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1. Introduction

In May 2012, the St. Maarten Archaeological Center (SIMARC) was asked to conduct an archaeological assessment of the Joremi N.V. property on St. Eustatius, Netherlands Caribbean. SIMARC sub-contracted the St. Eustatius Center for Archaeological Research (SECAR) to carry out the fieldwork.

The reason for this assessment is a proposed development project at Joremi N.V.’s property, indicated as NM-2 on the St. Eustatius Spatial Development Plan (Figure 1). Here, on the southwestern slopes of the Quill, Joremi N.V. proposes to construct a resort, eco-lodge, and several villas. The construction of these facilities can have a direct impact on archaeological remains present on the property.

SECAR and SIMARC conducted a comprehensive survey on Joremi N.V.’s property in November 2012, with the discovery and documentation of five archaeological sites and various historical stone walls. This report comprises a historical introduction to the island in general, and in addition an in-depth assessment of the archaeological remains encountered in the research area. This report further contains recommendations for future research and preservation of the archaeological remains encountered, and potential future research.

Figure 1. Location of the N-M-2 property on St. Eustatius, where the Joremi Development Project is proposed.
Figure 2. Proposed Joremi Development Concept Plan.

Figure 3. Topographic map of the survey area; note the extreme geographic conditions of the eastern portion of the property (White Wall and Big Gut).
Figure 4. Martin map of 1781, with some homestead properties and small plantations at the lower elevations of the survey property.

Figure 5. Werbata Map, 1916, of the proposed survey area; with no significant archaeological features identified.
2. Historical background

It was Wednesday 13th November 1493 when Christopher Columbus, on his second voyage to the New World, sailed by St. Kitts and became the first European to lay eyes on St. Eustatius. He did not land here, but he gave the island a name: *S. Maria de la niebe* (this name was later given to the island currently known as Nevis). Later explorers called the island by its probable Amerindian name *Aloi*, meaning ‘cashew island’. Throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the island appeared on charts and in documents as *Estasia, Estaxia, St. Anastasia, St. Eustatius, Statia, Eustathio* and *S. Eustachio*. In the end, two of these names are still used today.

In the sixteenth century the Spanish, who at that time constituted the majority of Europeans in the Caribbean, did not settle on Statia. One of the reasons for this is that the island did not have the things that the Spaniards were looking for: natural resources such as gold and silver. Furthermore, it did not have many (if any) Indian slaves who could be employed to mine these precious metals. Not surprisingly, other European powers came to have a presence in the area as well during the sixteenth century, and over time they were successful in making dents in the Spanish monopoly in the Caribbean. The Spanish, forced to defend their major ports and the treasure fleets, directed their attention to the Greater Antilles. The Lesser Antilles, including St. Eustatius, served as entry points for pirates and buccaneers, but later also for merchants, leading eventually to a presence in the Caribbean for, among others, the English, French and Dutch. They soon saw the value of the islands beyond points from which to attack the Spanish. In the early seventeenth century these European powers started to see potential in agriculture and commerce, resulting in rapid colonization of the Lesser Antilles. The organization that facilitated the first permanent European settling of St. Eustatius finds its origin in a war between the then most powerful European empire and one of the richest areas in Europe that started in the preceding century.

*The founding of the Dutch West India Company*

The story of the first permanent European colonization of St. Eustatius begins with the founding of the Dutch West India Company (WIC). The events leading up to its foundation can be traced back to 1568, when the people of the Seventeen Provinces started the so called ‘Dutch Revolt’ against Philip II, the king of the Spanish empire to which they were subjected. The main reason for this revolt was the persecution of Protestants by the Spaniards during the Protestant Reformation. The revolt resulted in the Eighty Years’ War, started by William the Silent to
liberate the Calvinist Dutch from the Catholic Spaniards. In 1581, the northern provinces signed the Union of Utrecht and the Act of Abjuration, which can be seen as a Dutch declaration of independence. The provinces which declared themselves independent of Spain called themselves the Republic of the Seven United Provinces.

Due to the war that was going on between this newly formed republic and Spain, the Dutch could no longer trade with Spain and its dominions (which also included Portugal). Until this time, the Dutch had distributed goods imported from the overseas colonies of Spain and Portugal. One of the main commodities they imported from Portugal was salt. The prosperous Dutch herring industry required large quantities of this commodity to conserve the herring. When the trade of salt with the Iberian peninsula was forbidden in 1598, the Dutch merchants had to build up an independent trade and search for salt elsewhere (Haviser 2010). Due to the former trade with Spain and Portugal they were well acquainted with the riches of the West Indies and South America where Spain and Portugal had a number of colonies. Moreover, the Dutch had a large number of sailors, capable ship-owners and sufficient capital. After the Twelve Years’ Truce, the Dutch Republic founded the First Dutch West India Company (WIC) in 1621. The WIC was a trading company that would increase trade with the West Indies and South America and establish settlements there which would be used as permanent trading posts. This was, however, not its main goal, since the WIC was an explicit instrument of war against Spain. This was to be, at all times, its main objective. The aim of the Dutch was not so much the occupation and colonization of the many easily available islands, as the gathering of information concerning the movements of the Spanish treasure fleets (Goslinga 1979:21). This information was used to capture the cargoes of Spanish ships, such as the famous silver fleet seized by Admiral Piet Heyn in 1628.

The Dutch merchants started an illicit trade with the Spanish colonies. As early as 1629, the Dutch had begun obtaining salt regularly on Tortuga. Salt was also obtained from St. Martin, Anguilla, the Curaçao islands, and the lagoon of Punta de Araya and the coastal area around the Uribe River in Venezuela (Haviser 2010). This aroused Great Britain’s jealousy since they were conducting illegal activities in the area as well, despite the monopoly position of Spain.

**The early years**

In the 1630s the Dutch began to colonize various Caribbean islands. St. Maarten was colonized in 1631, Curaçao in 1634, Aruba, Bonaire and St. Eustatius in 1636 and Saba around 1640 (Haviser 2010). In December 1635 the Zeeland merchant Jan Snouck and his partners received permission to establish a colony on St. Croix. They fitted out a ship, appointed Peter van
Corselles as leader of the future colony and sent him with sufficient men to the West Indies. On arrival the island appeared not to live up to expectations regarding fertility and anchorages, so they concentrated on the nearby St. Eustatius. This island was occupied by the Dutch in the spring of 1636. The expedition found the island uninhabited. The Amerindians who had lived there had probably died out or moved to other islands.

