controversially discussed – the “materiality discourse” is nevertheless remarkable. The author highlights how collectives and individuals express themselves in their life-situations through their use of objects and that they also use these as central elements of resistance strategies. Although Scott’s analysis does not profess to examine materiality as such, the relations between social practice and the agency of things are amply clear.

**Opposition in the Thicket of Sub-Disciplines**

Resistance, rebellion and revolution have long been subjects of archaeological disciplines, even if the topics have largely been confined to the English-speaking world. Contributions to the “archaeology of resistance” can be identified for historical periods with different temporal, spatial and material foci and overlaps, namely:

1) Traditional, North American style historical archaeology, which addresses resistance with a primary emphasis on slavery;
2) Conflict archaeology, which examines sites of hostilities as well as the forms of conflict action;
3) Contemporary archaeology, which variously deals with forms of resistance, particularly in industrialized societies from the mid-20th century to the present day.

The methods and techniques of these archaeological disciplines do not significantly differ from those of other archaeological disciplines. Prospecting and excavations, finds and features, stratigraphy and typologies, dating and material analyses also constitute the focus of this scientific research. These methods and techniques particularly play a central role for the analysis of sub-recent conflicts.

With temporal proximity to present times, the avenues of investigation are more highly differentiated and are not solely limited to data that has been recovered through excavations (Harrison/Schofield 2010, 54–60). In particular, contemporary archaeology applies methods of ethno-archaeology and the empirical social sciences (Fewster 2013; Harrison/Schofield 2010, 90–98; Graves-Brown et al. 2013a).

**Historical Archaeology**

Historical archaeology initially denoted the archaeology of the colonization of North America. The term was and is also used for the archaeology of Australia and Oceania and transatlantic relations in the modern era. In recent years, it has been used as an umbrella term, gaining enormous popularity, although it is often not quite clear what exactly is meant by the label “historical archaeology”. As the lowest common denominator, it may be argued that it designates archaeology in societies with parallel record transmission (especially written sources). Particularly after Anders Andrén (1998) discussed historical archaeology as a methodological approach and therefore claimed a globalized perspective, a restriction of it in Europe to the modern era appears to be emerging (Majewski/Gaimster 2009; Meher 2013). In German-speaking areas, “archaeology of the Middle Ages and Modern Times” still dominates (Müller 2013; Meher 2013). Recent times have been defined – above all by Claudia Theune-Vogt (2014) – as “modern archaeology” and described as a part of “historical archaeology”.

Classical topics of North American style historical archaeology were and are North American civil wars and slavery. Whereas the majority of the analyses on events or places of the Civil War focused on the military aspects of the conflicts (“battlefield”) and hardly deal with resistance, the examination of resistance in times of slavery can be defined as a long established field of research (Weik 2013; Marshall 2014). Moreover, there are also studies that investigate the resistance of the indigenous population (e.g. Wilcox 2009). With the spatial and temporal expansion of
historical archaeology, Oceania, Central and South America and the African continent have become areas of research interest. In the process, not only contributions on the resistance of slaves have increased and thus concentrate on regions outside of North America and the Caribbean. Interest has also been extended to subjects of the 19th and 20th centuries. Thus, repression and resistance in Latin America (e.g. Langebaek 2009) as well as forms of resistance in Mexico (e.g. Liebmann 2012) or Ethiopia (González-Ruibal 2014) have also been on the agenda. Numerous contributions on the archaeology of capitalism were also concerned with riots or disputes (e.g. Matthews 2010, 177–178; Shackel 2009, 53–61; Croucher/Weiss 2011).

Battlefield archaeology | Archaeology of conflict

“Battlefield archaeology” can look back on a long research and technical tradition that draws on very heterogeneous scientific and non-scientific interests, covering diverse timeframes. In this sense, it is not congruent with historical archaeology. A milestone in the development of battlefield archaeology was and is the time of the North American civil wars and campaigns against the indigene population (Little Big Horn). There, battlefield archaeology was and is a part of historical archaeology. In essence, however, battlefield archaeology is both temporally and thematically more extensive, because it deals with all tangible legacies of military actions. Nevertheless, a focus is placed on the investigation of the battlefield, which is often concerned with not only the use of prospective but also forensic techniques. With its expansion beyond the battlegrounds, battlefield archaeology has been expanded not only spatially and in substance but also has enabled an orientation towards conflict archaeology (Cornish/Saunders 2014; Carman 2013; Moshenska 2013). Conflict archaeology deals not only with the reconstruction of the processes of hostilities or associated military operations but also focuses on the technical, social, cultural and psychological aspects of conflicts with regard to anthropological aspects. Accordingly, conflict archaeology questions the preconditions, accompanying phenomena and consequences of conflicts (Pollard/Banks 2005). In recent years, the role of archaeology in light of military conflicts as well as its responsibility for cultural heritage has been strongly questioned (González-Ruibal/Moshenska 2014). Furthermore, conflicts are not merely limited to military confrontations and are not necessarily expressed in physical violence. This leads the study of conflict archaeology in the direction of resistance studies.

At least in the understanding of Nicholas J. Saunders (Cornish/Saunders 2014), conflict archaeology strongly focuses on modern conflicts, since due to their complexity they can provide insights and retrospective views into the structure of conflicts of times past. The Journal of Conflict Archaeology (JCA), introduced in 2005, understands itself as a platform for topics of conflict archaeology. The journal perceives “conflict in its broadest possible sense”, whereby it intends to be “a vehicle for a wide variety of approaches, promoting diversity and a holistic outlook” (Pollard/Banks 2005, V). In this function, the JCA straddles – in the sense of world archaeology – not only space but also timeframes so that Mesolithic conflicts are handled as well as conflicts of the 21st century. Scanning the JCA for keywords, terminology and themes such as “revolt”, “rebellion”, “revolution” or “terrorism” and “anarchism” are represented. Usually, they are discussed in the context of national or international conflicts, for example, resistance during the American Civil War, international brigades in the Spanish Civil War or desertion. In German-speaking countries, battlefield archaeology has first been established in recent years. The scenes of battlefields are still the centre of interest, even if increasing attention is being paid to the contents of conflicts (Brock/Homann 2011; Eickhoff 2014).

