

Chapter 1

Introduction

Plantation owners...have not left documents telling us what they thought about slavery, and slaves have left few documents at all.

(Cooper 1981, p. 271)

When you play the flute in Zanzibar, all Africa, as far as the Lakes, dances Nineteenth-century East African proverb (This proverb is common, and is cited in Craster (1913, p. 127) and Ingrams (1967/[1931], p. 6), among other works)

Zanzibar, in the nineteenth-century, was a global place. Following a thousand years of previous complex Indian Ocean trading networks, the economy of Zanzibar had shifted to include a much wider array of trading vessels and goods (Sheriff 2010). Expeditions from Zanzibar, such as those of the missionary David Livingstone, and the explorers Sir Richard Burton and Henry Morton Stanley, were famous in Europe and America for lurid tales of adventures through Eastern Africa. The routes traveled by these men were not carved out through an impassable geography. They traveled along well-known caravan routes, accompanied by men and women who frequently traveled these same routes, often making their lifelong livelihood from them (Rockel 2006a). Having come under the control of Oman by the early nineteenth-century, Zanzibar became rich from the profits of the caravan trade in ivory and slaves. Here lies the origin of the proverb, “When you play the flute in Zanzibar, all Africa... dances.” Caravan routes running west from the coast and connecting large areas of Eastern and East Central Africa were connected through the port of Zanzibar.

Zanzibar was not only a growing international trading entrepôt. With wealth from caravan trades flowing in to the islands, many Omani merchants and local elite indigenous Swahili began to invest money in new forms of agricultural production: the plantation. Three main regions of plantation activity developed on the Sp. East African coast during the nineteenth-century: grain plantations near Mombasa and Malindi, in present day Kenya; sugar plantations near Pangani, in present day Tanzania; and clove and coconut plantations on the islands of Zanzibar (Cooper 1977; Glassman 1995). The development of plantation agriculture in this region emerged

Fig. 1.1 Clove trees on a contemporary plantation



from the particularities of Islamic colonialism in the area, and through global and Indian Ocean large-scale economic networks.

In this book, I examine the archaeology of clove plantations (Fig. 1.1), at once a familiar and unfamiliar topic for historical archaeologists. Familiar in that plantation archaeology has long been a mainstay of the discipline, as has the investigation of global capitalism. Unfamiliar in that this is a study of Eastern Africa, and of islands that were closely linked in to the Middle East. While recent studies have tried to globalize historical archaeology (Baram and Carroll 2002; Falk 1991; Orser 1996), the majority of work remains tied to North America and Europe, with increasing amounts of work in West Africa (DeCorse 2001; Gijanto 2011; Monroe and Ogundiran 2012; Norman 2009a) and South Africa (Hall 2000; Klose and Malan 2000; Schrire 1995). Colonialism, when discussed in reference to African archaeological contexts, usually appears to be axiomatic with European global dominance. In both West Africa and South Africa, the colonial period means simply European colonialism.

While West African historical archaeologists are increasingly turning to consider the internal power structures of West African Kingdoms (Norman 2009b; Monroe 2010), archaeologists working in Eastern Africa tend not to embrace the label of “historical archaeology” as it is used in this volume. The reasons for this draw in part from the fact that historical documentation for the coast goes back over a millennia. Those sites encompassed within “Swahili” archaeology running back to the late first millennium AD are discussed as broadly forming a part of African historical archaeology. The presence of chronicles tied to different towns and travelers account link historical texts and archaeological sites here, making the claim of historical archaeology possible (Reid and Lane 2004a). But the development of specifically historical archaeology—a field tied to periods of European colonialism onward (in this case, after the arrival of the Portuguese at the close of the fifteenth century), has been a smaller field in Eastern Africa. Some early work recorded key sites associated with European colonialism from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, and Omani colonialism of the nineteenth-century (Kirkman 1974; Lane 1993). But until recently, there has been little attempt to examine specific changes relating to later colonial periods—whether these be European or Omani—on the

coast. In this book, I take a comparative framework, placing Eastern African plantation sites from the nineteenth-century alongside those of the Atlantic World. There have been significant doubts voiced as to the utility of such comparison in this field (Schmidt and Walz 2007), and indeed the claims of coherent comparison by historical archaeologists have been challenged in various ways (Funari et al. 1999; Moreland 2001). But, I argue that such comparisons are useful for our understanding of this region, and by using historical archaeology as an intellectual framework for understanding Eastern African plantations, this study also does the work of pushing forward postcolonial perspectives into the field. Through an explicit engagement with the social archaeology of capitalism on plantation sites in this book, I not only analyze the social relations of Zanzibaris, I also explore how these might allow us to more sharply delineate the specific conditions of European rule in other areas of the world. In this way, comparison serves to both consolidate nineteenth-century archaeological comparisons and fragment a totalizing narrative of capitalism and colonialism, as they played out on European-controlled plantations (see also Croucher and Weiss 2011).

Global Historical Archaeology

The study of clove plantations begins to open up key questions as to how archaeologies of Eastern Africa might contribute to the broad field of global historical archaeology. East African plantations were unusual; they were a part of global capitalist formations, in that they produced a commodity (cloves) for a global market. Simultaneously, they emerged from East African and Middle Eastern social and economic contexts. Omani immigrants and East African Swahili elites began to plant crops, and by the mid-nineteenth-century, the Zanzibari landscape was a plantation landscape. The plantation owners were Muslims, not European colonists. However, in the *longue durée* of plantation history (long-term historical structures, going back several hundred years), Muslim plantations in Eastern Africa and European plantations worldwide had the same antecedents. These all began in the Middle East; European plantations drew on the Islamic Mediterranean for the basic forms and technical knowledge of what eventually became sugar plantations in the Caribbean (Curtin 1998, p. 5; Mintz 1985, p. 27). By the eighteenth century, date plantations were established in Oman, drawing on Middle Eastern agricultural innovations, greatly intensifying land use in the area (Mershen 2001).

Studying clove plantations therefore allows us to interrogate the nature of plantations in capitalist periods. In addressing the archaeology of plantations, capitalism has been a central theme; plantations from the seventeenth century onward have been seen to represent the development of capitalist modes of production (Bell 2005; Delle 1998). The extent to which capitalism may be understood to have been fully developed within a plantation system utilizing slave labor has been debated by various scholars, as I discuss later in this book. Powerful arguments have been put forward with regard to the ways in which the landscapes and modes of production,

particularly on sugar plantations in the Caribbean, were imbued with logics of capitalist production (Mintz 1985). Later, as plantations developed, growing a range of crops, including cotton, the driving force of industrial transformations in shaping plantations cannot be ignored (Reidy 1995). On Zanzibar, the situation was a little different. In a classic scheme of capitalist development, merchant capitalism would be understood as the dominant economic structure in place on Zanzibar during the nineteenth-century. Much of the wealth which allowed plantations to be first developed came directly from a thriving caravan trade in ivory and slaves (Sheriff 1987). Framing the economic basis of Zanzibar's economy in these terms allows for an understanding of a teleological narrative of development: plantations were fundamentally part of an economic formation which always already precedes that of industrial capitalism. Thus, while the very mercantile trade which sustained the Zanzibari economy was driven by demand for goods in industrialized North America and Europe, East Africa is denied coequality vis-à-vis other locations of capitalist production during the nineteenth-century.

Bracketing off nineteenth-century Zanzibar into a developmental stage such as "merchant capitalism" creates problems. The mode of production did not exist in a vacuum. Ivory and gum copal, two of the raw materials traded out of Zanzibar, were in demand for industrially produced goods. Ivory was made into billiard balls and piano keys, and gum copal was turned into varnish for such purposes of finishing railroad carriages (Shayt 1993; Sunseri 2007). Enslaved Africans were sold into the Middle East but were also sold to a growing European market, occasionally sent to the Americas, as well as taken to plantations on the Mascarene Islands and elsewhere in the Indian Ocean (Austen 1988). What did this mean for Zanzibar? Older historical studies which addressed plantations found the economy to be one of merchant capitalism, with client-patron systems still at the heart of much economic activity (Cooper 1977; Sheriff 1987). More recently, historians have become interested in the way that we might view Eastern Africa as more fully participating in global economic networks (Prestholdt 2004, 2008). This approach forces the question of how archaeology might contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the social and economic relations of clove plantations.