The English were the first Europeans to settle on St. Eustatius in 1625, but they moved soon after, probably due to unsuccessful agriculture (Alofs et al. 1997:76). Van Corselles and his men found the ruins of a deserted bastion on the island, on which they built Fort Oranje.

The bastion Fort Oranje was constructed on was built in 1629 by the French. In this year they temporarily settled on Statia, because they were afraid that the Spanish were going to use the island as a base from which to attack the French settlement on St. Kitts. Insufficient quantities of drinking water made their stay a short one. The Dutch strengthened the French fort with some cannon (Goslinga 1979:79). In 1636 the new population of St. Eustatius consisted of 40-50 people. These were mainly Zeelanders, Flemings and Walloons. They set up tobacco, sugar cane and cotton plantations and called the island ‘Nieuw Zeelandt’. Coffee and indigo were also grown on the island. As the plantations increased, so did the number of imported black and red slaves. Because of the international trade, several European merchants settled on the island as well, although the emphasis in this century lay on agriculture. In 1665 the population had grown to 330 white people and 840 Negroes and Indians. The yields from the plantations, which by 1650 were even to be found on the slopes of the hills, were exported to Zeeland. Prosperity increased steadily, but it was probably not until the beginning of the eighteenth century that urban development started to take place. Habitation in the seventeenth century most likely consisted of scattered farms around the fort (Purmer 2003). There were also a few warehouses built indicating small-scale trade. All this Dutch activity on the island caused Great Britain to be envious, particularly since a royal patent of 1627 declared Great Britain the owner of St. Eustatius. Despite these irritations these first few decades were very peaceful.

*Turbulent times*

In 1663 peace was disrupted when the Englishman Robert Holmes sacked the island. The English occupied St. Eustatius in 1665 during the Second Anglo-Dutch War after an attack led by Edward Morgan. In 1667 St. Eustatius was given back to the Dutch after the Treaty of Breda. In 1672, during the Third Anglo-Dutch War, Statia was under English control again, but a year later the Dutch took over the island. At the Treaty of Westminster in 1674 it was officially returned to the Netherlands, but the English were afraid it would fall into French hands, so they held on to it. This was agreeable to the *Heren XIX*, the board of the West India Company; in this
way they did not have to spend any money on the defense of the island (Attema 1976:18). In 1679 it was taken back into Dutch hands. In the same year though, the French attacked the island and destroyed the whole settlement. A year later a joint English/Dutch attack placed the island in Dutch hands again.

At this time the West India Company thought St. Eustatius would be very suitable as a transit harbour for enslaved Africans. Until now, Statia had been owned by various ‘patrons’. These were individual merchants and representatives of the Zeeland Chamber, who had a large capital at their disposal and were responsible for law and order and the appointment of a commander. In 1682, the island became completely the property of the Second Dutch West India Company. The Zeeland merchants who had owned the island gave it to the Second WIC, since the constant disruption to planting and trading activities by pirates and privateers proved too difficult for them. In 1689, St. Eustatius was captured by the French during King William’s War. They hauled away a booty close to two million dollars. By 1697 the Dutch found themselves again in possession of the island, after the English recaptured it for them (Goslinga 1979:81). The poor state of the island’s defense, including cannon that refused to fire or would even explode, was one of the main reasons why it was often given over without any significant opposition during the last four decades of the seventeenth century. Moreover, the inhabitants over time lost the will to resist, since the Dutch Republic most of the time failed to supply them with sufficient ammunition.

The multiple changes of power and an economic recession led to great poverty on the island at the end of the seventeenth century (Purmer 2003). People sometimes did not even have money to buy shoes. Because land was extremely cheap, people from other islands started moving to Statia. Between 1705 and 1715 the population on the island more than doubled from 606 to 1,274 inhabitants. Because of this population increase and the prevailing poverty, in 1717 the Statians wanted to colonize St. Croix, but an answer from the States General of the Republic was never received (Hartog 1976:35). During the first three decades of the eighteenth century family feuds and rivalries increased dramatically, ruining all chances of good and stable government and undermining a solid basis for prosperity. Since Statia was not very productive at that time, the Heren X did not really care about this turmoil.

**Forts and batteries**

The first record of a fort other than Fort Oranje is found at the end of the seventeenth century. It was in this period that the Waterfort was built, although the exact year of construction is unclear. It contained sixteen cannon but was hardly ever used. As a result, it quickly fell into disrepair. In
the late 1680s a battery was built on Gilboa Hill, overlooking Tommelendijk (Tumble Down Dick) Bay. When Isaac Lamont accepted the post of commander in 1701, he found the forts in a sad state. He asked the Heren X of the WIC for building materials and craftsmen to strengthen them, but his needs were never met. In 1709 French filibusters captured the island. Out of joy at their easy conquest, they wanted to fire off a cannon, but not a single one was fit for use (Hartog 1976:33). The French soon took off with a large booty, after which Lamont resumed possession of the island. By this time there were three other batteries in use apart from Fort Oranje: Dolijn, Tommelendijk and a new fort between Tommelendijk and Oranje. Nearly 30 years later, during the command of Isaac Faesch, not much seems to have changed, for the forts were still in a poor state. In 1737 the taxes were raised to finance their repair and the WIC sent 30,000 bricks for the forts’ renovation. The walls were strengthened and the platforms for the cannon were rebuilt, but despite from that everything remained much as before (Attema 1976:24).

In 1748, during the command of Johannes Heyliger, the citizens voluntarily raised a sum of money for the building of some new coastal forts. Two new forts were built: Hollandia and Zeelandia. The Heren X supplied the forts with cannon, but they forgot to send the cannonballs. Fort Oranje was renovated as well, but by 1755 its condition had again deteriorated. The original plan of Fort Oranje incorporated four bastions, one of which eventually collapsed along the cliff edge. Drawings dating to 1765 clearly depict the current three-bastion design. Enclosed within Fort Oranje were magazines and barracks.