Archaeology of the contemporary past

In recent decades, the second half of the 20th century and the 21st century have been “discovered” by archaeology. The impetus of this development originated, in particular,
With a look at “revolution”, “rebellion” or “resistance”, very diverse themes and approaches are analysed. For instance, British research has particularly promoted investigations of relics from the Cold War (Cocroft/Thomas 2007). These also include studies on protest, particularly the numerous analyses of John Schofield (Schofield 2006; Schofield/Cocroft 2007; Schofield 2009). Further studies were conducted on protest camps of social-political movements (Schofield/Anderton 2000; Badcock/Johnston 2009; Dixon 2013) as well as on conflicts of workers (Badcock/Johnston 2013) or places of terrorist attacks (Wilson 2011). In addition, in recent years the projects on the Spanish Civil War have acquired national and international attention (González-Ruibal 2012). Further studies were devoted to prisons of the times of the Northern Ireland Civil War from 1970–1980 (McAtackney 2014), migrant camps in Southern Italy (Pisoni 2013), escape tunnels in Berlin4, graffiti (Lydon 2014) or places of homelessness (Zimmermann 2013). Such investigations focus on “resistance” in various ways, which is not least due to the diversity of the subjects.

SLAVERY AND RESISTANCE

A classic topic of archaeological resistance research is the investigation of slavery in modern times. In slavery, the relationship between the institutional and non-institutional legitimation of domination on the basis of racial inequality is particularly apparent. A social system, such as slavery, which is defined with racial superiority as the social norm, provokes resistance at various levels. Particularly in modern times, a plethora of hardly manageable publications and research on slavery exists so that further information on the history of slavery as well as a discussion of political, economical and societal motives will not be provided here.

4 [http://www.fluchtunnel-glienicke.de/].
Thus, a study of resistance must be much more comprehensive. In particular, analyses on Africa as well as on Central and South America or Canada must be initiated. In addition, post-colonial discourses must be considered in which questions on power and domination, class affiliation and globalization in the context of current politics must be introduced (Weik 2013, 153–154). The scientific discussion of slavery is not only limited to the scientific community. Dealing with the topic of slavery is also an expression of political positioning (Sayers 2015). In particular, within post-colonial studies the question has been raised about whose story is being told and who is working on it (Funari/Orser 2015). The participation of the involved persons, whose history is being researched and documented, is particularly important for slavery, since it is a matter of letting the African and Afro-American population take part in their cultural heritage. This concerns scientific investigations and non-scientific activities alike and the implementation of scientific studies for the general public (White 2010a).

The slave jail of Joseph Bruin

The history and archaeology of a “slave prison” is important in several respects. A concept of the delineation between prison/jail or detention camp is fundamentally difficult due to their complex historical genesis. For Michel Foucault, they are places and spaces of power techniques. A prison is intended to punish individuals but also collectives for defined actions. This can also apply to detention camps, whereby their purpose is also “prevention” by locking up, excluding, re-educating or destroying entire groups or collectives. According to Alan Kramer (Greiner/Kramer 2013, 23), “mainly imperialistic, nationalistic, racist, ideological, hierarchical and dictatorial thinking and superiority conceptions enabled camp systems to arise as disciplinary measures”. Although the detention camp is a phenomenon of the 20th century, it is rooted in the ideas of the 19th century.

Prisons and detention camps have primarily become the focus of archaeology through excavations at locations in connection with
the American Civil War, the Nazi era, Stalinism or the Spanish Civil War (Thrun-Vogt 2014; González-Ruibal 2012). Studies about prisons of democratically legitimized states are rarely encountered (McAtackney 2014). However, comprehensive research is being carried out about penitentiaries in Australia (cf. Gibbs 2012).

During times of slavery, prisons for slaves were not only places of punishment and disciplining but were also used as “warehouses”. In the USA, particularly the Lumpkins Jail in Richmond, Virginia (Laird 2010) and the slave prison of Joseph Bruin in Alexandria, Virginia have been archaeologically investigated (Kraus et al. 2007; Kraus 2009). A relatively dense chronology exists about the slave trader Joseph Bruin. He was active as a slave trader in the middle of the 19th century. The slaves purchased by him were sold primarily in the southeast, especially to New Orleans. As of 1844, he used his house, located at Duke Street 1707, as a “warehouse”. In coeval sources, it was denoted as a “jail” and served to incarcerate the slaves until their resale.

Joseph Bruin became indirectly known to the general public through Uncle Tom’s Cabin, a novel published by Harriet Beecher Stowe in 1852. He represents the epitome of the greedy, inhuman slave trader, whose intention was the “repurchase” of 76 freed slaves. In 1848, abolitionists planned the release of 76 slaves, who were to be released into freedom from Washington on the ship “Pearl”. Betrayal foiled the undertaking and the majority of the slaves were bought by Joseph Bruin. Among the slaves were four brothers and two sisters aged 14–16, known as the “Edmondson sisters”. Due to their ages and their light skin as mulattos, they were sold at a profit and believed to have been forced into prostitution. A comprehensive campaign launched by abolitionists attempted to prevent this. Sermons, rallies and other effective public measures as well as the personal commitment of the redeemed father of the family also put pressure on Joseph Bru-in. He initially refused to accept a redemption offer totalling $1000 and shipped the sisters to New Orleans. A local yellow fever epidemic forced him to send his “precious cargo” back to Alexandria and to agree to the redemption payment of $2250.

Beyond the analysis of written sources, excavations in the surroundings of the existing building were possible (Kraus 2009, 112–174; Fig. 2). Directly behind the house, archaeologists found evidence of huts and a kitchen from the mid-19th century. The main house, a brick building, did not provide enough space so that a separate building was required. A cistern uncovered during the excavations is connected with the personal fate of the Edmonton siblings. It was part of the laundry where the sisters worked (Kraus 2009, 135–140). Archaeozoological analyses indicate the consumption of cattle and sheep (Kraus 2009, 158). Mainly extremities and heads are identified, which can be understood as both the utilisation of slaughterhouse waste from the neighbouring slaughterhouses of the West End and traditional preparation techniques (Fig. 3.1–3.2).

---


6 On the following Lisa Kraus (2009, 48–71).
Of importance are mainly references to ritual-spiritual activities of the internees (Kraus 2009, 164–169). Four pits (Fig. 2) from the mid-19th century are linked to magical-religious acts. In particular, Hoodoo practices—a religious doctrine that originated from West African, Indian and Protestant influences among Afro-Americans in North America—are indicated. The interpretations are based, on the one hand, on the bones of a complete chicken (pit 57) and, on the other hand, on other animal bones and remains from pits 60 and 61. Moreover, in one pit the almost complete remains of ceramics, pieces of broken glass and iron nails were found. In all three cases, we are not dealing with storage pits, but rather hiding places due to the context of the findings. Such hiding places are also known from other slave quarters. Due to the specific composition of the finds, these pits are usually associated with Hoodoo. Revealed were collections that were ritually hidden and buried: “collections of carefully selected objects arranged in patterns dictated by ritual practice” (Kraus 2009, 184).

On a modest level, it was possible for the inmates of the prison to practice their beliefs in captivity. In contrast to other slave traders, Joseph Bruin did not prohibit ritual and spiritual ceremonies such as prayers or bible studies.

