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Chapter 6

Discussion and Conclusions

“It was rather like a mountain chain of tall peaks poking through an impenetrable cloud bank of terra incognita. The peaks represented a few one-by-ones (or at most two-by-twos, the proverbial telephone booths’) stretched all along the Amazon and its tributaries. In those days it was easy to see stylistic and other connections between even far-flung peaks because of the paucity of data. (...) Now, as the cloud bank is slowly lifting the topography between the peaks is becoming much more complex and convoluted, and the similarities seen between peaks lessen, and the ranges diverge.” Roe 1994:195

“The life of a person is the sum of his tracks. The total inscription of his movements, something that can be traced out along the ground. And the life course of a people, the totality of their ways, conventions, and conventionally encountered situations, is the sum of its ‘tracks’, the trails over its country along which experience is measured out.” Wagner 1986:21

In this thesis I set out to examine the movements of individuals and objects in the contemporary Trio village of Amotopo (2001-2008). This resulted in a movement terminology which helps to advance the interpretation of archaeological movements on a micro-level. This movement terminology was subsequently applied to shed light on a temporal blind spot in archaeology, namely a century of dynamics. Besides serving a conceptual purpose for the archaeology of the wider Caribbean-Amazonian region, the investigation of a century of Trio dynamics also met a local request. Light was shed on the ancestral trails of the Amotopoans. Moreover, the Amotopoan case study can potentially serve as a specific baseline from which future local archaeological excavations of post-1492 sites can ultimately be contrasted.

In the first section (6.1) the methodological considerations for the adopted approach are briefly revisited. These will explain the backbone of this thesis. In the second section (6.2) the results from the investigations in the village of Amotopo are discussed. The observed and reported movements in this village have been conceptualised into three spheres of mobilia: namely the spheres of residential, subsistence and exchange mobilia, respectively.
In the third section (6.3), the results will be presented from the reflection on Trio dynamics over the course of a century. The formulated spheres of movement in Amotopo have been contrasted with those of two others, namely that of the Trio village Alalapadu during the early 1960s and that of the village of Anapi during the first decade of the 20th century. Besides increasing our understanding of Surinamese-Trio history, these reflections also placed the observations in present-day Amotopo in a new light.

In the final section (6.4) this thesis is evaluated and concluded, and some future research avenues and questions are put forward.

6.1 Methodological considerations revisited

To reason from human movement rather than from material culture as a point of departure in archaeology turns out to be problematic. This is due to the fact that archaeology can be seen as the antonym of movement; archaeology becomes because matter no longer moves. In order to observe and conceptualize human movement, archaeologists therefore need to study the present. Some scholars have highlighted both explicitly and implicitly the unethical underpinnings of archaeological studies in the present which have a sole focus on ‘sourcing’ contemporary people for a research target that is in no way beneficial to them (e.g. Gosden 1999:9; Buchli & Lucas 2001:4; Meskell 2005:82). Although this study initially started out as an ethnoarchaeological study, I came to sympathize with the aforementioned line of thought.

However, I did feel uneasy with the reverse side of the coin. Implicitly these scholars also severed the analogical ties from their archaeological interpretation entirely and instead aimed to reason in a contextual manner. To me, however, archaeological interpretation cannot exist without a source-target construction of analogies. As I see it, those who deny this simply avoid referring explicitly to their sources for interpretation. Instead, contextual archaeologists rely heavily on anthropological literature and theory for their archaeological interpretations (see van Reybrouck 2000:46-7). On the other hand, the criticism that archaeological studies in the present should also be beneficial to the people amongst whom these studies are acted out is well-placed.

It became all the more apparent on my arrival in Amotopo. Observing all of the plastic and metal objects in their village, I asked Atinio how things used to be in the past for the Trio and if there were any oral histories they could tell me. These naïve questions were immediately corrected: “We are no longer like that anymore, we are the New Indians.” He was completely right and I am glad he corrected me. This remark came to convene with a larger issue in Amazonian archaeology in which the Amazonian past had been tyrannized for a long time by the present. During my sec-
ond fieldwork period I brought Rivière’s book *Marriage among the Trio* in which the names of many of their older relatives were documented. The Amotopoans were fascinated by it and wanted me to investigate this social history further. I sought a way to combine both Amotopoan remarks with an archaeological interest in human movement.