In the mid-eighteenth century, commander De Windt built various batteries along the northern coast of the island: Turtle Bay, Concordia, Corrie Corrie and Lucie. In the south he built a battery named after himself: Battery De Windt. By 1781 fourteen military sites were present on the island, all in severe disrepair. At the end of the same year the French, who had taken over the island, restored the neglected forts and built four new ones: Panga, Jussac, Royal, and Bouille. They also constructed a network of roads linking the forts and batteries. By the end of 1782 Johannes de Graaff mentions that the island had been brought ‘in a formidable state of defense’ (Hartog 1976:97).

All these sites were not used simultaneously. The Statian garrison numbered around fifty men of a low standard. They were vagrants, ranging from seventeen year old boys to 67 year old men. The attitude of the WIC was one of the reasons why the fortifications time and time again fell into negligence. Everything had to be done as cheaply as possible. This was not exceptional in the Caribbean, since defense works of the British and French islands fared no better.
Figure 6. Drawing by Jan Veltkamp depicting enslaved Africans working on a Statian sugar plantation around 1750. Source: National Maritime Museum, Amsterdam.

Figure 7. Drawing by S. Weuijster depicting slave traders in the roadstead of St. Eustatius in 1763. Goods and people are being transported between ships. One of the sailing ships bears the name Sara Helena. Source: Atlas van Stolk collection, Rotterdam.
Slavery and the slave trade

In the 1630s the Dutch conquered parts of Brazil and Guinea. From this time on they improved their position as slave traders. In the period 1660-1670 Curaçao developed into an important slave depot for the West Indies. After 1730 everyone was allowed to export enslaved Africans from the Dutch West African coast, but had to pay tribute to the WIC to do so. The WIC lost a lot of money to smugglers who did not pay and could offer enslaved Africans for a cheaper price. On St. Eustatius these smugglers sold a lot of enslaved Africans, since the WIC failed to supply them time and time again. Already in 1675 St. Eustatius provided the French, Spanish and English islands with enslaved Africans (Hartog 1976:49). By 1725 the Dutch shipped 2,000 to 3,000 enslaved Africans per year to the island, almost all in transit (Figure 7). Slave ships brought their cargo to Statia to be auctioned to buyers from the surrounding islands. Fort Amsterdam, at Oranje Bay’s northern end, hosted slave auctions and served to store enslaved Africans. Initially, the main building was only one storey; however it was expanded to two in 1742 to accommodate additional enslaved Africans. Sometimes the enslaved Africans were transferred from one ship to another without even coming ashore.

Enslaved Africans were delivered dressed, and if you wanted to get a good price for one, he/she needed to be well fed. The Statian enslaved Africans worked not only on plantations (Figure 6), but also as crewmen on ships, ship workers, transporters of goods to and from ships, and as servants (Haviser 1999). They possibly also helped in making illegally imported raw sugar into rum. The slave trade reached its peak in the early 1770s. Towards the end of the eighteenth century people started to protest against this trade. The slave trade in the Dutch colonies was ended in 1814, but it was not until 1863 that the Dutch abolished slavery. In town, enslaved Africans lived both in and around the merchants’ homes; various inventories indicate that slave dwellings were part of these properties in addition to other outbuilding. There is also

Figure 8. Het Eyland St. Eustasie. View of St. Eustatius in 1759. Cultivated land can be seen extending high up the slopes of the Quill to the right. Source: National Archives, The Hague.
strong evidence that a large number of freed enslaved Africans lived in areas at the periphery of Oranjestad. On plantations, enslaved Africans lived in little villages, often referred to as ‘slave quarters.’ Interestingly, whereas on most other Caribbean islands the slave dwellings were in sight of the plantation owner’s house, on Statia this was not the case, suggesting that surveillance of the enslaved Africans’ home lives was more limited. Owners could have, as was found elsewhere, placed slave housing in an area that was more easily observed. However, the owners may have felt no need to constantly watch their enslaved Africans due to the small size of Statia. As a result, enslaved Africans probably enjoyed a much different physical and social environment that those living on other islands. On Statia, enslaved Africans moved between the plantations and throughout the trading district with relative ease.

Thus the living conditions were more open for enslaved Africans on Statia compared to those in other places. Here they could earn money with which they could purchase their freedom. These so called ‘free blacks’ would sometimes have a few enslaved Africans of their own (Gilmore in Haviser & MacDonald 2006:78). Nevertheless, it often happened that enslaved Africans tried to escape, not always without success. In 1750, a ship named the Young Elias lay at anchor at St. Eustatius. The only people on board were four enslaved Africans, who hoisted sail and escaped to Puerto Rico, where, once they were baptized, they did not have to worry about being sent back.

Growing prosperity and the Golden Era

The economic situation of Statia changed for the better after 1730. In 1739 a synagogue (Honen Dalim) was built in the center of Oranjestad for the growing Jewish community of the island. Most people, however, were Christian, resulting in the building of various churches over time. By the 1740s it was no longer possible to expand agriculture, since all arable land was under cultivation. The demand for sugar soared in this decade. As a result, the plantations growing cotton, coffee and tobacco were converted into sugar cane plantations. A 1742 map of the island shows 88 plantations and/or landholdings. Nearly four decades later, in 1781, this number had diminished to about twenty, indicating an economic shift from agriculture to trade. On Statia, plantations were designed for two primary purposes. First, to process illegal sugar for re-export and second, to grow provisions for re-supplying ships and for slaves on other islands.

The residential and commercial areas on the island were enlarged in the eighteenth century despite various setbacks and difficulties like slow workers, conflicts about landownership and devastating hurricanes in 1772 and 1780. The bay area, where Lower Town is located, was extended by reclaiming land from the sea and Upper Town by newly built merchant
Figure 9. View of St. Eustatius from the northwest as it appeared in 1774. The large building in Upper Town is the residence of Jan de Windt. To the left of the church tower is the town hall. The first building (with the blue roof) at the front of Lower Town is the weighing-house. The building behind the weighing-house is the headquarters of the Dutch West India Company. Watercolour by Emants, after a drawing by A. Nelson. Source: SECAR collection.