With the analyses on “slave prisons”, places of activities are recorded where not only racial segregation was manifested and legitimised in daily practices. The prisons are also places where the functional logic of the valorisation of human capital comes to light. Analogous to markets and auctions, the transformation of humans to commodities is especially evident here. Resistance seldom occurred in an open and active manner at these places. But resistance can be manifested both in the form of religious practices and the emergent social ties as well as in the attempt to achieve a sense of normality.

**Locations of self- liberated African communities (“maroons”)**

The prisons continue to represent a marginal phenomenon of the archaeology of slavery, whereas the locations of maroon settlements are an integral part of research on resistance (Weik 2013, chap. 4; Sayers 2015). The term “maroon” is derived from the Spanish word “cimarrón”, meaning “wild animal” or “runaway pet” in Latin American Spanish. Thus, the expression is a political word of disqualification so that the phrase “self-liberated African communities” seems more appropriate. In this context, black African slaves and their descendants are meant who fled from plantations and established hidden settlements. Communities of maroons are found in the West Indies, Central, South and North America. The history of the maroons is historically, ethnologically and socially researched to varying extents. In the investigations, the confrontation of each country with its colonial
past is mirrored in the public and within research, whereby archaeology as a discipline outside of the scientific community is particularly significant (White 2010a). The study of the associated material culture and the interest of archaeology in the maroons already began in the 1950s and 1960s, however, this first became an established subject not least against the backdrop of the social and post-colonial movements of the 1970s (Weik 2013, 56–64). The focus of research was mainly directed towards the Caribbean and North America. In North America, the settlements and legacies of the maroons in North Carolina and Virginia are the primary focus of research.

Consequently, the story of the maroons in the “Great Dismal Swamp”, an inaccessible marshland, is intensively researched. They formed a community between 1700 and 1860 that consisted of several thousand migrants. In addition to the maroons, further migrants, such as white workers, deserted soldiers or indigenous groups, found refuge there (Sayers 2014). Over the past 30 years, a number of studies have also been published on the archaeology of the “maroons” in Central and South America. From the various studies, two examples are singled out in the following, because they implement different methodological approaches: landscape historical analyses on the maroons of St. Croix, Virgin Islands (Lesser Antilles) and the rainforest settlements of Tuido and Kumako in Suriname.

The analysis of settlements of the maroons is not only interesting in terms of resistance but such a study also touches numerous methodological aspects. The hiding places or settlements are mostly located at inaccessible sites. This impedes not only their discovery but also prospective measures or excavations. At hidden, intentionally inconspicuous locations, the features often appear undifferentiated. Thus, the span between a temporary hiding place and a (semi)permanent settlement is quite large. In general, the question arises, how and through which physical manifestations can individuals or collectives in flight or during a migration be distinguished. Holly Norton and Christopher Espenshade (2007, 6–7) discuss possible scenarios for the choice of hiding places and accommodations. “Site locations have been selected […] with concealment […] [or] with defensibility in mind” (Norton/Espenshade 2007, 6–7). This means, “Maroons would have made a concerted effort to reduce their signatures on the landscape”. This primarily concerns the features and “due to lack of building materials and risk of loss to slave hunters, the Maroons likely utilized indestructible, ready-made rock shelters or caves for many of their sites. […] Maroon refuge sites would not have been located on the landforms targeted by normal archaeological survey” (Norton/Espenshade 2007, 6–7). In addition, the precipitation of finds also mirrors this special situation. “Depending on the amount of interaction between the refuge Maroons, enslaved African Caribbeans, freedmen, and others (e.g., pirates), the Maroons may have had limited material possessions”.

With the establishment of stable communities and settlements (“gran maroons”), better research conditions are available, but these also provoke new questions. Which cultural, religious or also ethnic communities or group relations can be interpreted from the materials? What “outside” contacts are perceptible and what changes occurred within the communities?

The methodological possibilities in the search for lodgings and settlement of the maroons can be shown by the example of St. Croix. After 1665, the island was under French rule (French West Indies Company) until it was sold in 1773 to the Danish West Indies Company. Until the abolition of slavery in 1848, the economy of St. Croix was determined by the use of slave labour on sugar cane plantations. St. Croix had a relatively large community of maroons (Hall/Higman 1992; Roopnarine 2010). There is some information about the community in the collective memory as well as in written and cartographic reports (Hopkins 2014), but historical locations are not precisely recorded (Norton/Espenshade 2007). In the northwest part of the island, toponyms such as “maroon ridge” indicate relevant locations. As preparations for planned field studies, Bo Ejstrud (2008) carried out GIS analyses in order to identify settlement locations. Ejstrud used spatial statistical methods, such as cost-surface analyses and viewsheets on the basis of historical maps, written sources and a digital terrain model in
order to discern suitable locations of settlements with the implementation of predictive mapping. Based on the topography and relief, but also the locations of plantations and alleged path routes, he was able to identify a large area measuring 2–2.5 ha on the northeast part of the island. Its protected location offered excellent conditions for corresponding settlements of the maroons. Unfortunately, no excavations have been carried out.

In recent decades, research has particularly increased in South America (Funari/Orser 2015). Besides Brazil, Suriname can be considered to be well investigated. As of 1667, Suriname was a Dutch colony and formed with today’s Guyana the colony of Dutch-Guiana. Its economy was based on the cultivation of sugar cane, coffee, cotton and cocoa. At the end of the 18th century, Dutch-Guiana was divided between France and the United Kingdom. In 1863, slavery was officially abolished. Since the early 20th century, the maroons in Suriname have already been the focus of anthropological and ethnological investigations (de Groot 2009). Much of today’s population descends from the maroons and preserves respective traditions (Hoogbergen 2008; van Stipriaan 2009) that are important for the formation of identity (van Brakel 2012).

In Suriname, the escape of slaves initially began in the form of so-called “petit maroonage”, i.e. the escape of single persons or small groups. From this, the so-called “grande maroonage” developed, i.e. the escape of entire collectives or clans. From the 17th and 18th centuries, a number of maroon trails are known (Fig. 4). The paths in the rainforest followed the natural conditions and were understandably oriented close to river systems. Besides direct flights from the plantations, the capital of Paramaribo offered a suitable starting point. Here, informal and infrastructural networks were active. At the same time, Paramaribo was also the central place where slaves were bought and sold. It is estimated that between 1667 and 1826 more than 300,000 slaves were sold. A clear imbalance existed between the colonial planters and the slaves. This favoured “maroonages”. Historical and anthropological analyses suggest that cultural and ethnic communities were increasingly established over time. Thus, the fugitives seem to have selected specific regions and locations, which offered them the highest level of security. As a result of the maroonage phenomenon, numerous communities were established in the interior that currently exhibit populations ranging from 500–25000 inhabitants (Ngwenyama 2007, 58–60). With the peace between the Dutch colonial masters and the “Ndunya Maroons” in 1760, a period of stabilization and recognition of the autonomous forest settlements was initiated. It can be concluded from the respective contents of the contracts that very little was known about the specific locations and structures of the forest settlements.