Space and landscape have been a central focus of historical archaeologists interested in capitalism. Those who study industrialization have noted the manner in which space is often used to help control laborers in particular ways (Casella 2005; Mrozowski 2006; Shackel 1996). Those in power gained the ability to watch over and supervise laborers, and they were also increasingly able to control the time at and duration for which they were working. This was not simply a matter of efficiency, but a way through which a particular kind of capitalist subjectivity was created (Thompson 1967). Understanding that this was also in operation on plantations in part helps us to understand the way in which the subjectivities of (enslaved) laborers and plantation owners existed within a capitalist formation. Analyzing capitalism also allows us to investigate the reaction of subaltern laborers to the system and their participation in these landscapes of labor. We may see alternative landscapes for workers which highlight their everyday resistance (Beaudry et al. 1991; Orser and Funari 2001). Capitalist landscapes are many and varied, but understanding the

way in which space was utilized on Zanzibari plantations allows for an examination of the underlying economic and social logics of Omani planters. They were not simply in a developmental stage of mercantile capitalism. Clove plantation owners were part of a specific historical context. While far from the industrialized world, Zanzibaris did travel widely, including to Europe and America (Prestholdt 2008). The goods that plantation owners and traders were producing were sold to an international array of merchants. Cloves were regularly sold to Asian markets, but it would be wrong to assume that these areas were in any way less affected by global economic forces than Zanzibar was. A world systems theory approach might place regions in relations of dependency and interconnected webs (Crowell 1997; Wallerstein 1976). But this still leaves us to assume that Zanzibar trails on behind North America and Europe. This far-flung colonial locale is viewed in a modified form of the views taken by British administrators of the late nineteenth-century: Eastern Africa in the nineteenth-century is seen as behind the West in terms of development. This type of geographic imagery plagues the field of historical archaeology. Coeval contexts—those places which exist at the same time, such as Zanzibar and North America in the 1870s—are often not properly recognized as such (Fabian 2002/[1983]). To fully analyze socio-cultural contexts of Zanzibar during the nineteenth-century, a new approach must be taken to the capitalist geographies of nineteenth-century globalization. This should, as the geographer Doreen Massey (2005, p. 83) has pointed out, not assume that globalization is an outward spread from the West across a passive surface of space. Instead, “It is a making of space(s), an active reconfiguration of meeting-up through practices and relations of a multitude of trajectories.” Tackling the global connections of capitalism in the nineteenth-century in this way through plantations seems to offer up exciting routes for thinking about the nature of global colonialism and capital. This approach does not assume a linear trajectory of development in which particular stages (merchant, industrial) will be passed through, but instead sees a messier terrain of capitalist formations which draw in different influences into *multiple* formations.

Thinking of plantations in this way raises the fact that landscapes of production are not a given. While one must have trees, and the type of ground needed to grow them, there are many ways in which a clove plantation could be laid out, in which workers could be directed to care for the trees and to harvest cloves, and in which plantation owner’s homes could be built. In this study, I address the realm of space and landscape on plantations as an area through which it is possible to examine how economic ideas shaped new forms of subjectivity. Studying European run plantations, archaeologists have been keenly aware of the development of certain forms of capitalist modernity, with specific spatialities of control (Delle 1998; Singleton 2001). There is a generally understood agreement of certain shifts toward a broadly shared capitalist framework on such sites, despite acknowledged regional variation. This makes it seem that capitalism was a relatively straightforward progression, formed within the Atlantic World. By shifting instead into the Indian Ocean and to an Islamic Eastern African context, it becomes possible to question how landscapes of capitalist production might be otherwise, and how we might begin to have a

broader comparative understanding of capitalism during the nineteenth-century on a truly global scale.

The development of capitalist subjectivities and the economic effects of capitalism are also examined by archaeologists, anthropologists, and historians through the consumption of artifacts. In Africa, a number of studies have addressed the complexities of consumption during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, demonstrating the ability of African consumers during this period to carefully choose particular kinds of goods to fit pre-existing, and yet often simultaneously changing, cultural desires (Akyeampong 1996; Burke 1996a, b; Piot 1999). Such studies relate to other works which demonstrate that the types of goods demanded from the sale of enslaved persons in West Africa were not simply random trinkets, but were objects desired because of their existing use in particular cultural contexts (Alpern 1995; Monroe 2007; Ogundiran 2009). These studies force questions to be raised as to the nature of consumption in Eastern Africa during the nineteenth-century, particularly in relation to plantation areas. They also allow for a comparison with the development of capitalist subjectivities in Europe and America. Ceramics, for instance, have been argued to be at the heart of individualistic subjectivities formed during the emergence of industrial capitalism (Leone 1999; Shackel 1994). When tied to a metanarrative of spatial and landscape change during particular periods of capitalism, these studies also provide seemingly definitive markers of particular stages of capitalism. Contrasting with such conclusions are the multitude of studies about consumers in a globalizing world, where modernity can be understood in different ways in different contexts, understood as objects traverse the “commodity chain” of production, exchange, and use (Norton 2008; Watson 2006; West 2012). While indigenous consumers of Western ceramics are regularly argued to translate their use into radically different cultural meanings than those intended by makers (Cabak and Loring 2000; Russell 2011), there is less discussion of the manner in which imported and foreign goods could exist in a hybrid form: They could be thoroughly incorporated into a different cultural setting than that of their manufacture, and simultaneously understood to be foreign commodities, to have social effects through the very fact that the objects were global commodities. This type of approach utilizes a biographical or commodity chain approach (Appadurai 1986; Hansen 2000; Thomas 1991). In a biographical or commodity chain approach, commodities are understood as more than just an index of their intended use (e.g., the incorporation of individualistic dining practices), or as a measure of the amount of trade occurring. Approaching them in this way allows for a more complex understanding of the nature of commodity consumption in historical contexts. This approach also draws on a range of studies which have increasingly highlighted the ability of mass-produced commodities to be “domesticated” into local contexts, whilst simultaneously enmeshing consumers into growing global economic networks of which they are often well aware (Prestholdt 2008).

In these comparisons, I am interested in understanding the ways in which globalization occurs in different ways in different places at the same time. Geographers are keenly aware that globalization tends to be discussed as aspatial, lacking an explicit engagement with geographical space (Massey 2005, p. 82). In contemporary

popular and political discussions of modernity, different areas are often understood to be at a different developmental stage. Places such as Zanzibar or other areas in Eastern Africa are denied the same temporal space as the United States or European nations. We commonly hear metaphors thrown around that those far-distant places are “medieval” or similar, suggesting that these spaces exist in a different temporal framework. But all places in the twenty-first century are coeval; that is, they exist within the same framework of temporality. This was also true for the nineteenth-century. The particular trajectory of Zanzibari history explored in this book was shaped by many of the same social and economic forces as was the case in the Atlantic World. Archaeologists, by the very nature of the discipline, understand the importance of spatial connections and disparate geographies in understanding modernity and capitalism. Such connections have, albeit sometimes problematically, been increasingly recognized within the bounds of the Atlantic world (Horning 2011; Johnson 1997, 2006; Richard 2010). But there remains a stubborn problem of fitting wider geographical locations within the same temporal framework as those of clearly linked locations in the Atlantic. This problem could be usefully understood as similar to those identified by Fabian (2002/[1983]) and Trouillot (1991) as they, more than two decades ago, forced cultural anthropologists to consider the temporal frames they create in their work. Fabian’s *Time and the Other* was aimed at addressing the fact that within anthropological discourse, while it might appear that ethnographies were written in the “now,” a particular kind of distancing in time was going on. In tracing the intellectual roots of such distancing devices, Fabian (2002/[1983], p. 31, emphasis in original) argued that they produced a global result, which he called a “*denial of coevalness*. By that I mean a *persistent and systematic tendency to place the referent(s) of anthropology in a Time other than that to the present of the producer of anthropological discourse*.” The subject of this critique is ethnography; it is different to highlight the fact that non-Western others were placed into the past than it is to explore the way in which different pasts are understood to be coeval when we represent archaeological contexts. I argue that historical archaeology has a lingering and subtle problem whereby non-Western “others” are not considered fully a part of the same field of inquiry. Despite the fact that anthropology may have fully embraced this issue of temporality, it still lurks in the field of historical archaeology (Dawdy 2010, p. 763).

The issue of temporality and the useful possibilities for a wider comparative field of global historical archaeology have been raised recently in critiques of “historical archaeology” as it applies specifically to sub-Saharan Africa. Peter Schmidt’s work has been forceful in pushing against the increasing deployment of historical archaeology in African contexts. Critiquing the field of historical archaeology which frames itself as that of the modern world (*sensu* Orser 1996), Schmidt finds the field unable to include the study of African contexts:

We must come to recognize that the arbitrary idea that only certain forms of historical experience—the modern and the colonial European—fit within the mission of historical archaeology denies historical practice in other cultures and inhibits us from developing a more fulsome, richer understanding of history making at a global level. It is time to break the shackles of such disabling concepts and practice. (Schmidt 2006, p. 5)

These fears have been echoed, and amplified, elsewhere by Schmidt. In particular, he has called for a move away from “the conventional foci on imperialism and colonialism,” understanding that “a more international historical archaeology entails a renewed effort to develop perspectives that account for the histories of those without writing and those whose histories have been misrepresented.” (Schmidt and Walz 2007, p. 54) These fears are perhaps provoked by the fact that Africanist archaeologists are venturing into recent periods (those within the last few 100 years) with increasing frequency (DeCorse 2001; Hall 2000; Monroe and OgunDIRAN 2012; Reid and Lane 2004a). Although framed differently from Schmidt’s wariness, this shift has been accompanied by anxiety from some, particularly those who examine contexts which do not fall within an “Atlantic World” context. Calling for a multivocal field of enquiry, in which indigenous histories are treated on an equal footing as those of European texts, Reid and Lane (2004b, p. 6) also emphasize the importance of a close engagement between cultural anthropology and historical archaeology in African contexts. As with Schmidt’s work, their edited volume *African Historical Archaeologies* (Reid and Lane 2004a), one of the broadest collections in the growing field, does not follow the conventional break between contexts tied in some way to “modernity,” including material dating back to the first millennium BC (Edwards 2004) alongside material from Atlantic Africa (Kelly 2004).