Figure 10. View of St. Eustatius from the southeast as it appeared in 1774. The house left of the church tower, with the flag, is the governor’s house. Between this house and the church tower Fort Oranje is situated. Saba can be seen in the background on the left. Most ships are flying the Dutch tricolour, but there are also English flags (the St. George’s Cross) to be seen on the ships. Watercolour by Emants, after a drawing by A. Nelson. Source: SECAR collection.
houses on a stretch of land called the ‘Compagniessavane’, a West India Company owned plantation above town. The latter was laid out in lots approximately 0.1 hectares in size. Lower and Upper Town were divided by high cliffs. Several steep paths connected the two parts of the town. Lower Town started to become a trade locus towards the end of the first half of the eighteenth century. Due to steady population growth, housing was scarce and rental of a house was very expensive. This caused merchants to build houses on the bay after 1760, some of which were of palatial dimensions.

Besides the residential houses new warehouses, trade offices and a new weighing house were built. In the latter half of the eighteenth century building activities and trade increased resulting in a strip of an estimated 600 two-storey high warehouses that stretched for two kilometers along the bay (Figures 9 & 10). They were sometimes so full that the doors could no longer be used. An account from the Scottish lady Janet Schaw dating to 1775 shows Lower Town to have been a continuous market displaying goods of different types and qualities sold by people from all over the world:

“From one end of the town of Eustatia to the other is a continuous market, where goods of the most different uses and qualities are displayed before the shop doors. Here hang rich embroideries, painted silks, flowered Muslins, with all the Manufactures of the Indies. Just by hang Sailor’s Jackets, trousers, shoes, hats, etc. The next stall contains the most exquisite silver plate, the most beautiful indeed I ever saw, and close by these iron pots, kettles and shovels. Perhaps the next presents you with French and English Millinary wares. But it were endless to enumerate the variety of merchandise in such a place, for in every store you find every thing, be their qualities ever so opposite.”

(Journal of a Lady of Quality: Janet Schaw, 1731-1801)

After 1760, the number of ships arriving on Statia numbered between 1,800 and 2,700, reaching a maximum of 3,551 ships in 1779. They came from Europe, Africa and the Americas. Almost 20,000 merchants, slaves, sailors and plantation owners were crowded on this small island in its heyday (a large proportion of these were temporary residents). In the 1770’s imports exceeded the capacity of the island’s warehouses and sugar and cotton were piled up high in the open air (Klooster 1998:96). This was the time at which St. Eustatius reached its greatest prosperity and earned its nickname the ‘Golden Rock’.

In these years Statian society was composed of a small group of long-term residents and a majority of people who were short-term immigrants from Europe and the Americas, hoping to become rich in a short time. This resulted in a constant influx of new goods and ideas. Both
politically and economically, Statia was dominated by a small elite group of men who controlled the trade. Dutch, Spanish, French, English, Swedish, ‘Italian’, and Jewish merchants, participating in commerce on a massive scale, formed this community. The wealth and power of these men was symbolized and transmitted to the Statian population. This resulted in a culture focused on material possessions such as large numbers of enslaved Africans, extensive landholdings, large houses, and fancy objects such as Chinese porcelain. Johannes de Graaff, the commander of the island from 1776 to 1781, is a perfect example of this. His personal possessions included an army of enslaved Africans, chests filled with gold and silver coins and even a duck pond. It was not unusual for wealthy residents to own several properties, both in town and on the countryside.

A distinction can be made between those who owned and operated plantations and those who were merchants and resided in town. However, the available evidence suggests that Oranjestad was similar to some other colonial towns in the Americas, in that wealthy individuals would establish “urban plantations” containing all of the architectural elements of a typical rural plantation, including outbuildings and sometimes even small plots where crops were grown, just on a reduced scale. On St. Eustatius, one such home was constructed by one of the wealthiest merchants, Simon Doncker. He built on a substantial lot in very close proximity to the town centre. Towards the rear of the property he grew crops, and outbuildings were built between these and the main house. Other smaller homes, such as the one known as the Godet property, were condensed even further. Still standing on this property are the kitchen, hurricane house, cistern and outhouse, all built of hewn stone and imported yellow Dutch brick.

There were several reasons for Statia’s economic success. First, it had an ideal location on the busy sea-lanes between the Greater and Lesser Antilles. Second, the harbour was ideally situated on the leeward side of the island and geological conditions inhibited the condensation of rain clouds on The Quill. This reduced the quantity of rainfall, restricting the quality and quantity of tobacco, sugar cane and other farm products that could be produced on the island. Left with no agricultural promise, trade was the best option for the residents (Gilmore in Reid 2008). Third, the island was surrounded by colonies of various European countries. These colonies were dependent on supplies from their mother countries according to the monopoly system, which were not always sufficient or on time. Every colonial power tried to monopolize trade with its colonies in order to keep the prices high (Alofs et al. 1997:77). Since it was a Dutch custom to favour free trade and the Republic was in a neutral position in many European wars, in 1754 St. Eustatius was made into a free port which was in an excellent position to ship not only slaves but also other illegal supplies such as sugar, tobacco, foodstuffs, gunpowder, and weapons to these colonies. This illicit trade between the Caribbean islands, the Spanish-American mainland and
the North American colonies is termed the *kleine vaart*. On Statia this took on enormous proportions. For example, around 1770 Statia produced about 600,000 lbs of sugar annually, but it exported 20 million lbs. The remaining 19.4 million lbs were brought over from other islands and sold tax free on St. Eustatius to maximize profit (Gilmore 2004:49). Weapons and gunpowder, originally coming from Europe, were shipped in great numbers to the English colonies in North America in exchange for commodities such as sugar and tobacco. This trade reached its peak during the American War of Independence. The outbreak of this war in 1774 brought as many as twenty North American ships at a time crowding into the small bay at St. Eustatius to buy supplies needed by the rebels. Even the English merchants on the island were willing to sell whatever the enemies of their country needed. In 1775 the export of arms and war equipment to North America from Dutch ports was forbidden by the Dutch government under pressure from Great Britain, but on Statia this was ignored and the illegal trade continued to flourish. This is aptly illustrated by a letter from Abraham van Bibber, the Maryland agent on the island, written to his superiors, saying: ‘*obedience to the law would be ruinous for the trade*’. Gunpowder was shipped in boxes labeled as tea or in bales labeled as rice, officials were bribed and the control by customs officers was faulty (Goslinga 1985:144). These three factors caused the island to become *the* major trading center in the Atlantic World during the late eighteenth century.