I therefore geared this Amotopoan ‘source’ study to be primarily oriented to a connection with a preceding local or regional historical archaeology (see Fig. 1.2). The target therefore was not primarily a different people in a different past. Instead the target was set on the history of the people where the archaeological study in the present took place. Cultural continuities were to be expected, previously legitimizing the subsequent conduct of analogies into their pasts. Here, however, instead the differences have been sought after explicitly. Such difference appears when an analogy from the present, or from historical sources, is confronted with sources of the past that contrast with this projection. This analogical interaction cuts both ways: it yields an image of the past that is different from the present, as much as it makes the present differ from the past.

Likewise, in Amazonian archaeology the recent attitude has been to no longer allow the ethnographic present to tyrannise archaeological interpretations. The academic canon that has arisen in recent times speaks up for a different archaeological image than that of the Tropical Forest Culture that for decades has clouded the view of the archaeological past of the tropical lowlands of South America. Through its contrast with the present dominant image, the archaeological image became an independent entity (see also Rivière 1966-1967:305). However, I hold the opinion that this would not have been possible without the initial projection of a present or historical image that had to be corrected. I therefore came to see archaeological data as negative text which can be ‘read’ when contrasted with projected analogies that provide its necessary initial interpretative visibility. It is in this contrast that archaeological theorising begins.

### 6.2 Spheres of mobilia and the Amotopoan immobilisation process

In conducting an archaeological study in the present, much information appeared to be of interest, as one is able to observe all the actions and perceptions in which the material spheres are involved. Therefore it was necessary to restrict the unit of observation in order to archaeologically filter all this information. Parameters had to be sought in order to facilitate an archaeological source-target construction which made the recent past connect with preceding local periods. The first step was to equate the unit of observation with that of other archaeological periods. Therefore the choice was made to adopt a single village approach.
I decided to focus on Amotopo, a small Okomoyana-Trio village in the mid-west of Suriname, a village captained by Paneshi Panekke. In this village I came to advance knowledge of archaeological mobility on a micro-level by conceptualising it through archaeological parameters. It starts with the archaeological reality, in which all we encounter (ceramics, lithics, skeletons, etc.) is by essence no longer moving. All constituents of an archaeological site which share the fact that they all once have moved to the archaeological site under investigation can be called *immobilia*. In other words one can say that the archaeological mobility of a certain site is to be seen as the sum of its total of constituents’ movements.

In an ongoing context (a present-day village) the most predominant part of its constituents has not yet stopped moving yet, these are the *mobilia*. Coming from this direction both animate and inanimate entities are classed as *mobilia*. Objects in this way are perceived as an entity moving from place *a* to *b*, likewise an individual person is perceived as an entity moving from *a* to *b*. The people themselves are the primary *mobilia*. Next to moving their own bodies, they also transform animals and objects into *mobilia* by bringing them to the village. One can think for instance of bringing game, wooden posts, metal pans or plastic plates into the village. Ultimately all *mobilia* acquire a fixed position in archaeological sites through a process of immobilisation; they become *immobilia*.

The *mobilia* of Amotopo have further been conceptualised along archaeological parameters into spheres of residential mobilia, subsistence mobilia and exchange mobilia. It should be noted that these spheres are not mutually exclusive.

**6.2.1 Sphere of residential mobilia**

Let us begin with the first group of mobilia. Residential immobilia signify the sphere of residential movements. This group is represented by the structures that were built in the village (and theoretically, by the burials which did not yet exist in the village of Amotopo). The first appears to mark a residential move by a group of individuals. A burial on the other hand marks the final residential move of a specific individual and signifies a lifetime of movement.

In the course of its short life history a total of 24 persons had lived in Amotopo leaving their marks in the built environment. That means that some of the houses that were present in 2008 were temporarily or no longer inhabited (see Fig. 4.1). In that year 17 residents were said to live in the village. Over time these Amotopoan trails of ‘built environments’ had indirectly also determined the location of structures of newcomers in the outer circle of the village. The building of a new house, however, did not necessarily reflect the arrival of new inhabitants, but could also mean the
construction of a new house for current inhabitants. Instead of repairing a house, a completely new structure was preferred in which some posts of the old structures could be reused. The intentional infilling of postholes of older house plans potentially can mark intra-site residential movements. Trio habitation structures can be estimated to last a maximum of a decade or two, before a new house being constructed.

Reasoned from this observed sphere in Amotopo, the presence of traces of many structures does not necessarily mean many inhabitants, but instead points either to a high residential flux or to a high number of intra-site residential movements.