With the dissertation of Cheryl Ngwenyama (2007) and reports of Cheryl Ngwenyama (2009, 2010b), studies are available which combine archaeological and ethnoarchaeological research with the analysis of historical sources and oral tradition. In the framework of the “Maroon Heritage Research Project” (MHRP), the rainforest settlements of Tuido and Kumako were investigated. The examinations deal with two locations from the 18th century, which are also significant for the archaeology of maroons beyond Suriname (Goucher/Agorsh 2011, 155–160; Marshall 2014, 293–294). Both sites are located inland ca. 200 km from the coast. Kumako is situated ca. 10 km southwest of the “Prof. van Bloomenstein Lake”. Tuido is located on Tukumuku Creek, one of the tributaries of the Saramaka River. Kumako was known by the Dutch as a settlement since 1713/16, but only sources from 1730 first mention large settlements, which consisted of several villages between 40–300 dwellings. Kumako was excavated in several campaigns between 1999 and 2004. One goal of the work was to examine the relationship and the influences between the indigenous, Afro-American and European groups in terms of their cultural practices. The surveys and excavations are even interesting from a technical perspective, since the areas were completely covered by the jungle, which enabled only small-scale excavations. Both sites are located ca. 75–100 m apart and are parts of a large settlement. Kumako 1 could be examined according to 13 test sections measuring approximately 2 x 2 m each. Kumako 2 is an area measuring ca. 5.6 km² that was further defined by six 15 x 15 m large excavation sections. White (2010b, 474) inter-
interprets Kumako 1 as “areas for domestic activity” and Kumako 2 as a site for “ritual practices”, whereas Ngwenyama (2007) identifies differentiated structures for both sites. The 14-C datings verify the use of the sites between the late 3rd century AD and the early 19th century. The pottery also indicates a use phase of the locations before the occupation of the maroons. At least Kumako 2 appears to have been created with a nearly circular pattern and surrounded by a wall-ditch system (Fig. 5). Due to ethnological parallels, hilly structures are interpreted by Ngwenyama (2007) as the remains of collapsed huts which were often surrounded by a small ditch. It can be referred from contemporary written sources that palisades protected such huts. However, this is difficult to identify not least due to the small areas. Thus, White (2010b, 474) points to comparable features that can be assigned to an indigenous population. Furthermore, at Kumako 2 a centrally located area was examined...
that Ngwenyama (White 2010b) interpreted as a “village square” (Fig. 5). This interpretation is based on ethnoarchaeological comparisons and is supported by the fact that this was the only area completely free of old trees, enabling an almost complete view of the sky. Of importance is a round depression of ca. 3 m² that was dug about 2 m deep into the hill. It is interpreted on the basis of ethnohistorical comparison, ceramic finds and botanical tradition as a place for ritual baths (“Ahgbang”) (White 2010b). Ritual washings can be verified especially among indigenous groups. The adoption of this practice by maroon communities is conceivable. In addition to indigenous ceramics and locally manufactured ceramic goods of maroon communities, there are also ceramic goods from North American or Europe, whereby one must assume differential contexts of use or these can be deduced.

Given this date range, it is legitimately discussed, whether Tuido and Kumako could not have also been settlements of the indigenous “Amazon population” (White 2010b). Ngwenyama (2007, 273–277) negates this with a reference to archaeological and ethno-historical comparisons, but also mentions that the settlements of the maroons are not closed systems. Local contact is quite probable and to be expected. The slaves that fled from the coastal areas passed through unknown and dangerous territory. The construction of stable settlements in the rainforest took place under difficult circumstances and probably did not occur without contact to the indigenous population. However, little is known about the cultural contacts between the freed slaves and the indigenous groups. Historical documents indicate very different reactions. On the one hand, indigenous peoples and maroons were legally equivalent but, on the other hand, they were treated very differently. Reports suggest that the advance of maroons in the rainforest led, in the long run, to migrations of Indians to “more inaccessible” regions. Maroon settlements, such as Kumako, were in some sense “trading posts” for trade or exchange with the colonial world. In this way, European “luxury goods” reached the jungle.

The settlements are, so to speak, islands in a potentially hostile colonial sea. They were protected against external influence and offered the communities internal social and cultural stability. The ritual-spiritual system is cited as a central element of this stability, which mediated protection and safety for the various groups in a quasi pan-African tradition.

Resistance in area I

Both examples result in very different worlds of resistance. In the slave prisons, active resistance was hardly possible. These detention camps were warehouses in the true sense of the word. In them, the notion of race superiority and thus dehumanization materialized. In comparison to prisons and detention camps, similar strategies of maintaining normality in exceptional situations are recognizable. For example, cultural ties play an important role (cf. Pisoni 2013). Specific for Africa, but certainly structurally transferable, is an orientation to forms of spiritual behaviour. In Hoodoo, fears, hopes and wishes are realized.
At the same time, Hoodoo can also function as a system of resistance, both in spiritual and political terms. The religious system enabled new connections and created its own communication channels that were largely sealed for whites. Materiality is only a comparatively small part of cultural practices, which are significantly influenced by orality.

The settlements of freed slaves are conceived as an entirely different category. “Maroon” existence was a means to escape slavery. It was implemented both individually and collectively. The settlements of the maroons—whether temporary or constant—were located in seclusion from the colonial world. At the same time, they were not excluded from colonial perception, since for the slaveholders they were a sign of failed repressive measures and for the slaves a continuous image of (self-)liberation. However, one should refrain from making simple interpretations. The settlements of the maroons were spatially delineated places of refuge for the black African population. However, they also seem to have sometimes offered refuge to other cultural or ethnic groups. Examples from Surinam also verify a complex network of exchange relationships with various degrees for the scope of action of the different actors.

“THICK DESCRIPTION”: ARCHAEOLOGY OF A PROTEST CAMP

Since the beginning of the 20th century, protest camps have often been realized as isomorphic socio-spatial forms of protest. They stand for the idea of productive power in collective action and are an expression of social movements. Protests can relate to individual topics or places, projects or institutions, but also crosslink different economic and cultural spaces across local, regional and national boundaries. Examples of trans-local movements include the peace, women, ecology and anti-nuclear movements of the 1970s and 1980s, but also the occupy-movement or the “Arab Spring” (Kraushaar 2012; Décieux/Nachtwey 2014; Geiges 2014).