*The turn of the tide*

On 16\(^{th}\) November 1776 Johannes de Graaff, the commander of St. Eustatius at the time, ordered a return salute to be fired to the *Andrew Doria*, an armed North American brigantine flying the colours of the rebelling thirteen colonies. Although this counter salute was insufficient for a recognition of the sovereignty of a foreign state (it was not in accordance with protocol) and De Graaff did not have the slightest competency to do such a thing, the act was interpreted by the English as clear recognition of the rebellious colonies’ newly found state by St. Eustatius. The English were furious and felt betrayed by the Dutch because Statia, the representative of what was at that time still an allied state, chose the side of their enemy (Jameson 1903). The Statians, however, just wanted to make as much profit as possible, and ships like the *Andrew Doria* always came to buy arms and ammunition (Hartog 1976:72). Moreover, it was not the first time that a ship flying the Grand Union Flag received a return salute. Earlier that year it also happened on St. Croix and St. Thomas (Jameson 1903). The big difference with Statia was that here the flag was flown by a commissioned naval vessel whose captain, Isaiah Robinson, was a Captain.
of the Navy. The Statians had no idea of this, because the Andrew Doria did not look like a naval vessel by outward appearances (Hartog 1976:70).

Nevertheless, this event, together with the capture of an English ship by the American ship Baltimore Hero near Statia in 1776, the continued saluting of North American ships buying arms by commander De Graaff whom the English wanted to be fired, the constant equipping and fitting-out of privateers to prey on British commerce, and the steadily growing envy of the English to the prosperity of St. Eustatius led to increased conflict with Great Britain - which declared war on the Republic in December 1780 - and the capturing of the island by Admiral George Brydges Rodney in February 1781 (Jameson 1903). Together with Sir Samuel Hood and General Vaughan he arrived on St. Eustatius with 3,000 men in 23 ships of the line, five frigates and a number of smaller ships (Figure 11). The odds were clearly against the Dutch garrison of fifty men in their neglected forts and batteries and the two Dutch men-of-war lying at anchor. Nevertheless, a few shots were fired for honour’s sake before the island surrendered. Rodney kept the Dutch flag flying from Fort Oranje for a month in order to seize the cargoes of unsuspecting ships arriving on the island. The warehouses were sealed and all shops had to remain closed. When Rodney landed, the yearly rent on the warehouses totaled £1,200,000. Over £3,000,000 was realized from goods that were auctioned from the warehouses in what the 1783 Annual Register described as “one of the greatest auctions that ever was opened in the universe.”
In addition to this sum, over £4,000,000 in bullion was confiscated from island residents. All of these figures are in eighteenth-century terms. They represent the largest single booty taken in time of war by any nation during the eighteenth century. The intended destruction of the island, which Rodney called ‘a nest of vipers which preyed upon the vitals of Great Britain’, did not take place (Attema 1976:40).

Towards the end of 1781 the French managed to take over the island with a surprise attack. At this time, France and the United Provinces were allies against Great Britain. St. Eustatius returned to Dutch control in 1783. In 1784, after the actual change of government had taken place, St. Eustatius again became a free port and trade recovered, causing the economy to flourish even more than it had done so in the previous decade. The population increased to a record breaking 8,000 at the end of the 1780’s, of which almost 5,000 were enslaved Africans.

Around 1795 the importance of St. Eustatius as a transit harbour declined. The United States had become independent and trade moved to North America. To make matters worse, the end of the slave trade was looming. On top of all this the French captured the island in 1795. The French policies governing trade inhibited the free transactions that built the island’s wealth. These events signaled the end of prosperity on what a mere fifteen years earlier was the richest trading centre in the Caribbean. In 1801 the English seized St. Eustatius again, but a year later Dutch rule was reinstated with the peace of Amiens. In 1810 St. Eustatius surrendered to the English. In 1814 Great Britain agreed to return the six Caribbean islands to the Dutch. The actual change occurred two years later, causing the Dutch flag to reappear in the West Indies. In the following decades the warehouses that used to be stuffed to their roofs decayed, just like the forts.
and batteries. Upper Town fared a bit better. In 1840 there were just ten plantations left. The size of Oranjestad rapidly decreased along with the population density. After the abolishment of slavery, enslaved Africans left the countryside to settle in the town and as a result the cultivation of crops came to an end. In order to provide some income 80,000 warehouse bricks were exported in 1855. Another way the people on the island made money in these years was by exporting trass, a volcanic earth that makes good mortar, to other Caribbean islands. Devastating hurricanes in 1898, 1899, 1900, 1923 and 1928 caused a lot of damage and increased the rate of decline. The population decreased from 2,668 people in 1816 to a mere 921 in 1948. The island that was once known as one of the leading ports of the world became an almost forgotten community.
3. Research methodology

The research area is located on the southwestern slope of the dormant Quill volcano. Because it is densely overgrown and even impenetrable in some places, it was decided to cut a path across the research area with a mechanical excavator. This path would serve as a point of reference during the survey and would allow for easier access to all parts of the research area. The cutting of this path was monitored by an archaeologist at all times.

From the path, surveys by foot were conducted throughout the research area by a team consisting of SECAR, SIMARC, and STENAPA personnel and volunteers. In this way, five archaeological sites were encountered, of which GPS coordinates were taken. Wherever possible, surface artifacts were collected to determine the age, nature, and extent of the site. At site 5, the most prominent site in the research area, five test units were excavated in order to get a better understanding of the date and function of the structures. Site plans of sites 2, 3 and 5 were also drawn.

Figure 13. Part of the path cut by the excavator.
4. Results

In addition to several historical stone-pile walls, five archaeological sites were also identified during this 2012 survey campaign. Many of these stone-pile walls were in variable states of decomposition by both natural causes and in a small part due to the mechanical clearing for the survey tracts. Due to the poor quality of preservation of many of these stone-pile walls, only documentation of the most prominent walls were noted in this report. Below is an inventory and interpretation of the archaeological sites encountered. Appendix 1 contains a satellite image with all the sites indicated. The green area on this image is an area of high expectancy. An extensive survey was conducted in this area where, according to the 1781 P.F. Martin map, a sugar processing area was located. No remains on the surface were found, but it is expected that these remains are buried.