6.2.2 Sphere of subsistence mobilia

Subsistence immobilia signify the sphere of movements necessary to fulfil daily subsistence needs. This group is represented in Amotopo by the 23 refuse deposits that are scattered around the village. The daily refuse, however, was observed to be predominantly deposited on the refuse heap behind the communal cooking structure (RD-1, see Fig. 3.30-1). Day in, day out, waste and remains of food (bones of fish and game, peels of manioc, etc.) were being covered over by communal weed clearings from the village.

Labour divisions in Trio society were strictly gender-related, which also manifested in the observed daily Amotopoan movements and the goods that were subsequently brought into the village. Firstly I observed what the men of the village would bring into the village. Their movements were the most distant from the village (averaging 2834 m) and the items they procured from the surroundings were game and fish (respectively 1.2 and 4.4 per diem for the whole village), as well as fruits and construction wood. The same was done for the daily movements of the Amotopoan women, which did not extend beyond the adjacent gardens (averaging 206 m). They brought the largest and heaviest quantities of goods into the village, namely firewood, manioc and sugar cane (respectively 35 kg, 21 kg and 2.8 kg per diem for the whole village).

It should be stated that these numbers refer to daily movements during the rainy season, that the catch of game was relatively high thanks to favourable hunting conditions and that due to the heavy rains, there was a relatively low manioc yield during this season.
6.2.3 Sphere of exchange mobilia

Alongside to the procurement of subsistence materials from the surroundings, the Amotopoans also received mobilia through exchanges with non-Amotopoans. The sphere of exchange immobilia in Amotopo is marked by the toss-zone, which was encountered beyond the cleared and maintained village core and the boundary where the actual forest begins.

The temporal sequence signified by this sphere in Amotopo differed from days to decades. From the actual exchanges I could observe in village time, the sphere was dominated by perishable organic materials (58%). In the observed exchanges I could witness that a substantial part of the Amotopoan sphere of mobilia (22% of all the caught fish) left the village as exchange mobilia to relatives in other villages. Moreover, as I could observe in 2007, another exchange specialty of the village appeared to be manioc and its by-products. However, as mentioned above this exchange specialty could not be measured since the manioc yields in 2008 (when I explicitly focused on exchange) were low.

The longer-lived exchange mobilia were those accumulated in the Amotopoan habitation and cooking structures. Needless to say, the durable mobilia (containers and non-containers) stored in the structures were in the majority (74%). From the proportion of the inventoried Amotopoan durable mobilia for which a year of acquisition could be approximated, 25% (n=44) appeared to represent brought exchange mobilia from prior places of residence, signifying former exchange networks. To give an example of the time span, the oldest inventoried object in Amotopo was a metal pot which the wife of the captain had received from a missionary in the village of Alalapadu in 1967.

By adopting a meshwork analysis, a further study could be undertaken to visualize the intra and inter-site movements of both observed and reported exchange mobilia. Here the gender-related task divisions again became apparent in the Amotopoan movements. The flux of the exchange mobilia from and to the village was largely carried out by Atinio Panekke (AMO-03), the eldest son of the captain, whereas the growing collection of the exchange mobilia was temporarily accumulated by his mother Apëhpïn Mami (AMO-02) and his wife Rosianne Inesaahpë (AMO-04) in their respective cooking structures. The Amotopoan women appeared to have a substantial influence on this exchange sphere. The complementarity of gendered movements was clearly signified by the two different meshwork analyses: Atinio performed the actual exchange movements outside Amotopo, and his mother and wife subsequently accumulated the fruits of these exchanges.

160 The term ‘meshwork’, coined by Ingold (2007:80-2) was applied here instead of ‘social network’, since the movement aspect was emphasised here instead of the power relations of the different nodes (for a focus on the latter with the same data see Mol & Mans 2013).
6.3 A century of Trio movements

Staying with the theme of the movements in and out of Amotopo, the viewfinder was subsequently expanded to look at Trio movements over a longer period of time. The reasons for doing this were twofold: (a) the Amotopoan interest in investigating their own social history, and (b) the archaeological interest in investigating a longer period of Trio movements. A period of a century was chosen primarily because it was within this time frame that the most detailed reports could be found for individual Trio movements in the Sipaliwini basin. In addition, the period of c. 100 years can also be said to represent the archaeological blind spot in Caribbean and Amazonian region.