Protest camps are not exclusively an expression of political conditions but are also a manifestation of alternative lifestyles and economies. These accompany processes of identity formation. A protest camp can in many ways be regarded as a continuation of demonstrations or occupations since they serve the establishment of a protest over a longer period of time and provide a tangible and an intangible infrastructure for the protesters. They differ from direct actions, such as site occupations, or from wagon barricades and other forms of alternative housing. In common, however, is that they each need an infrastructure in the form of basic services (such as water, food, waste disposal and energy).

Protest camps can arise in a spontaneous and unorganized manner, but also as planned actions. Moreover, they are normally public and not usually screened. This does not mean that they are accessible to everyone. Protest camps are exposed to publicity through the media and depend on the media for the articulation of their protests. Just as with demonstrations or more short-term occupations, the response from the public is dependent on a variety of external and internal factors. Because camps do not only serve as the expression of immediate protest but also have rather longer-term quality, they can develop a momentum that is not always easy to control. Thus, they have great symbolic significance. By claiming not only space but also a great amount of time, they gain attention. Protest camps create temporary spaces of the political and encompass many dimensions of social identity. Even if they have a priority issue (“anti-nuclear”, “cruise-missile”), they usually offer space for numerous topics and groups. As temporary space, camps are typically located at the places against which the protest is directed. In principle, protest camps are a peaceful form of resistance, which can, however, turn into active, possibly violent resistance upon eviction. Protest camps—as varied as they are at the core—are characterized by a number of common features.

The archaeology of protest camps is usually an archaeology of contemporary times, which operates not only with archaeological methods but also with a wide range of approaches of (empirical) cultural sciences. For archaeolo-
gists, protest camps are significant objects of study for a number of reasons. In particular, they are significant as they constitute space over specific time periods. They are committed to the creation of certain identities that can be understood as counter-proposals to the target of the protests. Numerous factors are reflected in the materiality of protest camps: temporal limitations, specific collective identities, organisational forms and the access to resources and infrastructures. In this regard, the study of protest camps with archaeological means is significant in two respects. On the one hand, the analysis of the materiality of the camps is a contribution to the sociology and ethnology of the forms of protest. On the other hand, important methodological insights into the structures and processes of temporally and spatially limited stays of smaller groups or collectives can be gained.

Studies on the materiality of (protest) camps are still rare (Badcock/Johnson 2013). However, this is not likely due to a lack of scientific acceptance but rather to the specific character of protest camps. After the abandonment of or eviction from a protest camp, gen-
eraly little evidence of a protest remains, particularly if a camp was built in a densely populated area.

Most notably, protest camps became a focus of archaeology by the work of the English archaeologist John Schofield. He became aware of them in the context of studies concerning relics of the Cold War. The joint project on Greenham Common is known, whereby interviews were conducted and further sources were consulted in addition to an excavation (Fiorato 2007; Schofield 2009, 99–111; Schofield/Anderton 2000). Greenham Common was a Royal Air Force base in Berkshire, Great Britain from 1942–1992 and played an important role during the Cold War. In the 1980s, a protest against the stationing of “cruise missiles” formed directly at the location. In particular, the “Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp”, established in 1981 and at the same time part of the feminist movement, became internationally known, among other things, because only women were allowed access to the camp. The camp existed until the 2000s. At the beginning of the year 2000, a “Commemorative and Historic Site” was established that existed until 2013.

Another example is the protest camp of Lees Cross/Endcliff of Stanton Moor near Matlock, Derbyshire, Great Britain. It is a camp of the late 1990s, which was primarily driven by the ecology movement. The trigger of the protest was an announcement of the Stancliffe Stone Company. It intended to reopen the stone quarries to mine high-quality sandstone. In order to achieve this, the company claimed old mining rights. The mining area is located in a national park and would have affected not only the fragile ecosystem, but also a Bronze Age stone circle (“Nine Ladies”). The latter was also used by new pagans as a spiritual site. Starting in 1999, activists built a camp, which consisted mainly of tents, caravans and tree houses on an area of 32 ha. At times, the camp was inhabited by up to 80 people. It had an extensive infrastructure and stood out not least by having its own zip code. The protests lasted over nine years. The company first dispensed with exploitation after a long legal battle. In 2007, the last activists left the site and the camp was abandoned. Fieldwork was carried out in the following years (Badcock/Johnston 2009; Badcock/Johnston 2013).

### The Nevada test site and the protest camp

In the following, an overview of the “Nevada Test Site” (NTS) grounds and the “peace camp” in front of its gates will be provided (Fig. 6–7). The latter was the focus of an interdisciplinary project, which is regarded as a successful example of the analysis of a protest camp (Beck et al. 2007; 2008; Schofield 2006; 2009, 75–86; C. Beck 2014). The peace camp was one of the “hot spots” of the US-American anti-nuclear movement up into the 1990s (Futrell/Brents 2003). The “Nevada National Security Site”, also referred to as the “Nevada Test Site” (NTS) until 2010, has an expanse of ca. 3500 km² and is located in a secluded desert landscape some 100 km northwest of Las Vegas. From 1951–1992, more than 1000 nuclear weapons tests were carried out on the premises, of which 119 were performed above ground until 1958 (Fehner/Gosling 2000; NTS 2005; Beck 2002). The NTS terrain was originally settlement lands of the “western Shoshone” Indians. Since the 1950s, the site was systematically expanded and accommodated ca. 1100 buildings, four landing strips for airplanes and helicopters and an extensive road system. The entrance to NTS was located in the city of Mercury, which was a base for scientists and the military and at times counted up to 10,000 inhabitants. The terrain is divided into 30 so-called “areas”, which partly had specific tasks and special buildings, test facilities, etc. The tests began in 1951 with the so-called Ranger series, which was the first nuclear weapons test series that was carried out on the territory of the United States after the Trinity-Test in 1945. For Las Vegas, the tests devel-

7 [http://www.greenhamwpc.org.uk/historic.htm].
can Order, pacifists, veterans of the nuclear programme, those affected by the fallout (downwinders) and the Shoshone Indians also took part in the protests. The “Nevada-Semipalatinsk” movement brought activists from the USA and Kazakhstan together, and spiritually or environmentally motivated groups, such as the group “Mother Earth”, are also to be mentioned. Just as varied as the activists were the forms of resistance. These included religious services, spiritual ceremonies and prayers of Christian and indigenous religious communities, as well as demonstrations, teach-ins or “walks” to the main entrance. Direct actions, which resulted in the delay of at least one nuclear test, have also been reported. In the late 1980s, discussions within the groups were carried out regarding the forms and strategies of resistance, which also dealt with questions concerning violent resistance. The latter was addressed in the context of respective governmental reprisals (Futrell/Brents 2003, 754). Overall, the protests remained non-violent and occurred within a performative process in a certain sense. A memorandum in 1992 sealed the end of the NTS, although the American government had already considered the setup of a permanent disposal repository in the neighboring Yucca Mountains since 1987. Futrell and Brents (Futrell/Brents 2003, 759–760) consider various reasons why no violent protests or sabotage actions occurred at the NTS. On the one hand, the long duration of the protests and a certain ritualization of the conflicts on both sides played a role. On the other hand, sabotage actions at nuclear facilities are involved with non-assessable risks for everyone involved.