Figure 14. Archaeological sites indicated on the 1781 P.F. Martin map. Site 1 is indicated by the green circle, site 2 by the red circle, site 3 by the yellow circle, site 4 by the orange arrow, and site 5 by the blue arrow.
Site 1 (SE602) - 17°28.506’N  62°58.574’W

This site consists of one historic cistern with several modern pieces of concrete wall in close proximity. The cistern is in a very bad state of repair. Its inner dimensions are 3.35 x 1.74 m. A round circular feature was found on the cistern’s northern wall, measuring 45 cm in diameter. The few historical artifacts noted at this site were primarily of the 19th century, and thus this site is suggested to also be from that time period. The structure might be related to the plantation complex historically known as ‘the Farm’, as it was found in close proximity to this complex.

Figure 15. Close-up of the cistern’s northeastern corner. Scale: 20 cm.
Figure 16. Circular feature in the cistern’s northern wall. Scale: 20 cm.
Site 2 (SE603) - 17°28.307’N 62°58.288’W

This site comprises of several stone pile walls (Figure 17). Their exact function could not be determined, but given their proximity to each other, they are not likely to be boundary walls. This site is not indicated on any known historical maps. An unusually large quantity of surface artifacts on the site indicates that it might have served a residential purpose. Artifacts encountered and collected include fragments of Rhenish stoneware, creamware, delftware, and porcelain, several glass bottle fragments, Dutch yellow bricks (IJsselsteentjes) and floor tiles. These historical artifacts suggest a temporal occupation at Site 2 within the 18th century.

Figure 17. Site plan of site 2, indicating the position of the stone pile walls.
Figure 18. Fragment of a Chinese porcelain plate, found on the surface.

Figure 19. One of the walls exposed by the excavator, looking southwest. Scale: 2 m.
Figure 20. The westernmost wall looking northwest. Scale: 2 m.

Figure 21. Nearly intact case gin bottle, dating to the nineteenth century, found on the surface.
Situated between two guts, this site consists of numerous piles of stones, a large tamarind tree, a small cistern, and a stone piled U-shaped or rectangular feature (Figures 22, 23 and 24). The cistern is in a very bad state: its walls are falling apart and the plaster is disintegrating. It probably did not have a dome on it originally. Few surface artifacts were encountered, making it hard to determine the function of this site. However, some case gin bottle bases indicate a nineteenth century date for the use of this site. Most likely, the stone piles are a result of land clearing in order to allow cattle and/or other farm animals to roam freely without hurting themselves on the stones. The small, domeless cistern could have been used by these animals. The U-shaped or rectangular feature could have been used as an animal pen. Several nearby plantations were transformed into cattle farms in the early nineteenth century, as shown on the 1846 Bisschop-Grevelink map. This site might have been used by people operating these farms. This site is not indicated on any known historical maps.

Figure 22. SECAR and STENAPA staff and volunteers exploring site 3. In the foreground, several stone piles can be seen.
Figure 23. The cistern at site 3.

Figure 24 (next page). Site plan of site 3.
Site 4 (SE605) - 17°28.240’N 62°58.421’W

This site, located in the lower part of the research area, consists of numerous surface artifacts and building remains. Artifacts include several types of slipware, porcelain, stoneware, roof tile fragments, bottle bases, and a large proportion of delftware.

The 1781 P.F. Martin map shows three small structures at this site (Figure 14). Evidence of these was found in the form of several cut stones that were bulldozed when the Kadaster tried to establish the property boundaries several weeks prior to the start of the archaeological fieldwork. Part of this site falls outside of the Joremi property (see Appendix).

Figure 25. Cut basalt cornerstone exposed by the bulldozer at site 4.
Figure 26. Surface artifact collections, of the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries.
Site 5 (SE606) - 17°28.382’N  62°58.194’W

Site 5 is clearly an historical homestead complex, perhaps associated with the Site 3 upland cleared pasture area. Site 5 is at a much higher elevation, which overlooks Site 3, on the narrow (about 60 m wide) ridge between these two deep ravines. Site 5 consists of various stone-mortar structures, including: a domed cistern with yellow brick trim (3.2 m X 1.6 m, and 2.65 m from the top opening to the interior bottom of the cistern). This cistern is attached to a rectangular house structure with about 2 m maximum height wall ruins and three window openings, approx. overall dimensions 6 X 10 m); to the north of these about 10 m is a larger (storage) structure with about 3m maximum height wall ruins and no apparent windows, only half of this structure is present; and a rectangular terraced platform (about 15 X 10 m) surrounded by stone piles to the immediate east of the house/cistern. Around the area are various stone-piles resultant from land-clearing, and a stone-pile wall uphill to the west which spans between both the deep ravines on either side of the site, and has a V-shape at its apex, perhaps to divert water into the ravines. Artifacts first noted at the site were few and diverse ranging from 17th to 19th century, with a small surface collection made. From these final observations I have made the general rough sketch map below of Site 5 characteristics, with the various features indicated and the locations of the five test unit excavations.
Figure 26. Site 5, General sketch map of overall site features and test unit locations.
Figure 27. Site 5, Feature 1 cistern.

Figure 28. Site 5, Feature 2 structure (house), wall with three openings, and south wall without mortar.

Figure 29. Site 5, Feature 3 mortared walls (work-food processing) (left), and Feature 4 rectangular stone piles (animal pen).
During the photography at the site, it was noted that on the house structure there seem to be two types of mortar, an old lime-mortar and a newer 19th century mortar. For a more precise documentation of Site 5 (the most significant site recorded during this 2012 campaign) we conducted five 1 X 1 m Test Units and one 1 X 2 m Test Unit excavations at the various structural features of the site. These units were excavated in arbitrary levels, yet based primarily on the soil stratigraphy noted in the deposits. Artifacts from the excavations were separated and labeled by provenience, for processing at the SECAR laboratory.