Between an average site’s duration (the determination of which is already a difficult enough task as it is), and the period in which interpretation emerges out of the realms of speculation, there seems to be an archaeological blind spot. The reason for this seems to be both a sequential problem and a contemporaneity problem. Both problems are caused by the fragmentary evidence of archaeological sites, in combination with such coarse instruments as seriation and radiocarbon dating, that make temporal connections between actual archaeological sites speculative and problematic. The data set simply gains more credibility when light is shed on a period of several centuries: in seriation the development of different styles of objects becomes clearer when we are dealing with a period of over a century, and the same goes for carbon dating, which becomes ever more certain when we move beyond the two-σ range of the carbon dates.

Trio oral history and historical reports were bundled to shed light on this century of Trio movements. With the aforementioned spheres of movements in mind, the small village of Amotopo formed our point of departure, from whence we reasoned to the beginning of the former century. In this century three Trio villages were selected (the first being Amotopo) for which high resolution reports were available. The specific villages were determined by having historical connections with the Amotopoans and by being contextualised in a period concerning a specific state of movement. Amotopo is contextualised in a period of fissioning, the sources for which are my own observations in 2007-2008. The second village is the missionary village of Alalapadu which represents a state of fusion. When Paneshi arrived here in this village as a young boy, it was probably the first time he saw white people. The first-hand reports for this village are provided by anthropologist Peter Rivière and cover 1963 and 1964. The final village is that of Anapi, an ancestor of Paneshi, which represents a deep state of fission. Both Claudius de Goeje (1907) and Conrad Käyster (1910-1911) were told about this village on their expeditions, but they were unfortu-
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nately unable to visit. Reports of Trio oral histories and memories have been referred to in all of the periods and especially in this final period.

These villages were contrasted with each other on the basis of their reported and inferred spheres of mobilia and immobilia. A counter-chronological approach was adopted because of the difference in the justification of knowledge that existed between the different data sets (the asymmetry of perception), therefore preventing conflation of different epistemic data sets. Care was taken to make reports (of lower justification) contrast with analogies from my own observed situations. Paraphrasing the philosopher Black, such an analogy ‘cuts both ways’ (Black 1962:38-47; Levine 2009:596). In this way the differences between the three selected villages concerning the spheres of movement could be highlighted and the changes through time became more apparent.

Now the results of this counter-chronological approach and its interactive analogies can be restructured into a brief archaeological overview of the different spheres.

6.3.1 Changes in the sphere of residential mobilia

When de Goeje visited the Trio in the first decade of the 20th century, they appeared to be in a process of fission. In their oral histories the Trio speak of the large village of Samuwaka, allegedly located near the Brazilian Parau savanna and the Kantani mountain, where in an undefined earlier period different groups (now all Trio) formed alliances and lived together. After some time the Samuwakans allegedly started to leave their village, in part because of rising political tensions due to the shortage of game, but also out of fear of attacks by other groups. The Samuwakans dispersed in different directions (Pesaihpë in Findlay 1976:1-4; Tëmenta in Koelewijn & Rivière 1987:253-262 and Boven 2001:18-19).

Much later Claudius de Goeje and Conrad Käyser encountered the Trio of the Sipaliwini basin living in dispersed small villages (in 1907 and 1910-1911, respectively). Anapi lived in one of the Trio villages mentioned to them. He was the great-great-grandfather of captain Paneshi of Amotopo. Of those villages visited in the course of subsequent expeditions, neither was in existence by the time of the second visit. Schmidt, who travelled through the area three times three decades later (1940-1942), had similar experiences. Even on single journeys he could perceive what seemed to be village trajectories, where the abandoned village, the present village and the new village of the same village leader could be witnessed. Schmidt estimated the duration of a Trio village to be only three to six years. An average of 26 inhabitants for each Trio village could be calculated on the basis of his reports.
During the early 1960s the Trio started to live together again in Alalapadu and the quick collective residential movements came to a halt. Due to the missionary influence, houses were built for the nuclear family and a change in house types slowly started to appear. After one more move to an even larger village (Kwamalasamutu), some of the Trio families started founding new small villages. The movements in the early 20th century were on foot and by bark canoes. Later, dugout canoes with outboard engines increased the distances between sequential villages. In these small villages different functional types of structure are observable, such as individual cooking structures and additional support structures. The quantity of built environment increased rapidly.