The record of resistance at the NTS is comprehensive and can represent the source variety and heterogeneity of knowledge formats and the base of knowledge for the archaeology of current times. Included are not only the materials but above all the oral, visual and written sources, which are usually not archived or processed. The “Nevada Test Site Oral History Project” is an attempt to save this body of
knowledge from being forgotten. In the scope of this project, numerous interviews were conducted between 2003 and 2008. The selection primarily considered participants of the 1980s. Scientists as well as engineers, workers, military and federal officials were interviewed. In addition, “Native Americans” and their spiritual leaders, activists and demonstrators of the different protest groups were also interviewed. Furthermore, residents within the vicinity of the NTS area and particularly in the fallout areas (“downwinder”) were also included in the interview process. The collection includes not only transcripts of the interviews but also documents, photographs, and audio and video clips. Moreover, a number of websites were created by activists, which represent a collective memory and individual accounts of the protests particularly of the late 1980s.

The protest camp itself was located south of the central entrance of the NTS and was separated from it by the highway, which ran in almost east-west direction. Since the protest or peace camp did not have any boundaries in a proper sense, it is difficult to provide information about its size. Due to surveys, Schofield specifies an expansion of ca. 240 ha (Fig. 7). This area was established since the 1950s as a location for protests, meetings, events, and for overnight stays. The uncultivated desert land was in public ownership. On the living conditions, James Donald Merlino states “And so, that was where they had the camp when they was out there for four or five days. They would camp right in the sagebrush. There was no water. There were sand huts but that was all. It was tough living.”

The camp was named the “protesters camp” by the participants and the media up into the 1980s (C. Beck et al. 2007, 299). During the 1980s, the camp was increasingly denoted as “peace camp”. Different activists and groups of various political, social and ecological orientations met there annually. The span of the groups extends from “new age representatives” to anti-nuclear groups, peace initiatives and the Shoshone as indigenous representatives. The activities at the “peace camp” were varied, often not centrally coordinated and frequently spontaneous. From the sources it is known that the protests were seasonal and temporary until the late 1970s (Futrell/Brents 2003). With the rise of the movement in the 1980s, it was decided to carry out activities at the peace camp all year round. For this purpose, two “trailers” were installed, in which at least one person lived for a longer period of time. In 1989, the trailers were cleared and the hitherto existing “old camp” was disbanded. Already in March 1988, a ten-day mass protest occurred at which more than 8000 people participated. In connection with the action “Reclaim the Test Site”, more than 1,200 protesters were arrested in one day. After the clearing of the old camp, the “new camp” was organized further to the east. Paul Colbert, the “program director of the Nevada Desert Experience”, recalls the “old camp” as follows: “The line is down half-way to Mercury, which is where the old camp was, and that used to be where the protests were held. And so when they talk among themselves about crossing the line, they think somebody’s down in there a ways.”

While the extension of the site could be quite well circumscribed during the surveys, there are quite different assessments in the memories of those interviewed concerning the location and size of the new peace camp. The interview that Suzanne Becker (SB) performed with Dorothy (Day) Ciarlo (DC) is revealing: “[SB] Now this camp, was this set up outside of Mercury on the highway, do you remember? [DC] My recollection is it was inside, but they couldn’t have been. [SB] Well, behind the line. I mean it’s still on the other side of the property? [DC] It had to be behind the line, yes. [SB] I’m just wondering if it’s the same – there is a little area that is now known as Peace Camp up there where throughout the eighties and the nineties when the protests were really

---
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12 Interview with Paul Colbert, July 12, 2004. [http://digital.library.unlv.edu/u?/nts,1224].
picked up again, is where everybody camped and the hub of activity was. I’m just wondering if this is possibly the same location. [DC] It might be. I know that this camp was not far from this guard station and where the people that were committing civil disobedience actually walked into the site, and then of course they were arrested immediately. Others, such as David Buer (“Nevada Desert experience staff”) are surprised about the size and location of the camp: “I was surprised at how close to the major highway it was. I was surprised at how close the gates were and the town of Mercury being there [...]. So you had the Peace Camp area, it was a smaller area where the people were actually staying, but then there was this extended area and you might have people who would set up tents a little bit more remote.” In addition to the results of the survey, the interviews and photos provide more information about the route maps. On a map of the Desert Waves AG dated around 1988, the camp is only roughly specified, but the entrance area of the NTS (Fig. 8) is provided in detail. The “official” map from 1987 (Fig. 9), however, specifies different areas of the peace camp. The “tranquility base” is marked with a green flag, and the “art’s camp” and the “Dept. of Peace” are noted as central “institutions.” An elevation in the west is noted as “Sugar Mountain” (red flag), which, however, is not identical with “Pagoda Hill.” Furthermore, a “camping” area and a car park are mentioned.

The surveys were carried out according to the normal sequence of an archaeological prospection. During two campaigns in 2002, 771 finds and features were measured and documented for an area of about 240 ha. By means of the documented “features,” the diversity of the groups and the forms of protest are clearly reflected, but also the conditions of conservation. It is obvious that stationary constructions are the most durable features and a majority of them were stone constructions. There are foundations for sculptures or flags, enclosures for areas, such as tent camping sites or path boundaries, as well as individually standing stoves or other structures. These are partly documented on contemporary photos (Fig. 10).

In addition, even “negative” features are remarkable. These include areas that were systematically cleared of stones and boulders and served as sleeping or resting places. Rarely encountered were features and finds made of
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13 Interview with Dorothy (Day) Ciarlo, August 18, 2005. [http://digital.library.unlv.edu/u?/nts,1281].
14 Interview with David Buer, August 9, 2006. [http://digital.library.unlv.edu/u?/nts,1177].
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During the survey, geoglyphs were most frequently identified. These stone structures characterize the protesters and their protests through their richness in variety. The geoglyphs include peace signs and chi-rho symbols, as well as spirals, flowers and snake images. Often, however, stone circles are exhibited, whose meaning cannot be deciphered without further analysis. Apart from daily waste, the find material also includes objects that can be associated with the diverse activities and were consciously “deposited” or simply lost. These include the remnants of masks, crystal stones or so-called “dreamcatchers”. Objects identified as “dreamcatch-

---


---

*Fig. 9.* Nevada Test Site, Nevada/USA. "Official" Peace Camp Map 1987. [http://peacecampnts.blogspot.de/2011_04_01_archive.html].