The fears that have been expressed with regard to the introduction of historical archaeology—suggesting that there has been no critical reflection on the relevance of the supposedly universal themes of the field in Africanist contexts—are valid. Clearly, historical sources relating to nineteenth-century Eastern Africa are qualitatively different from those of a nineteenth-century plantation in the Caribbean or North America. Documents of plantation owners and accounts by enslaved Africans, as highlighted by Cooper in the opening quotation to this chapter, are almost completely absent.¹ Oral histories become increasingly important in this field, as do ethnographic accounts, for providing details of what may have happened in the past. These must be treated carefully (Lane 2005), but they are a vital part of any African historical archaeology, and are widely utilized within this volume alongside archival sources. This drawing together of different perspectives has become the hallmark of African historical archaeology, perhaps epitomized in the research of Ann Stahl in Ghana, who draws deeply on oral histories alongside documentary historical and archaeological data. As with others concerned with historical archaeology in Africa, she has highlighted the need to sometimes break out of conventional frames of understanding material culture as it travels into novel contexts, emphasizing the agency of Africans (Stahl 2008). She argues that the “fruitful engagement between history, archaeology, and anthropology/sociology” can “shed new light on Africa’s past,” but that taking up an interdisciplinary approach such as this may sometimes be “fraught with tensions that emerge from distinct epistemologies,

¹ There are some important accounts collected in the early twentieth century, particularly by feminist oral historians, which do provide some first-person accounts (Curtin 1983; Mirza and Strobel 1989; Wright 1993). An important account is also that of Seyyida Salme who, having eloped to Germany, wrote an account of her early life as daughter of the Sultan (Reute 1998/[1886]).

foundational categories, and assumptions about the questions that count.” (Stahl 2001, p. 15). Taking the type of broad approach to African historical archaeology as I do in this book, drawing varied historical sources together, does not simply open up sets of exciting connections between different sources, it also brings with it particular methodological issues. Material remains, oral histories, and documentary history—the three forms of evidence I draw from here—all come with their own methodological challenges. But, like Stahl, I think that despite the problems in integrating the three, the end result is a richer interpretation which allows for a more nuanced understanding of the past and the agency of the Africans and others who were responsible for the material remains we address as archaeologists.

The particular concerns of Africanists regarding methodologies and the importance of indigenous epistemologies lie at the root of the fraught relationship between historical archaeology and Africanist archaeology, as discussed above. To address some of these issues, many Africanists engage with postcolonial theory. The desire is for archaeology to have a greater engagement with the multivocality of the past, drawing on indigenous sources where possible and allowing for diverse “ways of telling” (Lane 2011, p. 18). But this should not require a rejection of broader comparative questions. As Stahl (2010) has pointed out, there is a variety of ways in which something we could call a postcolonial historical archaeology might be practiced with regard to African contexts. Given the concerns of Africanists as to the exclusionary Eurocentric dimensions of historical archaeology vis-à-vis African histories, we might consider that the latter may require critical reflection as to why this is so. Such reflection would form a central part of a postcolonial archaeology. As Rizvi (2008, p. 197) has argued, “Postcolonial research is a confession of enduring political inequality; it is a condition that continues until the disparities created by colonialism, often recast into neocolonial frameworks, are deconstructed.” The turn I make toward postcolonial theory here recognizes the importance of multivocality, and the often complicit history of archaeology in colonial and neocolonial discourse (Leibman 2008).

Along with shifts in theory and praxis, postcolonial archaeology also requires that we continue to question often taken for granted ideas about the progression of history in the West. The issue of temporality in historical archaeology, in relation to viewing varied contexts as fully coeval, draws upon a postcolonial theoretical critique (Croucher and Weiss 2011). Postcolonial historians have argued that history is a political practice. Ideas in the present can be altered when capitalism is understood to have a broader history than that of the Atlantic world alone, and is seen to include the heterogeneity of the conflicts, contradictions, and ambivalence of colonial history (Prakash 2000, p. 236). The project of postcolonial history, particularly through scholars forming part of the Subaltern Studies Group, has included an attempt to “Provincialize Europe” through making a theoretical move whereby Indian history and that of Europe become coeval (Chakrabarty 2008). Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued that this entails understanding that histories of European capital tend to exclude the contributing factors of wider global locations (cf. Goody 2004, 2006; Hobson 2004).

In discussing a historical archaeology of capitalism in Eastern Africa, this study takes up a form of postcolonial critique. Through understanding clove plantations, we can recognize Africans as fully participating in the creation of capitalist formations in particular contexts. Modernity in this sense may become fragmented. This also fits with anthropological work which has taken up the idea of “multiple modernities” as a way to understand the fact that manifold coeval modernities exist: cultural contexts shaped by global forces and simultaneously by long-term local histories and cultures (Eisenstadt 2000; Gaonkar 2001; Piot 1999). By fragmenting our ideas of modernity into multiple iterations, anthropological theory may be more responsive to the analysis of the effects of global connections and forces—such as capitalism—while understanding that these are always understood through and shaped by local cultural forms (Comaroff and Comaroff 2003). This book suggests that perhaps the concept of multiple modernities, or multiple archaeologies of capitalism, might be usefully applied to the field of historical archaeology. In this manner, the push toward “African historical archaeologies” in the plural can be maintained (Reid and Lane 2004a). Alongside a relevance to African contexts, this work should join studies in North America and elsewhere in questioning the ability of current frameworks of classification and interpretation to allow for truly multivocal pasts, which pay attention to the agency of the full range of historical subjects under study (Silliman 2005, 2009; Voss 2008).

As with historical archaeologies of Africa overall, research into later Eastern African archaeological contexts is growing rapidly. As scholars begin to examine sites associated with Kenyan *watoro* (maroons, or self-emancipated slaves) and those associated with the intense caravan trade through Tanzania, connections and differences become readily apparent with the broader field of historical archaeology (Biginagwa 2012a, 2012b; Lane 2010; Marshall 2011). Eastern Africa during the nineteenth-century was fundamentally a global place (Prestholdt 2008). This should force archaeologists to immediately have to consider the type of theoretical issues highlighted in relation to later historical periods in which “entanglement” occurs at various levels on a regional through global scale. These complexities require “new theoretical paradigms [that] explicitly articulate local and global processes in relational, non-teleological ways.” (Clifford 1997, p. 7) Drawing Eastern African contexts into a conversation with the broader field of historical archaeology potentially offers just such a theoretical lens through which to more fully understand particular historical contexts.

Feminist Archaeology of the African Diaspora

As an archaeological study of plantations, this book also forms part of the broader field of African diaspora archaeology. Plantation archaeology in North America, where most African diaspora archaeology takes place, has long had plantation studies as a mainstay of the field, but recently there has been a move toward the study of free black communities, particularly when the nineteenth-century is being studied

(Leone et al. 2005). Despite this shift, the investigation of the lives of enslaved communities through plantation archaeology continues to be practiced widely; when dealing with communities who often had little or no access to writing about themselves, archaeology has much to offer our historical understanding of those forcibly taken to labor on plantations and elsewhere (Singleton 1985). Common themes of African diaspora archaeology are picked up in this book, include the investigation of how enslaved Africans forged identities within new contexts of enslavement. Local ceramics are particularly important in addressing this question, tying in with the study of locally produced ceramics as a potential locus for understanding African identities in diasporic contexts in the Americas (Ferguson 1992; Hauser 2008).

While there are clear connections to studies on plantations in the Americas, in this book I also throw up challenging questions as to the ability for African diaspora archaeology to expand straightforwardly beyond the Atlantic world. As historians have noted, descendants of those enslaved into an Indian Ocean African diaspora often elide any visible connection to their African heritage (Alpers 1997, 2000). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (hereafter UNESCO) is currently undergoing a large-scale Slave Routes project which attempts to reconnect the descendant communities of enslaved populations (not only those who descend from Africans) worldwide with their heritage, and to promote the heritage of a broader set of histories of enslavement (UNESCO 2006). UNESCO's desire to connect descendent communities with their African heritage is a problem when we turn back to scholarship which points out the complexities of slave heritage—and the rejection of such—in some areas of the Indian Ocean (Alpers 2000; Glassman 2010). As I discuss in later chapters, on Zanzibar, despite the scale of enslavement during the nineteenth-century, almost no one I have spoken to in several years of research has identified themselves as having slave heritage. The reasons for this are complex, and it raises the question of how those enslaved on plantations came to find ways to seemingly assimilate into broader East African Swahili culture.

As a qualifier for the term assimilation, used later in this book; my usage here is not meant in the sense of a “whole-culture assimilation model” where all elements of a “dominant” culture (in this case that of the Swahili coast) are adopted by a subordinate group by a process of acculturation (Armstrong 1998, p. 379). While assimilation and acculturation are important terms when trying to understand the choices of enslaved individuals in Eastern Africa, this does not imply that coastal society during the time of Omani colonialism was not a creolized colonial context (Dawdy 2008). We might think of Zanzibar during the nineteenth-century as a situation where we see clear cultural hybridity; identities were being reproduced anew, through transformation and difference (Hall 1990, p. 235). For example, as discussed in Chap. 2, “Swahili” identity shifted in meaning through the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, rapidly claimed by many emancipated slaves, despite seeming to be a stable ethnonym denoting ethnic coastal origins. When recognizing cultural change on plantations with enslaved populations it must also be recognized that power relations are fundamental to understanding cultural change (Singleton 1998, p. 179). Historical studies show that enslaved and formerly enslaved Africans on Zanzibar used material culture such as dress to claim to be fully a part of

“civilized” coastal society (Fair 1998, 2001). I argue that archaeological sources show that this process of claiming coastal identity went beyond dress and public participation in Muslim society; they extended into the everyday (quotidian) practices of households across plantation areas. Food in particular was an important marker of identity. While participating in important public elements of being a civilized Muslim, such as women covering their heads, became an important dimension of an emergent Swahili identity in the late nineteenth-century, being Swahili was also based on more prosaic elements of domestic life.