In terms of the immobilisation of residential mobilia one could hypothesize the following: residential movements in more lengthily occupied villages (> c. 15 years) occur within the same locality, which would result in an overlap of different structural layouts. However, in a situation of frequent collective movements, one would encounter only a single phase of structures. In plenty, if not all, of Trio cases villages are founded on former sites. The burials are an interesting feature in the immobilisation process since they mark the end point of human mobilia. Moreover, in the small Trio villages of the early 20th century a burial would probably also be the reason for the subsequent abandonment of the village, as was witnessed by Schmidt and reported by others. How the Trio dealt with burials in more lengthily occupied villages in the past is unclear (cf. Fock 1963:165).

6.3.2 Changes in the sphere of subsistence mobilia

The sphere of the subsistence mobilia of the Trio is the least known of the three from the earlier sources. De Goeje made the first implicit observations on movements concerning men clearing a garden, fishing and hunting. Women, on the other hand, would see to the cultivation of the gardens and the subsequent processing of food. Men would construct the houses and fashion dance attributes and basketry utensils, and women ceramic pots (de Goeje in Franssen Herderschee 1905b:957). Rivière would later emphasise that, in keeping with the gender-related task division, each man and woman was responsible for the provenance of the materials necessary for the production of these items (Rivière 1969:46). Reasoned from my own observations I could add that the Amotopoan women bring large quantities of firewood into the village. The procurement of clay is not necessary in Amotopo since the women from the village no longer make pottery. The women instead collect decorative seeds beyond the cultivated area on trips to other villages or on special trips escorted by men. Since most of these objects leave the village again in the hands of tourists, these objects now largely belong to the sphere of exchange.
The immobilisation of the remains of subsistence mobilia has been observed by Rivière, who states that garbage is deposited behind the structures on a plot of half-cleared land between the village and the forest (Rivière 1995:193). De Goeje’s observations and Rivière’s reported information strengthened his remark that in the past the Trio would have moved easily between different villages in the same agglomeration, to those places where certain resources were available (de Goeje 1908:1062-4, Rivière 1969:52,57). The hypothesis can be postulated that this could result in a larger than average accumulation of refuse heaps in a certain village (relative to its village size), in which a certain type of subsistence mobilia is overrepresented. In addition, I can add that most communal food remains were deposited on one of the refuse heaps in which layers of animal refuse and manioc peels were alternated with deposits of the frequent weed and soil clearings of the public area (T: anna) of the village. Besides this communal refuse heap, which was the largest, refuse of meals consumed in the domestic cooking structures would be deposited on the nearest domestic refuse heap.

6.3.3 Changes in the sphere of exchange mobilia

De Goeje observed several goods among the Trio that they had received from others. From the Ndyuka and Aluku Maroons, the Trio received various manufactured goods such as metal axes, knives and fish hooks. In return they provided the Maroons with hunting dogs and resin, which they acquired from the Saluma. From the Saluma they also received basketry and dance attributes. Later Schmidt described how exchange could also turn sour and mobilia could be obtained through coercion, as exemplified in Schmidt’s report on the raiding of a Saluma village (Schmidt 1942:38-9). This seemed to have resulted in residential movements away from the Trio. In that period sickness and curses must have also played a role in stagnating the exchange sphere for several Trio villages. Likewise, it can be postulated that these also led to a higher frequency of residential movements. From then on, these goods probably had to be made by each village or agglomeration itself again, necessitating the revival of former skills (see also Chagnon 1968:101). In this respect objects are derived from a different sphere of movement, namely that of own provenance.

When the Trio started to live together in the larger village of Alalapadu, the exchange movements between villages, like the residential movements, now unfolded within the confines of the village. Instead of moving between the physically separated villages, now a great part of the interaction sphere had now contracted into one village. The sphere of intra-site food exchange between families predominantly signified marital alliances. Slowly, more durable containers such as metal and plastic pots and pans
came to replace gourd, calabash and ceramic containers (Rivière 1969:46-7, 222). Since the latter would normally be produced using materials obtained from own provenance, the new objects with the same functionality were derived from exchange movements. In Amotopo the exchange mobilia would be accumulated to even greater proportions by the women in new types of structures. In tandem with the residential movement back to smaller villages, the exchange movements also seemed to receive an impulse. For example, Atinio came to act as a middle-man in performing the exchange movements, the act of which is highlighted in the ‘fission’ setting.