*Fig. 10.* Nevada Test Site, Nevada/USA. Rock foundations for sculptures or flags.
“rock garden”) for the activist Ben Linder, who was killed in Nicaragua in 1987. At this stone setting, numerous objects were placed, which are to be regarded as gifts or had commemorative function (C. Beck et al. 2007, 305 fig. 17). Also no longer present or considered unimportant was the “Porta loo”, a mobile toilet unit, which was donated by the authorities. Due to its fate, symbolic destruction and transformation into a sign of resistance can be read. The chemical toilet was “filled” with rubble. By its installation at a central point of the camp, it underwent a transformation into a sign of resistance.

Next to both camps, “Pagoda Hill” – a 150 m high elevation located in the southwest of the area – formed much more than a terrain marking point (Fig. 7). It became a centre for political and spiritual activities. The hill provided an overview of the NTS along with the city of Mercury. Although Pagoda Hill was important for the activists, it is only mentioned in one interview and is referred to here as a “lookout”20. This may characterize the problems of oral tradition. Was the area present to such a great extent in the communal memory that it was not necessary to mention it, or was its importance only restricted to certain times or groups? This presumption is contradicted by the surveys (C. Beck et al. 2007, 308–312). They provided a variety of features and finds. These are associated with ceremonial activities and support the interpretation that Pagoda Hill served as a focal point for ritual activities.

This is indicated by a female figure made of red clay that was found during the survey. The face of the figure is covered with ulcers and it carries a necklace with the inscription “DOE Nuke Waste Dump” (C. Beck et al. 2007, 311 fig. 17.12). Oral tradition and objective sources, however, correspond with regard to the “Shadow Children”. Here, we are dealing with two figures, which were found during the survey (Shofield/Cocroft 2007). The children, shown in a crouching position, were found lying in an oval stone circle (Fig. 12). Rose-
mary Lynch, sister of the Franciscan Order and one of the founders of the "Nevada Desert Experience," recalls: "An artist made two figures, a black child and a white child, out of some kind of plastic material. Beautiful. And we went far up into the mountain area out there, and we had this ceremony. We called them the Shadow Children. And with time and rain and wind they disintegrated, but somewhere I have the photo of that, just that unknown monument to the children who had been hurt through nuclear testing." Elsewhere, the nun explains: "we had a ceremony installing them kind of up on the mountain near the test site," which could possibly indicate Pagoda Hill. David Buer from the Nevada Desert Experience also recalls the Shadow Children and provides insights on the camp: "And then even further out you have peace signs made out of white rocks that were found or pictures. Near the Shadow Children there were pictures of loved ones, who'd been affected by testing, put out on the rocks ceremoniously and lovingly, and people would leave their names and other mementos." Just as the geoglyphs provide excellent insights on the materiality of the actions, the interviews show the various aspects of actions beyond their physical characteristics.

Other objects associated with the events are only transmitted in photographs. Among them is a sculpture of a naked pregnant woman, who was set up on Mother's Day 1987 (Fig. 13). In addition, the "Blessed Yucca of the Four Spirits" (Fig. 14) shows that protest was captured in materiality here with an emphasis on transcendence. The performative action "Princesses against Plutonium" in 1988 appears to have left little trace. Whether the masks found during the surveys are similar to the ones worn by the activists of "Princesses against Plutonium" remains a topic for further research. The performance of the drama group from San Francisco appears to be no longer present in the memories of the interviewees, although a photo of a "princess" was published in the media (Fig. 15). The picture of Richard Misrach represents a very specif-
to the NST and the drainage tunnel under the highway (Beck et al. 2008). The latter provided a path to the entrance of the NTS if one did not want to cross the highway. In the tunnel, a lot of graffiti remains (Fig. 16) which was not mentioned in the interviews. The graffiti is currently being evaluated (Beck et al. 2015). In contrast, attention is drawn to the entrance of the NTS, which appears to have had both practical and symbolic meaning for the activists. James Donald Merlino, Nye County Lieutenant, remembers just as the activists, who broke into the grounds: “They would come into Mercury and we’ d catch them in Mercury. I don’t remember any damage, very little graffiti or any of that kind of stuff”25.

Resistance in area II

At protest camps, politics are exhibited by every day, physically-representational and especially spatial aspects. The areas of protest camps are spaces of multiple social practices, but they mainly produce a sense of belonging that arises not only on the part of the protesters but also on the part of the subjects of the protest. The NTS and its diverse record transmission represent very different aspects of the research on material forms and scopes of action. An archaeological investigation of resistance can only be successful if the concept of materiality is widely defined and the discourses on resistance are analysed according to rules of production, which are followed by those of materiality. In its historical dimensionality, the NTS and the peace camp stand for the dialectic of social movements of the 20th century. In spatial terms, the camps already marked the other and the elsewhere. The people within the peace camps were located – at least for a time – outside of the legitimate order and were thus bound more closely to each other. The camp, built for the purpose of resistance and non-violent actions, was also a place for “social experiments”. In the materi-

Fig. 14. Nevada Test Site, Nevada/USA. Blessed Yucca of the Four Spirits. [http://peacecampts.blogspot.de/2011_04_01_archive.html].

Fig. 15. Nevada Test Site, Nevada/USA. Princess of Plutonium, Nuclear Test Site, Nevada, 1988 [photo: Richard Misrach]. [http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft8g-5008gg&chunk.id=d0e11502&toc.depth=1&toc.id=d0e11351&brand=ucpress].
ality of the site, group-specific patterns are just as tangible as general trends in society. General expressions of communication are discernible, such as graffiti, and specific protest forms, such as the Shadow Children or chi-ro signs, can be identified. It is also clear that the parallel record of events can have very diverse forms and the associated transtextuality produces specific narratives. One is inclined to let material tradition fall into the background behind other records, but the different strands of tradition are nevertheless clearly visible.

Protest camps are simultaneously “contested spaces”. They represent areas that are associated with disputes, contradictions and contrasts. In fact, the contrasts could not be greater: here, a camp measuring ca. 20 km², there testing grounds nearly 4000 km² large; here tents and a provisional infrastructure, there planned high technology; here often spontaneous actions and protest forms, there a research program that has been planned for years. “Contested space” also means the realization of memory about the appropriation of space. This is also well demonstrated on the basis of protest camps and the NTS. It is not only the long period of use and protest, during which unique performativity developed. Rather, in both geographical locations fundamental and contrasting notions of political responsibility in a global perspective were manifested. Thus, nuclear tests appear to be a guarantor of world security and democracy according to governmental perspectives, while the activists refer to their responsibility towards society and their descendants and emphasize indigenous origins. However, it would be too simplistic, if protest camps are reduced to pure dichotomies. In this sense, Christian Scholl (2012) discussed “contested spaces” in conjunction with protests against the World Economic Summits and demonstrated the entanglement of both. This also applies to NTS. The materiality of the NTS and the peace camps appears to be influenced by contrasts, but in interviews and further memories the hybrid narrative becomes clear. Employees of the NTS appreciated – at least in retrospect – and indirectly sympathized with the activists.