By turning to domestic life and foodways, this book also takes up feminist approaches toward the archaeology of the African diaspora. Drawing on black feminist theory, several scholars have shown the ways in which women were at the heart of cultural transformations and the building of new identities in enslaved communities (Battle-Baptiste 2011; Franklin 2001; Wilkie 2003). These studies have emphasized the role of women as laborers, and as mothers, cooks, and strong figures at the center of family and community. Similarly, women—as acknowledged by historical studies focusing on aspects such as dress and music—were at the heart of transformations in the East African diaspora. Although Zanzibar was radically different from contexts in the Americas, the importance of domestic transformations underscores the ability of archaeology to provide broader feminist perspectives on the African diaspora and colonial cultures more broadly. The study of gender also goes beyond that only of enslaved Africans. Gender relations were fundamental to the structure of colonial society on plantations, as is shown by the materiality of patriarchal power on plantations and gendered roles across broad cross-sections of society.

To produce a feminist archaeology also goes beyond simply an explicit discussion of women’s lives. Of course, this is important, but core tenets of feminist archaeology are to expose presentism, androcentrism, and ethnocentrism, alongside the detection of material traces of gender roles, relations, identities, and ideologies. Although first developed in the 1980s, this basic work of feminist and gender archaeology remains important today (Conkey and Spector 1984; Geller 2009, p. 66). Exposing the importance of gender and sexuality—here I discuss how patriarchal rule on plantations translated into gender norms, for instance, and I attempt to recuperate the important role concubines (*masuria*) had within the social landscape of clove plantations—helps us to see how capitalism does not hold within it a single set of norms in relation to gender and sexuality and this, in turn, will allow for further elucidation of the particular role gender and sexuality played in *varied* plantation systems worldwide. Feminist theory also introduces broader theoretical concerns. As I have written and responded to reviewers, I am reminded of the sometimes uncertainty of my interpretations. I have argued here for the importance of recognizing particular aspects of material lives on plantations—such as potential traces of concubined women, other enslaved women, and female plantation owners—which are difficult to find secure material evidence for. In part, perhaps this uncertainty can be celebrated in a feminist archaeological interpretation, where the recuperation of such lives is acknowledged to be underdetermined, although strengthened through the “tacking” between multiple sources of historical and material evidence

(Gero 2007; Wylie 2002). Following Wilkie and Hayes (2006, p. 252, my emphasis), I take the line that “Feminism is a *political* theoretical position with the stated goals, in the simplest terms, of working toward women’s social, economic, and political equality while attempting to understand the societal structures that allow for the perpetuation of white patriarchy.” On Zanzibar, the situation as addressed by most historical archaeologists is complicated via the hegemony of Islamic patriarchy. But the goal to address patriarchy in general, and to trace the contours of the power relations of patriarchy, in order to come to understand how such power relations continue to be perpetuated, flows through this book. Thus, while often focused on gender and sexuality, a feminist approach in the sense I refer to here is a broader theoretical framework: a particular way of engaging with data and refusing to ignore subaltern women and men, even when we struggle to represent them through archaeological data.

As mentioned above, the study of slavery on Zanzibar highlights material evidence relating to a large category of enslaved women, those held as concubines. Sexuality has been recognized as an important element in the colonial control (Casella and Voss 2011; McClintock 1995; Voss 2000, 2008). Legal or other frameworks regulating sexual relations have commonly been a means of protecting the reproduction of colonial power. The intersection of power and sexuality can easily be traced through the position of women enslaved as concubines in Eastern Africa. On Zanzibar, these women were the last to be emancipated from slavery; their legal manumission lagged several years behind that of enslaved laborers. They were simultaneously absorbed into elite households (their children were treated as equals to those of freeborn wives), and were held as slaves. A song sung by enslaved women in the Pangani area of Tanzania during the nineteenth-century highlighted this position. They warned,

A concubine is still a slave,
 Today the concubine is still a slave.
 Do not think about lying on a mattress,
 A concubine is still a slave. (Glassman 1995, p. 90)

Material culture helps demonstrate the complexities of this position (Croucher 2011). Women held as concubines might technically be freed on the birth of a child, and seem to have been offered material comforts. And yet their position remained one of bondage. Here we see the complexities of enslavement on Zanzibar; there was not simply a dichotomy of slave versus free. As I discuss later in this book, slavery existed on a broad scale. While this is most visible in the archaeology of concubinage, it highlights the importance of breaking down a simple slave/free binary in this context, and the intersectionality of slavery, gender, and sexuality. Focusing on the material traces of concubinage also offers one way in which we might begin to enter the difficult field of addressing sexuality and slavery through archaeology.

Overall, the archaeology of enslavement on Zanzibar provides a context radically different to the majority studied by African diaspora archaeologists. Slavery was not structured by race or ethnicity on Zanzibar. Enslaved individuals (although mostly men) were able to rise socially based on their ability to claim full participation in

Muslim coastal culture. Based on these measures, we might think that the context is that of an “open” system of slavery (Watson 1980). But the development of plantations—tying Zanzibar into global capitalism—provided something which was more of a hybrid: not the chattel slavery of the Americas, nor (if such a thing should exist) a purely “African” form of slavery (Cooper 1977). Through examining plantation slavery on nineteenth-century Zanzibar, it becomes possible to complicate the archaeology of the African diaspora, demonstrating the variability of enslavement in different times and places (Miller 2012).

Methodology

This book is based on interpretations of archaeological fieldwork on Zanzibar: the Zanzibar Clove Plantation Survey (Croucher 2004) and excavations at the plantation site of Mgoli on Pemba. Survey of clove plantations was undertaken through interviewing local residents in four areas of Zanzibar and Pemba (two on each island).² This survey (which consisted entirely of surface survey, for logistical reasons) recorded 64 sites in total across the four areas. Some oral histories were also recorded in conjunction with the survey. Excavations were undertaken at Mgoli in 2004. This was a nineteenth-century clove plantation owned by an Arab man called Abdalla bin Jabir. Oral histories testified to the size and importance of this plantation within the area of Piki on Pemba, in which it was located. Artifact analysis used in this book draws from these two studies. Wherever survey sites or artifact analyses are mentioned for Zanzibari plantation sites, the discussion refers to this body of data.

As no other archaeological study of plantation sites has been undertaken so far in Eastern Africa, this data is, in some ways, rather limited. Greater comparisons have been made possible by the recent work of Biginagwa (2012a) examining caravan route sites in Tanzania, Marshall (2011) studying self-emancipated slave sites on the Kenyan coast, and Walz’s (2010) broad study of the Pangani region in Tanzania. None of these studies, however, deals directly with plantation contexts. Thus, while they all provide important broader context for nineteenth-century archaeology in the region, they do not directly expand our knowledge of the material record of clove plantations. As this is the case, to some extent, the analysis of archaeological data here may be considered as somewhat tentative. It may also raise important questions for investigation through future fieldwork projects.

² Zanzibar is used in several senses; it may refer to the islands that make up the polity of Zanzibar (properly Unguja and Pemba), the southern island of the political unit (also referred to as Unguja), and the capital city of the islands, located on Unguja. Where possible, I have inferred the context (i.e., “the islands of Zanzibar,” “the city of Zanzibar”) when using the name so as to make the object clear.

In addition to archaeological data, this book draws heavily on oral histories collected in conjunction with fieldwork from 2003 to 2005. These were largely recorded on Pemba, and provide greater depth in understanding social shifts during the nineteenth-century. As none of the interviewees were alive during the period of Omani colonialism and plantation slavery, these are used carefully. They provide interesting windows onto the past, but must also be taken as a product of the present. Certainly, on Zanzibar, the narrative of slavery has been heavily shaped by twentieth-century political debates (Glassman 2010). However, much of the history I draw on here, such as the foods people ate in the past, the way they ate them, how pots were made and traded, and the nature of consumerism, while not disconnected from politics, are not perhaps so directly shaped by contemporary events. Potential issues in interpreting these sources in relation to specific elements, such as women's production of pottery, are discussed later in this book at relevant moments.