Site 5, Test Unit 1
Located at the northeast corner of the Feature 2 structure, the house structure, we placed at the immediate corner adjacent to the north and east walls a 1 X 2 m test excavation unit. Surface photographs taken, then cleared surface photographs, with subsequent photographs of each Level floor.

Level 1 (0-15 cm b.s.) consists of removal of the leaves, mulch, and roots with fine sand, with a Munsell Soil Color of 10 YR 3/2. Very few artifacts we noted, a few clear glass fragments, numerous large stones with plaster attached, and several yellow bricks.

Level 2 (15-20 cm b.s.) was a transition from the first strata soils, into a more grey colored and more sandy soil, at 20cm the grey soils cover the unit. The Munsell Soil Color of these loose fine sandy soils were 10 YR 3/2-4/2. Along with two clear glass fragments, two interesting artifacts were found in this level 2, including a hand-wrought iron hinge fragment, and a very unique bronze object that seems to be an ink pen tip, with molding design. This is a very stylized and unique artifact, which should be easily datable.

Level 3 (20-40 cm b.s.) was situated directly below the upper soils, becoming more fine sand with a more graying of color to 10 YR 4/2-3, and a dramatic reduction of larger stones noted and with an increase of the artifacts found. The primary artifacts founds in this level were numerous hand-wrought square iron nails, some clear glass, and only 3-4 ceramics (porcelain/lead-glazed earthenware). These iron nails artifacts seem to be the remains of a wooden floor of roof for this part of the structure, including one nail was found hammered thru a lead seal, which suggest a roof nail. At about 40cm depth the soil changes dramatically to a very grey gravel-grit, with very few larger stones, and sterile of artifacts.

Level 4 (40-50 cm b.s.) these are grey gravel-grit soils, which seem to be the foundation fill material and are sterile of any artifacts. Munsell Soil Color of these fill-soils is 10 YR 6/1.

We ended the Test Unit 1 excavation at 50cm depth. The east wall soil profile was drawn.
Figure 30. Site 5, Test Unit 1, Level 1 floor with rubble piles, and level 3 floor with wall foundation.

Figure 31. Site 5, Test Unit 1, Level 4 floor with east profile, wall foundation, and sterile base soils.

During completion of the site map, was noted an unusual attribute on the Feature 2 north wall, the top of the wall has a sloped mortared flat top, which is angled from the east wall down to about half way to the cistern (about 3-4 m), then a drop angle of about 40 cm, then the ruins
walls continue. Part of the sloped wall is collapsed on the ground adjacent and exterior to the wall, with the flat top mortared angle evident.

Figure 32. Site 5, Feature 2, sloped top attribute, north wall.

At Site 5, to determine a specific function for this Feature 2 wall with three openings. It was seen that the south mortared wall extends east towards the ground embankment about 3 meters. Thus the three openings are actually the west wall of the house structure, this is further confirmed by the wooden door frame insets on the openings being to the west face of this wall. This means that the Test Unit #1, was actually on the exterior of the house structure west wall. This further explains what the sloped flat top on the Feature 2 north wall is, a buttress of the west wall of the house at the structurally weakest corner. Therefore the actual house area of Feature 2 is now indicated as Feature 2a. As well, the quantity of roof nails found in Test Unit 1, would suggest a wooden cover roof over the rectangular flat area to the west of the house, as a work area, which also explains why the south wall of this area was a non-mortared wall. Therefore this area of Feature 2 is now indicated as Feature 2b.

Also considered was that the deeper soils of Test Unit 4 within the flat covered area of Feature 2, were a yellowish color, while the deeper soils of Test Unit 1, at the exterior of the house
structure, were grey gravel-grit soil. During the general area survey, we noted soils in the bank of a ravine which was exposed by the loader, they showed the basic soil profile of an uppermost layer of brown-organic sandy soils, a second layer of yellowish sandy soils, then the bottom layer of grey gravel-grit. See here on the loader tract.

If this is the basic soils stratigraphy for the overall area, then finding the yellow soils in the bottom of Test Unit 4 and the grey gravel-grit at the same depth in Test Unit 1, could suggest that the ground surface was leveled for the house foundation, cutting deeper into the grey soils then at the other end of the flat area of Feature 2.

We then continued the excavations with five 1 X 1 m test units, the first of these units, Test Unit 2, is located to the north wall of Feature 2, close to the connection with the Feature 1 cistern; and
another in the area between the Feature 3 wall and the noted grinding stones, north of Features 1-2.

**Site 5, Test Unit 2**, is situated immediately adjacent to the Feature 2 north wall exterior, at 1.5 m east of the cistern connection corner. The ground surface in this area shows about 20 cm elevated raised soils into the corner with several trees also present. The unit ground surface was cleared and photographed.

**Level 1 (0-10 cm b.s.)** consists of the mulch, leaves and loose sand, with numerous large roots, as well there are abundant yellow bricks and some large stone also in this unit level. The soils are Munsell Soil Color 10YR 3/2-3/3. No artifacts were found in this level. Floor photo and drawings were made.

**Level 2 (10-30 cm b.s.)** consists of the same 10 YR 3/2-3/3 organic soils, yet with very abundant yellow bricks (60-70 brick fragments, only 2 whole bricks), as well as some large stones and large roots. At the floor of this level the soils are becoming more sandy. Artifacts found were ceramics, glass including a diagnostic case-gin bottle rim, and hand-wrought square iron nails.

**Level 3 (30-50 cm b.s.)** consists of an end to the yellow brick rubble pile, and first observation of the Feature 2 wall foundation. These north wall foundation stones are 105-110 cm below the interior foundation stone noted in Test Unit 1 on the east wall. Munsell Soil Colors are 10 YR 4/2 sandy at the foundations stones and 10 YR 3/2 for the rest of the unit floor. Artifacts found were ceramics, glass, square iron nails, a kaolin pipe, but no yellow brick.

**Level 4 (50-55 cm b.s.)** from just below the foundation stones and covering the entire unit by 55 cm b.s., the grey gravel-grit 10 YR 6/1 soils are present. These are the same base sterile soils noted in Test Unit 1, also sterile here, so the unit was ended at 55 cm b.s..
Situated at about four meters north of Feature 2 Test Unit 2, in between the Feature 3 stone wall ruins and the fragments of the grinding stones (see site map), was placed the 1 X 1 m Test Unit 3.