Protest camps are similar to “short-term events”. According to their archaeological formation processes, they are comparable to battlefields, but also festivals (A.S. Beck et al. 2007; Flere-Risbuna 2012; White 2013) or the living space of non-sedentary persons (Zimmermann 2013). With regard to their structures, settlements and economic forms that are based on mobility can also be mentioned. This includes nomadism, transhumance or pastoralism in recent, sub-recent or also prehistoric societies. It is also worth questioning, if comparable feature and find structures also appear, for example, overnight or as resting places, places of waste disposal or food preparation. In methodological terms, protest camps can be categorized between singularly visited places and places of seasonal use. With its 50-year history of usage, the NTS is rather an exception and therefore reveals methodological problems. Only the dense record makes it possible to distinguish continuities and breaches of usage and forms of action. Many aspects are not reflected in material features, others cannot be categorized without further information. Nevertheless, this does not mean that archaeological research cannot make a substantive contribution. It rather points out that only a dense description of the fragmentarily transmitted image of all singular source groups enables clarification in its entirety.

Fig. 16. Nevada Test Site, Nevada/USA. Graffiti inside the tunnel. [http://3.bp.blogspot.com/-YhpM1szgYwE/T4l1gtcUC9I/AAAAAAAABKg/wrk_ie6GNo/s1600/DSCF9483.JPG].
Materiality of Resistance

From the perspective of an object-oriented science such as archaeology, protest and resistance are manifested not only from texts, signs and discourse but also in things and materiality. Objects are active players in negotiation processes. Things acquire their own capacity for action in specific relations and exchange processes between subjects and objects. Things obtain a history and are central not only for the “identity formation” of subjects. They can even be memory-forming.

The compaction of sources and the increasing parallelism of different sources are characteristic features of archaeologies of historical epochs. Thus, perspectives are not only widened but they require transdisciplinary discourse. Particularly in recent times, technical and methodological approaches used by archaeologists are not classically characterized by excavations, but use a wide range of cultural studies approaches, whose common denominator is based on investigations of materiality in all its manifestations.

A remaining fundamental question is the comparability and transferability of presented analyses in association with earlier epochs. The latter include medieval and early historical periods as well as prehistoric societies. This question cannot be answered in general and is ultimately dependent on the scientific orientation of a researcher. Certainly, we are dealing with highly complex pre-modern, modern and post-modern societies in general and capitalistic industrial societies in particular, which are only partially comparable with prehistoric or ancient societies. From an anthropological or cross-cultural comparative perspective, the phenomena discussed here are structurally similar without implying that their historical path dependencies are negated. In my view, the chosen examples can at the same time be used as “reference systems”, which render certain human behaviours comprehensible across epochs and societies. Not least, dense transmission provides a corrective. Oral, written and visual sources can be positively correlated with materiality or even confirm specific cases. Historical archaeology is often confronted with the accusation that certain acts and structures are not reflected in substantive traditions or no significant gains are achieved by archaeology. This is certainly true in some cases and is also repeatedly evident in the examples discussed here. A dense parallel record is admittedly no guarantee that “everything is known”. Thus, actions represented by materiality may occasionally appear to be completely different, are simply not mentioned in written or visual records or are no longer available in the memories of actors.

The examples exhibit very individual forms and scenes of action. At Joseph Bruin’s slave prison, no tangible protest or resistance is identifiable. But behaviours become tangible, for example, with the proven magical practices that were well-known among the actors and provided a degree of stability for the individuals and the collective. The reference to ritual and religious acts and/or a corresponding metaphysic can also be associated with an appeal to the appropriate authorities to improve the current situation or to punish the torturers. The residential sites and settlements of the maroons are, however, a result of resistance, which manifests itself, among other things, as the consequence of escape attempts from the plantations. Here, resistance obtains space and forms identities, which are still present until today. The Nevada Peace Camp is certainly the most immediate form of protest among the examples presented here. Protest culture is “within reach” and the cause of the protests is directly visible. At the same time, the forms of protest are extremely various. In particular, the peace camp shows that materiality is one side of a protest, but that it cannot simply be equated with the preservation of the material.

Social movements are comprised of people in motion with their special performativities and corporeality. Spaces are occupied by means of common social practices. Whether at a slave prison, settlements of maroons or the Nevada Peace Camp: the respective players shape and create places and spaces for a time, which are initially characterized by contradictions. The slave camp described here was located in the middle of the city of Alexandria, and was equally a known and an unknown place for the white population. As a “warehouse”, it was a place where the racist ideology of the inequality and superiority of race was materialized economically. The sanctuaries of the maroons
represented a reversal of the latter. They were hidden places that were geographically but also culturally and socially based on detachment. They were located outside of the colonial society of the white planters, but were present in the perception of the planters as spaces of resistance. The peace camp can be categorized apart from both the slave camp and the maroon sanctuaries. It was located immediately outside of the test site and was created and developed in contrast to it. This is reflected in the organization and structures of life at the peace camp and the test site as well as directly in the distinction between activists and “employees”. Just as the protesters had no access to the test site, their opponents were also formally denied access to the camp.

Resistance and protest are based on different assessments of domination and its legitimacy. Even if domination and resistance represent a contrastive pair, they are not only mutually dependent but are also interwoven. This is also clear from the examples presented here. At least multiple spaces are generated in part that do not necessarily exist from the contrast between “black” and “white”, “slave” and “colonial master” or “peace activists” and “test proponents”. In a somewhat different perspective, resistance manifests itself on very different scales. The abolition movement supported the ransoming of slaves, just as the maroons depended on a network that was not only supported by slaves. The protests against the NTS also found understanding among the employees of the test site and were differentially evaluated among different social groups. Not least, the different forms of remembrance about resistance are put into perspective with the examples provided here. Today, the “Joseph Bruin Jail” is a memorial site about the period of slavery in Virginia. The settlements and the culture of the maroons in Suriname or St. Croix are preserved in the collective memory of the descendants of the self-freed slaves – the maroon people – and equally play a role, for example, in the identity of the Republic of Suriname. A very special remembrance culture becomes tangible at the Nevada Test Site grounds. The peace camp is mainly present in the memories of those involved during the time of protests or is passed on by means of oral history projects. However, the test site – even more than the camp of the peace activists – appears to stand as a witness to a world that was inspired by the belief in the peacemaking power of the atomic bomb. Research by historical archaeology on the materiality of protest and resistance is thus not only an engagement with methodological concepts and issues but also concerns one’s own position to a far greater extent than in other subject areas.
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