Documentary history also forms a large proportion of the evidence used in this book, mostly drawing on the record of British colonial administrators and travelers from the late nineteenth-century. Using colonial archives has many issues, particularly in relation to their potential to re-create colonial images of the past (Schmidt and Walz 2007). But in the imagination of colonial administrators and explorers we also discover “unrealized and improbable plans”—such as the hoped-for full cadastral survey of Zanzibar, discussed in Chap. 3—which express anxieties about colonial futures (Stoler 2002, p. 157). On Zanzibar, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, as the British struggled to effectively administer the islands, many of the conversations that are revealed through colonial archives focused on questions of urban planning, control of different groups in particular areas, and the abolition of slavery and future of labor on plantations (Bissell 2011; Myers 2003). A major strength of historical archaeology is the ability to draw these perspectives from colonial authors into critical conversations with material and oral historical evidence; this provides a way to understand how we might see indigenous and subaltern views of the past refracted back through these documents. Such routes may aid us in locating particular forms of resistance, compliance, or many positions in-between to colonial rule—be that Omani or British. This combination of multiple sources is not uncommon for Africanists engaged in the archaeology of later historical periods in Africa (Stahl 2001). It also follows a recent broader trend in historical archaeology toward greater integration of historical sources in line with approaches taken by historical ethnographers (Dawdy 2010). While archaeological data, oral history, or documentary history alone might not provide enough information to understand the colonial social and economic transformations of nineteenth-century Zanzibar, this interdisciplinary conversation allows greater traction to critically engage a diversity of sources so as to interrogate the past. In this combination, I attempt to “tack” between different sources and theoretical arguments (Wylie 1999, 2002), providing a richer interpretation through their integration. It is this holistic approach to a range of sources that I think holds the strongest potential for a thoughtful theoretical contribution to global historical archaeology.

Organization of the Book

As this book is intended in part for an audience who may not be familiar with East African archaeology and history, Chap. 2, “Why Clove Plantations,” provides an introduction to these fields. This chapter is intended to also contextualize the social changes taking place on clove plantations. Through the examination of Swahili archaeology, which dates back several hundred years prior to the period of clove plantations, it is possible to better understand cultural change on these plantations as part of the *longue durée* of Eastern African history. Taking this approach, it becomes clear that while the nineteenth-century was an era of rapid social change, foundational aspects of what emerged as Zanzibari culture also drew upon preexisting Swahili norms. Indeed, the very identity of “Swahili,” as it emerged by the early twentieth century, made reference back to a perceived earlier cultural identity along the coast. Archaeologists have increasingly begun to grapple with the idea of a singular cultural identity shared along coastal sites, noting that this did not simply extend back through a thousand years; different regions and towns were likely much more fragmented (Fleisher and LaViolette 2007; Fleisher 2010a, b; Wynne-Jones 2006). Nevertheless, an understanding of cultural similitude and a real basis of broadly shared cultural traits was clearly important to nineteenth-century Zanzibaris.

Chapter 2 also introduces the specific historical context of clove plantations. Historians have taken various perspectives in relation to the history of Omani colonialism, nineteenth and early-twentieth-century social change on Zanzibar, and Eastern African plantations. Engaging with historical studies not only provides background but also demonstrates the way in which archaeology can provide a broader understanding of a historical period through the integration of material and historical sources. Moving out from history, this chapter also discusses the development of later archaeologies of Eastern Africa, and the sometimes problematic lack of connection between archaeology and historical studies. Historical archaeology as is increasingly practiced in Eastern Africa seems to offer the potential of integrating between these two fields of studies, making our understanding of the long-term regional history of the area more comprehensive.

Chapter 3, “Plantation Landscapes” discusses the way in which clove plantation landscapes can be understood in relation to the spatialities of capitalism, and of Swahili cultural approaches to landscapes. Drawing largely on historical sources, in this chapter, I discuss the way in which clove plantations were essentially hybrid landscapes. They were far from the capitalist regimes of plantations in the Americas and European-run plantations in the Indian Ocean, yet simultaneously they did not fully fit with the indigenous Swahili conventions of landholdings that may have existed prior to, and concurrently with, clove plantations. Drawing on European colonial documents from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, I demonstrate the manner in which European landscape sensibilities were frustrated by the ways in which land was held and landscapes were understood by Omani plantation owners. This chapter serves to highlight the manner in which space may be involved within a diversity of capitalist formations. It demonstrates the manner in which there may be alternatives to capitalism existing within capitalist regimes of production

(Gibson and Graham 2006/[1996]). The specificity of particular colonial contexts of capitalist production is reinforced through recognizing the presence of such hybrid forms of capitalist production and colonial rule (Dawdy 2008; Hauser 2008).

Continuing on the theme of landscape and space, Chap. 4, “The Archaeology of Slavery,” largely employs an analysis of landscape and buildings to analyze the relations of slavery on clove plantations. This chapter also extends the historical introduction to slavery on plantations which was begun in Chap. 2. To examine these landscapes, the analysis turns more strongly to archaeological evidence, drawing from purposive surface survey across both islands of Zanzibar and from more extensive excavation at a single plantation site on Pemba. However, for complex reasons, few sites were identified which were directly associated with slaves, despite the fact that a specific aim of the Zanzibar Clove Plantation Survey was to locate these. This largely seems to be due to an active process of forgetting, perhaps relating to the distantiation of many Zanzibaris from any acknowledged slave heritage. Owing to these difficulties, in this chapter, I continue to draw heavily on oral and documentary histories through which to understand the landscapes and forms of housing plantation slaves, and the forms of buildings that these took.

What emerges is a picture of seeming assimilation by enslaved laborers to coastal forms of buildings. As plantation owners were often Omani, this seems not to have been mandated by their wishes alone. Comparison to *watoro* settlements shows a similar pattern (Marshall 2011). The fact that enslaved *and* self-emancipated Africans on the East African coast followed Swahili coastal norms in house styles suggests that building houses was part of an active choice on the part of plantation slaves, one which enabled them to show their place as members of Muslim coastal society and, crucially, as civilized (*waungwana*). An Islamic cemetery recorded on the clove plantation survey, associated with plantation slaves, seemed to demonstrate another manner in which enslaved Africans tried to publically demonstrate their conversion to Islam and their place in coastal society. This is not to question the faith behind this conversion, but to suggest that signs of Islamic practice such as this demonstrate the way that those with little social power, and who may have been excluded from worshipping in mosques, were able to materialize their assimilation into the new norms of Zanzibari society. In turn, these shifts may have enabled enslaved plantation laborers—particularly men—to claim a greater status in the client–patron relations which partially characterized plantation slavery on the islands. A final analysis of the historical records of British administrators in relation to emancipation in the late nineteenth-century serves to complicate a simple narrative of assimilation with an aim of integrating directly into a client–patron system. While the vast majority of enslaved Africans on Zanzibar seem to have rapidly converted to Islam, not all stayed within the expected confines of client–patron relations. The colonial issue of “vagrancy”—individuals with no fixed place of labor and residence—demonstrates the agency of many hundreds of individuals to choose new ways in which to live in an era of emancipation.

Remaining in the realm of spatial analysis, Chap. 5, “Plantation Households,” tackles the materiality of households, changing the focus to a much smaller scale than the opening analysis of landscape. Largely focused on Mgoli and drawing

extensively on excavation data, this chapter explores a range of issues. The Omani identity of plantation owners is explored through the use of particular architectural forms on plantations. No singular architectural form is found to dominate the forms chosen by plantation owners for their homes, but it is clear that when able to build in stone, Omani planter's houses tended to make clear reference to the architectural features found on buildings in Oman, and to Omani merchants' houses in urban Zanzibar. These links seem to show a desire by at least some plantation owners to materialize an Omani identity, since the many indigenous Swahili neighboring and included in plantation areas continued to build in slightly different architectural styles. Little other material evidence points to plantation owners having worked hard to make clear their ties to Oman through material culture, but this set of evidence seems to show that, unlike enslaved Africans, Omani planters did not simply try to assimilate in to coastal culture.

This chapter also explores the nature of power on plantations. In this, the position of a clove-drying floor running in front of the planter's house at Mgoli is analyzed in relation to other spatial features of Omani and Swahili houses. I argue that the use of clove-drying floors as major features in the most public space of the plantation house was a way for male plantation owners to demonstrate their power in a social structure dominated by paternalistic relations. However, survey evidence that a number of female plantation owners existed during the late nineteenth-century complicates this gendered interpretation of power. Drawing on archaeological and historical evidence, I analyze the way in which such women may have used space in order to participate in paternalistic power structures. Here we see that being a paternalistic plantation owner did not necessarily equate to being a man. Even in a deeply gendered Muslim society, as Zanzibar during the nineteenth-century was, women could still gain positions of power. They could utilize the same kinds of client-patron bonds as was the case for men, and were able to direct plantations. In the absence of excavation at a female plantation owner's site, many questions remain open about the way in which gendered power was negotiated by such women. But the evidence from survey coupled with historical detail provides a compelling account of powerful women during the nineteenth-century.

Included in interpretations of plantation owners' homes is a discussion of the material culture associated with the possible home of a woman enslaved as a concubine. Women such as this were common on plantations such as Mgoli. The *chokaa* (lime mortar) structure of the building provides an insight into the complexities of architectural scaling on Zanzibar during the nineteenth-century. Following Myers' (1997) discussion of the fact that *uwezo* (power) was understood through the structure house owners were able to construct, it becomes clear that women enslaved as concubines may have held a strange place in the social hierarchy of Zanzibari plantations. As mentioned above, they were very much still enslaved, and yet they also had access to many of the better material conditions of life on clove plantations. The position of these women serves to highlight the fact that society was not simply structured between those who had wealth and power and those who did not. Subject positions in Zanzibari plantation society were understood through the complex intersections of freedom and bondage, gender, sexuality, and religion.