Not much is known about the Trio immobilisation of exchange items. Whereas in Amotopo the remains of food exchange immobilised quickly, the immobilisation of durable objects was not observed, except for that of some discarded objects in the toss-zone. The durable exchange items can potentially remain in circulation for long periods of time. Some of the items were described as having been deposited in the burials with their owners, with the exception of those items which were difficult to make or to come by through exchange (Schmidt 1942:26; Rivière 1969:222). It can be hypothesised that durable exchange items were only deposited in a burial when there was relatively easy access to similar items.

6.4 Concluding remarks and future research

The archaeological conceptualisation of movement in this dissertation has been strongly guided by archaeological parameters. Instead of following the movement of an object, I initially chose to observe objects moving in and out of the spatial area which is the village. Different categories of moving matter, deposited in different locations throughout the village, were observed to signal different spatial spheres of movement, condensing different temporal periods. Only those human movements which were actually marked by matter in the village were considered in this conceptualisation. Reasoning further from this stance I came to separate spatial spheres of mobilia (different categories of matter moved into a village by humans) from dimensions of mobility. The former hopefully provides an archaeological platform to the latter, which encompasses all human movements regardless of whether these are materially marked at a site or not.

Through the formulation of different archaeological spheres of mobilia, these could subsequently be contrasted with preceding time periods to mark material differences over time, each signalling different movements of their inhabitants. Due to the nature of the oral and historical reports, the material spheres had to be inferred in several cases. As such, beyond Amotopo’s timeframe, only archaeological hypotheses and expectations could be postulated for the selected periods, based on the reported obser-
vations of the mobilia at hand. In particular, the nature of the historical reports also had the effect that in approaching the earlier periods I increasingly came to lose the situational micro-level perspective on individuals and objects which the conceptualised archaeological mobilia concepts were actually designed to connect. Ideally I would have contrasted the Amotopoan data with data from as yet unexcavated archaeological sites of these selected periods. However, this hurdle was expected and a decision was made to contrast these mobilia concepts as a first test of the counter-chronological approach and interactive analogies. It in fact confirmed the essence of the asymmetry of perception that the interactive analogy had been anticipated to overcome.

In this centennial archaeological focus I was directed by the patrilineal genealogy of the Amotopoans, contextualising their history up to seven generations back. In this diachronic multi-site perspective I abandoned the fixed spatial unit of observation and followed the residential movements of the Amotopoans and their ancestors. From the village leader of Anapi and his son Sawirapo, who lived near the mountain of Tukuimín in the first decades of the 20th century, to Êujari’s village of Panapipa where his son Malatin and his grandson Paneshi were born, to the missionary village of Alalapadu, birth place of Atinio and subsequently to Kwamalasamutu, where his son Manais came into the world, and eventually, to the small village of Amotopo where the trajectories of the Amotopoans and my own trajectory became entwined. This century, albeit brief period from an archaeological point of view, showed a high dynamicity, with the Amotopoans and their ancestors moving through different sized villages ranging from approximately 20 inhabitants to 1000 inhabitants, during the course of which the material spheres of their villages slowly changed in appearance, along with their identities.

I would propose three directions particularly worthy of further exploration in future research. The first is to continue to broaden the research on the recent archaeology of Amotopo. The second is to extend the counter-chronological approach by exploring the proto-historical archaeology of the Guianese interior (for instance, the excavation of one of the early sites encountered by de Goeje or Käyser) in cooperation with its inhabitants, in order to archaeologically ground the Surinamese-Amerindian history of the interior. The third is to further the development of the concepts of mobilia by broadening and deepening the corpus of regional contemporary and historical observations concerning the spheres of movement. Other spheres of movement could be added to the conceptual corpus. The dynamic toolkit of concepts would aid in interpreting the dynamic micro-level of archaeological sites. This holds for the Caribbean and Amazonian sites in particular, where we are uncertain whether to interpret
sites as sequential or contemporaneous, because they are still obscured by the archaeological blindspot. We are again in need of an even higher resolution.

Further collaboration with the Amotopoans has already occurred since 2008. Together with representatives of a Karī’na village, they visited the National Museum of Ethnology (Leiden, the Netherlands) as community consultants in 2009. Here they studied their overseas heritage for several weeks, became acquainted with the Netherlands, the Kingdom about which they had heard so much. And they could finally pay me (NON-06) and my family a return visit!