The final two interpretive chapters turn to artifacts. Chapter 6, “Global Goods,” examines evidence for imported commodities on clove plantations. This is primarily through archaeological data; drawing heavily on evidence from survey and excavation it examines the way in which jewelry and mass-produced ceramics were consumed by different households across plantations. In taking up this theme, this chapter examines the possibility that Zanzibaris during the nineteenth-century were increasingly enmeshed in “consumerism.” This means that social relations and social status was commonly mediated through the use of imported goods which had to be purchased for cash (Prestholdt 2008). Clove plantations, despite their centrality in capitalist production on the islands during the nineteenth-century, had to this point not been examined as a part of the growth of consumerism in Eastern Africa during the nineteenth-century. Particularly through following the trajectory of mass-produced European ceramics, it is possible to see that commodity consumption was on the rise; however, it was tempered through the cultural relations of Omani and Swahili plantation owners. Drawing on oral historical evidence, I suggest that mass-produced ceramics were important elements in a form of transitory gift exchange. While they were purchased for cash as commodities, they were important in materializing particular social obligations, such as the proper feeding of houseguests or the feeding of guests at weddings. For poor Zanzibaris, including enslaved plantation laborers, the purchase of these items may have been out of reach, but they could always be borrowed from wealthier neighbors to whom one had connections. This may have been one of the important ways in which client–patron relations continued to exist between rich and poor, during and after abolition. Studies of African systems of slavery have argued that this type of client–patron relation has tended to characterize enslavement on the continent (Watson 1980). While the conditions and expectations of slavery on Zanzibar were shifting during the nineteenth-century, the negotiation of client–patron obligations remained important. The study of mass-produced ceramics is one way through which we can chart the realities of this type of relations on plantations.

This chapter also takes a “commodity chain” approach to mass-produced ceramics. While social relations between plantation owners and enslaved laborers are at the heart of my interpretation, by taking a multi-sited approach to the production and exchange of these objects it is possible to see how they also further our understanding of Zanzibar as a global place. The sale of imported goods on Zanzibar was one route through which an emergent shared Zanzibari identity between indigenous Swahili, enslaved plantation laborers, and plantation owners, came to be understood. The perceived mercantile role of many Indian immigrants to Zanzibar, particularly on Pemba, was used to highlight the understanding that Indians were a group apart from Zanzibaris, a fact also reinforced by perceived differences in the foods Indians ate as compared to other Zanzibaris. While acting as a medium for the construction of difference on Zanzibar, ceramics also acted in complex ways far from their use on plantations. The types of mass-produced ceramics used on Zanzibar were often in rather different forms than that graced the table of European and North American houses. In Britain and the Netherlands, where the majority of these wares were made specifically for export markets, I suggest that the manufacture

of large open bowl forms, often known to be for a foreign culture, helped to solidify a sense of difference in an era of global colonialism. Factory workers could know that the consumers far distant from them, linked through a commodity chain, were somehow different in their daily practices. While this might not have been an openly acknowledged difference, I suggest that it shows the manner in which global commodities played a subtle role in the way in which far distant places came to be known by manufacturers, consumers, and traders. By taking a range of approaches to imported commodities, it becomes clear that these were far more than simply nice objects to be purchased by merchants or planters who had access to wealth. Zanzibari consumers were careful about what they purchased, and once-owned goods might circulate in ways specific to Zanzibari society, reinforcing social rules which were quite different to those of the developing consumer culture of Europe and North America in the nineteenth-century.

Chapter 7, “Pembani People,” circles around a topic familiar to Africanists and African diaspora archaeologists, that of locally produced ceramics. Understanding the production of ceramics in relation to identity has been an important research topic for many African archaeologists and ethnoarchaeologists (Gosselain 1992, 2000). This work has shown that ceramic manufacture is far more than a static indicator of particular ethnic identities. But the study of locally produced colonial wares found on plantations in the Americas has often turned to the potential tie between these low-fired wares and African identities (Ferguson 1992). While the frame of discussing ceramics in the African diaspora is changing (Hauser 2008), I am interested in the contrast between the approach to ceramics in Africa and that of the African diaspora. This suggests, I argue, a framing of locally produced goods as somehow tied to a particular temporal realm, outside of modernity.

Locally produced ceramics on Zanzibari clove plantations provide an interesting study because, despite widespread social change and the arrival of massive numbers of immigrants, the style of these wares remains remarkably stable from the eighteenth century through to the present day. I suggest that this conservatism in production is actually indicative of the manner in which immigrants were able to incorporate themselves into Zanzibari society. Drawing on oral historical evidence to interpret the archaeological data, I discuss the way in which pottery manufacturers, usually women working on a relatively small scale, may have been part of communities of practice. The ability to apprentice immigrant women into the skill of making Zanzibari wares may have been one way in which immigrants made themselves into constituent members of coastal society. As ceramics are also an important part of foodways, I argue that this shift was not only linked to production; the use of these specific coastal forms and designs was also a way in which newcomers were able to signal their cultural incorporation into local norms. Food was central to this transformation, as was discussed by several elderly residents of Pemba interviewed as part of my research.

Overall then, as I discuss in the concluding Chap. 8, we see the way in which Zanzibari clove plantations play out a narrative of local histories of colonialism and capitalist formations. In some ways, this study is particularistic; the findings in this book relate to a specific historical context, quite unlike that studied by the

majority of historical archaeologists. But these specificities cannot be disengaged from the fact that the shifts occurring were also tied in to global networks. Zanzibaris themselves were often aware of such networks, but their power may have been more often felt through the ways in which local practices came into contact with multiple possible ways of doing. Clove plantations came into being only because they could grow for a global market, only because Omani merchants were already on the islands of Zanzibar, and only because there was already a vigorous slave trade in Eastern Africa. The social relations and cultural shifts on these plantations can be understood within larger global shifts in colonial contexts, whereby newly creolized cultural practices came into being. By being simultaneously so rooted in local conditions and so much a part of global connections, the study of clove plantations allows for reflections back on the broader field of historical archaeology. This may help us to more clearly understand the particularities of colonialism and capitalism in many different places, including those more traditionally the subject of study in this field.

References

- Akyeampong, E. (1996). *Drink, power, and cultural change: A social history of alcohol in Ghana, c.1800 to recent times. Social history of Africa series*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Alpern, S. B. (1995). What Africans got for their slaves: A master list of European trade goods. *History in Africa*, 22, 5–43.
- Alpers, E. A. (1997). The African diaspora in the Northwestern Indian Ocean: Reconsideration of an old problem, new directions for research. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 17(2), 62–81.
- Alpers, E. A. (2000). Recollecting Africa: Diasporic memory in the Indian Ocean World. *African Studies Review*, 43(1), 83–99.
- Appadurai, A. (1986). Introduction: Commodities and the politics of value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective* (pp. 3–63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, D. V. (1998). Cultural transformation within enslaved laborer communities in the Caribbean. In J. G. Cusick (Ed.), *Studies in culture contact: Interaction, culture change, and archaeology* (pp. 378–401). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations.
- Austen, R. A. (1988). The 19th century Islamic slave trade from East Africa (Swahili and red sea coasts): A tentative census. *Slavery & Abolition*, 9(3), 21–44.
- Baram, U., & Carroll, L. (2002). The future of the Ottoman past. In U. Baram & L. Carroll (Eds.), *A historical archaeology of the Ottoman empire. Contributions to global historical archaeology* (pp. 3–32). New York: Springer.
- Battle-Baptiste, W. (2011). *Black feminist archaeology*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Beaudry, M. C., Cook, L. J., & Mrozowski, S. A. (1991). Artifacts and active voices: Material culture as social discourse. In R. H. McGuire & R. Paynter (Eds.), *The archaeology of inequality* (pp. 150–191). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, A. (2005). White ethnogenesis and gradual capitalism: Perspectives from colonial archaeological sites in the Chesapeake. *American Anthropologist*, 107(3), 446–460.
- Biginagwa, T. J. (2012a). *Historical archaeology of the nineteenth-century caravan trade in north-eastern Tanzania: A zooarchaeological perspective*. PhD thesis York: Department of Archaeology, University of York.

- Biginagwa, T. J. (2012b). Historical archaeology of the nineteenth-century caravan trade in north-eastern Tanzania: A zooarchaeological perspective. *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa*, 47(3), 405–406.
- Bissell, W. C. (2011). *Urban design, chaos, and colonial power in Zanzibar*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Burke, T. (1996a). *Lifebuoy men, lux women: Commodification, consumption, and cleanliness in modern Zimbabwe*. London: Leicester University Press.
- Burke, T. (1996b). “Sunlight soap has changed my life”: Hygiene, commodification, and the body in colonial Zimbabwe. In H. Hendrickson (Ed.), *Clothing and difference: Embodied identities in colonial and post-colonial Africa* (pp. 189–212). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cabak, M., & Loring, S. (2000). “A set of very fair cups and saucers”: Stamped ceramics as an example of inuit incorporation. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 4(1), 1–34.
- Casella, E. C. (2005). Social workers. In E. C. Casella & J. Symonds (Eds.), *Industrial archaeology. Contributions to global historical archaeology* (pp. 3–31). New York: Springer.
- Casella, E. C., & Voss, B. L. (2011). Intimate encounters: An archaeology of sexualities within colonial worlds. In E. C. Casella & B. L. Voss (Eds.), *The archaeology of colonialism: Intimate encounters and sexual effects* (pp. 1–10). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2008). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference. Princeton studies in culture/power/history* (2nd ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (2003). Ethnography on an awkward scale: Postcolonial anthropology and the violence of abstraction. *Ethnography*, 4(2), 147–179.
- Conkey, M. W., & Spector, J. D. (1984). Archaeology and the study of gender. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, 7, 1–38.
- Cooper, F. (1977). *Plantation slavery on the east coast of Africa*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cooper, F. (1981). Islam and cultural hegemony: The ideology of slave owners on the east African coast. In P. E. Lovejoy (Ed.), *The ideology of slavery in Africa* (pp. 271–307). London: Sage.
- Craster, J. E. E. (1913). *Pemba, the spice island of Zanzibar*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Croucher, S. K. (2004). Zanzibar clove plantation survey 2003: Some preliminary findings. *Nyame Akuma*, 62, 65–69.
- Croucher, S. K. (2011). “A concubine is still a slave”: Sexual relations and Omani colonial identities in nineteenth-century east Africa. In B. Voss & E. C. Casella (Eds.), *The archaeology of colonialism, gender and sexuality* (pp. 67–84). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Croucher, S. K., & Weiss, L. (2011). *The archaeology of capitalism in colonial contexts: Postcolonial historical archaeologies*. New York: Springer.
- Crowell, A. (1997). *Archaeology and the capitalist world system: A study from Russian America*. New York: Plenum.
- Curtin, P. D. (1998). *The rise and fall of the plantation complex: Essays in Atlantic history* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Curtin, P. R. (1983) Laboratory for the Oral History of Slavery: The Island of Lamu on the Kenya Coast. *The American Historical Review* 88(4), 858–882.
- Dawdy, S. L. (2008). *Building the devil’s empire: French colonial New Orleans*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dawdy, S. L. (2010). Clockpunk anthropology and the ruins of modernity. *Current Anthropology*, 51(6), 761–793.
- DeCorse, C. R. (2001). *An archaeology of Elmina: Africans and Europeans on the Gold Coast, 1400–1900*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Delle, J. A. (1998). *An archaeology of social space: Analyzing coffee plantations in Jamaica’s blue mountains*. New York: Plenum.
- Edwards, D. (2004). History, archaeology and Nubian identities in the middle Nile. In A. Reid & P. Lane (Eds.), *African historical archaeologies. Contributions to global historical archaeology*, C. E. Orser (Gen. Ed.) (pp. 33–58). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.

- Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1–29.
- Fabian, J. (2002/[1983]). *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fair, L. (1998). Dressing up: Clothing, class and gender in post-abolition Zanzibar. *The Journal of African History*, 39(1), 63–94.
- Fair, L. (2001). *Pastimes and politics: Culture, community, and identity in post-abolition urban Zanzibar, 1890–1945*. *Eastern African Studies*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Falk, L. (Ed.). (1991). *Historical archaeology in global perspective*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Ferguson, L. (1992). *Uncommon ground: Archaeology and early African America, 1650–1800*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Fleisher, J. B. (2010a). Swahili synoecism: Rural settlements and town formation on the Central East African Coast, A.D. 750–1500. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 35(3), 265–282.
- Fleisher, J. B. (2010b). Rituals of consumption and the politics of feasting on the East African Coast, A.D. 700–1500. *Journal of World Prehistory*, 23, 195–217.
- Fleisher, J. B., & LaViolette, A. (2007). The changing power of Swahili houses, fourteenth to nineteenth-centuries A.D. In R. A. J. Beck (Ed.), *The durable house: House society models in archaeology*. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper No. 35. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Carbondale.
- Franklin, M. (2001). The archaeological dimensions of soul food: Interpreting race, culture, and Afro-Virginian identity. In C. E. Orser (Ed.), *Race and the archaeology of identity* (pp. 88–107). Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Funari, P. P. A., Jones, S., & Hall, M. (1999). Introduction: Archaeology in history. In P. P. A. Funari, M. Hall, & S. Jones (Eds.), *Historical archaeology: Back from the edge* (pp. 1–20). London: Routledge.
- Gaonkar, D. P. (2001). On alternative modernities. In D. P. Gaonkar (Ed.), *Alternative modernities* (pp. 1–23). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Geller, P. L. (2009). Identity and difference: Complicating gender in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 38(1), 65–81.
- Gero, J. M. (2007). Honoring ambiguity/problematising certitude. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 14(3), 311–327.
- Gijanto, L. (2011). Socio-economic interaction and ceramic aesthetic: Understanding west African ceramic production and use in context. *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa*, 46(3), 250–268.
- Glassman, J. (1995). *Feasts and riot: Revelry, rebellion and popular consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856–1888*. Portsmouth, London: Heinemann, James Currey.
- Glassman, J. (2010). Racial violence, universal history, and echoes of abolition in twentieth-century Zanzibar. In D. R. Peterson (Ed.), *Abolitionism and imperialism in Britain, Africa, and the Atlantic*. *African studies from Cambridge, Cambridge Center of African Studies* (pp. 175–206). Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Goody, J. (2004). *Capitalism and modernity: The great debate*. Malden: Polity.
- Goody, J. (2006). *The theft of history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gosselain, O. P. (1992). Technology and style: Potters and pottery among Bafia of Cameroon. *Man*, 27(3), 559–586.
- Gosselain, O. P. (2000). Materializing identities: An African perspective. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 7(3), 187–217.
- Graham, J., & Gibson, K. (2006/[1996]). *The end of capitalism (as we knew it): A feminist critique of political economy* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hall, M. (1990) 'Hidden History': Iron age archaeology in Southern Africa. In P. Robertshaw (Ed.), *A history of African archaeology* (pp. 59–77). London, Portsmouth: James Currey, Heinemann.
- Hall, M. (2000). *Archaeology and the modern world: Colonial transcripts in South Africa and the Chesapeake*. New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, K. T. (2000). *Salaula: The world of secondhand clothing and Zambia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Hauser, M. W. (2008). *An archaeology of black markets: Local ceramics and economies in eighteenth-century Jamaica*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Hobson, J. M. (2004). *The Eastern origins of western civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horning, A. (2011). Subduing tendencies? Colonialism, capitalism, and comparative Atlantic archaeologies. In S. K. Croucher & L. Weiss (Eds.), *The archaeology of capitalism in colonial contexts: Postcolonial historical archaeologies. Contributions to global historical archaeology* (pp. 65–84). New York: Springer.
- Ingrams, W. H. 1967 [1931] *Zanzibar: its history and its people*. Frank Cass and Company, London.
- Johnson, M. (1997). Towards a world historical archaeology. *Antiquity*, 71(271), 220–222.
- Johnson, M. (2006). The tide reversed: Prospects and potentials for a postcolonial archaeology of Europe. In M. Hall & S. W. Silliman (Eds.), *Historical archaeology. Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology* (pp. 313–331). Malden: Blackwell.
- Kelly, K. G. (2004). The African diaspora starts here: Historical archaeology of coastal west Africa. In A. Reid & P. Lane (Eds.), *African Historical Archaeologies. Contributions to global historical archaeology*; C. E. Orser (Gen. Ed.) (pp. 219–242). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Kirkman, J. (1974). *Fort Jesus: A Portuguese fortress on the East African coast*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klose, J., & Malan, A. (2000). The ceramic signature of the Cape in the nineteenth-century, with particular reference to the tennant street site, Cape Town. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 55(171), 49–59.
- Lane, P. J. (1993). Tongwe fort. *Azania: Journal of the British Institute in Eastern Africa*, 28(1), 133–141.
- Lane, P. J. (2005). Barbarous tribes and unrewarding gyrations? The changing role of the ethnographic imagination in African archaeology. In A. B. Stahl (Ed.), *African archaeology: A critical introduction*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Lane, P. J. (2010). Developing landscape historical ecologies in eastern Africa: An outline of current research and potential future directions. *African Studies*, 69(2), 299–322.
- Lane, P. (2011). Possibilities for a postcolonial archaeology in sub-Saharan Africa: Indigenous and usable pasts. *World Archaeology*, 43(1), 7–25.
- Leone, M. P. (1999). Ceramics from Annapolis, Maryland: A measure of time routines and work discipline. In M. P. Leone & P. B. J. Potter (Eds.), *Historical archaeologies of capitalism* (pp. 195–216). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Leone, M. P., LaRoche, C. J., & Babiartz, J. J. (2005). The archaeology of black Americans in recent times. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 575–598.
- Liebmann, M. (2008) Introduction: The Intersections of Archaeology and Postcolonial Studies. In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, edited by U. Z. Rizvi and M. Liebmann, pp. 1–20 AltaMira Press, Lanham, MD.
- Marshall, L. W. (2011). *Fugitive slaves and community creation in 19th century Kenya: An archaeological and historical investigation of Watoro villages*. PhD thesis Charlottesville: University of Virginia.
- Massey, D. B. (2005). *For space*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender and sexuality in colonial contest*. New York: Routledge.
- Mershen, B. (2001). Observations on the archaeology and ethnohistory of rural estates of the 17th through early 20th centuries in Oman. *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, 31, 145–160.
- Miller, J. C. (2012). *The problem of slavery as history: A global approach*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mintz, S. W. (1985). *Sweetness and power: The place of sugar in modern history*. New York: Penguin.
- Mirza, Sarah and Strobel, Margaret (1989) *Three Swahili Women: Life Histories from Mombasa, Kenya*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

- Monroe, J. C. (2007). Dahomey and the Atlantic slave trade: Archaeology and political order on the Bight of Benin. In A. OgunDIRAN & T. Faloda (Eds.), *Archaeology of Atlantic Africa and the African diaspora* (pp. 100–121). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Monroe, J. C. (2010). Power by design: Architecture and politics in precolonial Dahomey. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 10(3), 367–397.
- Monroe, J. C., & OgunDIRAN, A. (2012). *Power and landscape in Atlantic West Africa: Archaeological perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moreland, J. (2001). *Archaeology and text. Duckworth debates in archaeology*. London: Duckworth.
- Mrozowski, S. A. (2006). *The archaeology of class in urban America*. New York: Cambridge Studies in Archaeology, Cambridge University Press.
- Myers, G. A. (1997). Sticks and stones: Colonialism and Zanzibari housing. Africa. *Journal of the International African Institute*, 67(2), 252–272.
- Myers, G. A. (2003). *Verandahs of power: Colonialism and space in urban Africa. Space, place and society*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Norman, N. L. (2009a). Powerful pots, humbling holes, and regional ritual processes: Towards an archaeology of Huedan Vodun, ca. 1650–1727. *African Archaeological Review*, 26(3), 187–218.
- Norman, N. L. (2009b). An archaeology of West African Atlanticization: Regional analysis of the Huedan palace districts and countryside (Bénin), 1650–1727. *Azania*, 44(2), 277–277.
- Norton, M. (2008). *Sacred gifts, profane pleasures: A history of tobacco and chocolate in the Atlantic world*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- OgunDIRAN, A. (2009). Material life and domestic economy in a frontier of the Oyo Empire during the mid-Atlantic age. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 42(3), 351–385.
- Orser, C. E. Jr. (1996). *A historical archaeology of the modern world*. New York: Plenum.
- Orser, C. E., & Funari, P. P. A. (2001). Archaeology and slave resistance and rebellion. *World Archaeology*, 33(1), 61–72.
- Piot, C. (1999). *Remotely global: Village modernity in West Africa*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Prakash, G. (2000). Can the ‘Subaltern’ ride? A reply to O’Hanlon and Washbrook. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and the postcolonial. Mapping, published in association with new left review* (pp. 220–238). New York: Verso.
- Prestholdt, J. (2004). On the global repercussions of east African consumerism. *The American Historical Review*, 109(3), 755–781.
- Prestholdt, J. (2008). *Domesticating the world: African consumerism and the genealogies of globalization*. Berkeley: The California World History Library, University of California Press.
- Reid, A., & Lane, P. (2004a). *African historical archaeologies. Contributions to global historical archaeology*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Reid, A., & Lane, P. J. (Eds.). (2004b). African historical archaeologies: An introductory consideration of scope and potential. In *African historical archaeologies. Contributions to global historical archaeology*. C. E. J. Orser (Gen. Ed.) (pp. 1–32). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Reidy, J. P. (1995). *From slavery to Agrarian capitalism in the cotton plantation south: Central Georgia, 1800–1880*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Reute, Emily (born Salme, Princess of Oman and Zanzibar) 1998 [1886] *Memoirs of an Arabian Princess from Zanzibar*. Gallery Publications, Zanzibar.
- Richard, F. G. (2010). Recharting Atlantic encounters. Object trajectories and histories of value in the Siin (Senegal) and Senegambia. *Archaeological Dialogues*, 17(1), 1–27.
- Rizvi, U. Z. (2008). Conclusion: Archaeological futures and the postcolonial critique. In M. Liebmann & U. Z. Rizvi (Eds.), *Archaeology and the postcolonial critique. Archaeology in society series, I. Hodder & R. W. Preucel (Gen. Eds.)* (pp. 197–203). Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Rockel, S. J. (2006a). *Carriers of culture: Labor on the road in nineteenth-century east Africa. Social History of Africa*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Russell, M. A. (2011). Precolonial encounters at Tamál-Húye: An event-oriented archaeology in sixteenth-century northern California. In S. K. Croucher & L. Weiss (Eds.), *The archaeology*

- of capitalism in colonial contexts. Contributions to global historical archaeology* (pp. 39–63). New York: Springer.
- Schmidt, P. R. (2006). *Historical archaeology in Africa: Representation, social memory, and oral traditions. The African archaeology series*. Lanham: AltaMira.
- Schmidt, P. R., & Walz, J. R. (2007). Re-representing African pasts through historical archaeology. *American Antiquity*, 72(1), 53–70.
- Schrire, C. (1995). *Digging through darkness: Chronicles of an archaeologist*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Shackel, P. A. (1994). *Personal discipline and material culture: An archaeology of Annapolis, Maryland*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Shackel, P. A. (1996). *Culture change and the new technology: An archaeology of the early American industrial era*. New York: Plenum.
- Shayt, D. H. (1993). Elephant under glass: The piano key bleach house of deep river, Connecticut. *IA. The Journal of the Society for Industrial Archeology*, 19(1), 37–59.
- Sheriff, A. (1987). *Slaves, spices and ivory in Zanzibar*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Sheriff, A. (2010). *Dhow cultures of the Indian Ocean: Cosmopolitanism, commerce and Islam*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Silliman, S. W. (2005). Culture contact or colonialism? Challenges in the archaeology of native north America. *American Antiquity*, 70(1), 55–74.
- Silliman, S. W. (2009). Change and continuity, practice and memory: Native American persistence in colonial New England. *American Antiquity*, 74(2), 211–230.
- Singleton, T. A. (Ed.). (1985). *The archaeology of slavery and plantation life*. New York: Academic.
- Singleton, T. A. (1998). Cultural interaction and African American identity in plantation archaeology. In J. G. Cusick (Ed.), *Studies in culture contact: Interaction, culture change, and archaeology* (pp. 172–188). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, Center for Archaeological Investigations.
- Singleton, T. A. (2001). Slavery and spatial dialectics on Cuban coffee plantations. *World Archaeology*, 33(1), 98–114.
- Stahl, A. B. (2001). *Making history in Banda: Anthropological visions of Africa's past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stahl, A. B. (2008). The Slave trade as practice and memory: What are the issues for archaeologists? In C. M. Cameron (Ed.), *Invisible citizens: Captives and their consequences* (pp. 25–56). Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Stahl, A. B. (2010). Review of Peter R. Schmidt (Ed.). Postcolonial archaeologies in Africa. *African Archaeological Review*, 27(2), 165–168.
- Stoler, A. L. (2002). Developing historical negatives: Race and the (modernist) visions of a colonial state. In B. K. Axel (Ed.), *From the margins: Historical anthropology and its futures* (pp. 156–188). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sunseri, T. (2007). The political ecology of the copal trade in the Tanzanian coastal hinterland, c. 1820–1905. *The Journal of African History*, 48(2), 201–220.
- Thomas, N. (1991). *Entangled objects: Exchange, material culture, and colonialism in the Pacific*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thompson, E. P. (1967). Time, work-discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past and Present*, 38, 56–97.
- Trouillot, M.-R. (1991). The savage slot. In R. G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology* (pp. 17–44). Santa Fe: School of American Research.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2006). The UNESCO slave route project. *International Social Science Journal*, 58(188), 191–194.
- Voss, B. L. (2000). Colonial sex: Archaeology, structured space, and sexuality in Alta California's Spanish colonial missions. In R. A. Schmidt & B. L. Voss (Eds.), *Archaeologies of sexuality* (pp. 35–61). New York: Routledge.
- Voss, B. L. (2008). Domesticating imperialism: Sexual politics and the archaeology of empire. *American Anthropologist*, 110(2), 191–203.

- Wallerstein, I. (1976). *The modern world-system: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic.
- Walz, J. R. (2010). *Route to a regional past: An archaeology of the lower Pangani (Ruvu) Basin, Tanzania, 500–1900. C.E.* PhD thesis Gainesville: Anthropology, University of Florida.
- Watson, J. L. (1980). *Asian and African systems of slavery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Watson, J. (Ed.). (2006). *Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- West, P. (2012). *From modern production to imagined primitive: The social world of coffee from Papua New Guinea*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wilkie, L. A. (2003). *The archaeology of mothering: An African-American midwife's tale*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilkie, L. A., & Hayes, K. H. (2006). Engendered and feminist archaeologies of the recent and documented pasts. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 14(3), 243–264.
- Wright, Marcia (1993) *Strategies of Slaves and Women: Life Stories from East/Central Africa*. James Currey, London.
- Wylie, A. (1999). Why should historical archaeologists study capitalism? The logic of question and answer and the challenge of systemic analysis. In M. Leone & P. B. J. Potter (Eds.), *Historical archaeologies of capitalism. Contributions to global historical archaeology* (pp. 23–50). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Wylie, A. (2002). *Thinking from things essays in the philosophy of archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wynne-Jones, S. (2006). Creating urban communities at Kilwa Kisiwani, Tanzania, A.D. 800–1300. *Antiquity*, 81(312), 368–380.