We further believe that the quantity of yellow brick in Test Unit 2 is a reserve pile of bricks, piled in the corner-notch between the north wall of Feature 2 and the cistern.

**Site 5, Test Unit 3** is in the open flat area within the northern yard area, between Features 2-3, some trees are present.

**Level 1 (0-10 cm b.s.)** surface mulch and leaves in a sandy soil with some but not many roots. The Munsell soil colors are 10 YR 2/2, at about 10 cm b.s. were noted were noted 10 YR 3/3 more sandy soils with less organics. No artifacts were found.

**Level 2 (10-20 cm b.s.)** were fine sandy soils with some roots, of Munsell 10 YR 3/3 color. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, polished/water-worn pebbles, red brick, coral, and in the
southwest quadrant abundant charcoal fragments (not crushed but rather whole stem charcoal). At 20cm soils change to 10 YR 3/2 fine sand.

**Level 3 (20-30 cm b.s.)** The 10 YR 3/2 loose fine sandy soils continue with some roots and a few medium sized stones. Numerous artifacts were found in this level, with red/yellow bricks, ceramics, iron nails as predominant, charcoal fragments continue to be abundant.

**Level 4 (30-50 cm b.s.)** Numerous artifacts continue with ceramics, iron nails, a nail lead-seal, red/yellow bricks, a unique iron tool w wooden handle, and a very unique iron skeleton key. Also noted were coral fragments and crab claws. The unit was ended at 50 cm depth, because the sterile grey gravel-grit (10 YR 6/1) was noted in a dramatic soil color change at about 45 cm b.s..

Figure 36. Site 5, Test Unit 3, in proximity to Feature 3 (left), and to the grinding stone rubble.

It would also seem that the presence of roof nails at Test Unit 3, also suggests a wooden roof cover over the storage-food processing area there at Feature 3.

**Site 5, Test Unit 4** is situated within the Feature 2 interior at the west end, where the front is supposed to have been. It is 3.2 m south of the Feature 1 cistern, and 1 m east of the Feature 2 west wall. The ground surface was covered with leaves and mulch, with a very flat ground elevation. Photos were taken of the surface.

**Level 1 (0-10 cm b.s.)** These are the loose sandy soils with mulch and leaves and some tree roots, with a 10 YR 3/2 Munsell color. At 8-10 cm a dramatic soil color change to 10 YR 4/2 with more fine sandy texture with no mulch/leaves, as well with no large stones, but abundant tree roots. Artifacts recovered were glass, mortar, yellow brick and shell.
Level 2 (10-20 cm b.s.) has a continuation of the 10 YR 4/2 fine sandy soils with no large stones, yet many large tree roots. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, glass, iron nail, mortar, and yellow brick.

Level 3 (20-30 cm b.s.) has a continuation of the 10 YR 4/2 fine sandy soils with only one large stone, yet very abundant large tree roots. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, iron nails, glass, mortar, yellow brick, and 1 round Blue-Bead (1.3 cm dia.).

Level 4 (30-55 cm b.s.) Most of the level 4 is the 10 YR 4/2 fine sand with no large stones, and less roots. A dramatic soil color change at about 50 cm to a 10YR 4/6 yellowish fine sand with small pebbles only, no roots, and no artifacts. In the upper 10YR 4/2 soils were recovered a few shards of thin clear glass only. This unit was ended at 55 cm b.s. depth.

Site 5, Test Unit 5 is situated in the pathway connecting the house to the cistern and animal pen, at the west side of the house structure. This unit is located at about 1.5 m from the front of Feature 2, and about 2.5 m from the cistern steps. The ground surface is flat, covered with leaves and mulch, photos taken.
Level 1 (0-10 cm b.s.) is filled with fine sand, mulch and leaves with some roots. The soils are a Munsell 10 YR 3/2 color. At about 8-10 cm a soil color change to 10 YR 4/2 fine sand with no mulch, yet still abundant roots. Several large stones are in this level, as well in the level floor were noted two soil discolorations (10 YR 2/1) very dark organic sand with mulch. These discolorations are most likely uneven ground surface features, and/or animal digging, to bring the upper soils a bit deeper. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, shell, and water-worn pebbles.

Level 2 (10-20 cm b.s.) is a continuation of the 10 YR 4/2 fine sand, a bit more compacted than noted elsewhere, with the two 10 YR 2/1 soil discolorations with mulch continuing into this level. Artifacts recovered were ceramics and glass.

Level 3 (20-30 cm b.s.) continuation of the 10 YR 4/2 fine sands slightly compacted, with some tree roots and a few large stones. One of the large stones has facing modification on it, most likely from the front of the Feature 2 west wall. Both of the 10 YR 2/1 soil discolorations end by 30 cm b.s.. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, glass, shell, iron nails, and red brick.

Level 4 (30-50 cm b.s.) continuation of the 10 YR 4/2 fine sands, somewhat less compacted, no large stones and fewer large roots. Yet with abundant artifacts, recovered were ceramics, glass, shell, iron nails/straps, and water-worn pebbles.

Level 5 (50-60 cm b.s.) the 10 YR 4/2 fine sands continue until about 55 cm, then a dramatic soil color change to 10 YR 4/6 yellowish fine sand with small pebbles, no roots and no large stones. Artifacts recovered were ceramics, glass, shell, iron fragments. The unit was ended at 60 cm b.s..

After all the test excavations were completed, we mapped all the excavations into the site map, and took general site photographs. Then one of the crew members was lowered by rope into the
**cistern Interior** to check the bottom (which is dry) for any artifacts, which he collected as surface finds on the bottom. These artifacts were only 19th century glass bottle fragments, mostly square case-gin bottles. The dimensions of the cistern interior are 3.2 m length, 1.65 m width, with a height to the opening hole of 2.65 m to the bottom of the hole opening and 2.85 m to the top of the opening. The soil deposits in the cistern were only about 3-5 cm, with various goat and crab remains noted. Due to the very shallow interior deposits and exclusively 19th century artifacts found in the cistern bottom, it is suggested here that the cistern had been cleaned out for re-use in the 19th century.

![Figure 39. Site 5, Feature 1 cistern interior.](image)

Some of the most interesting and potentially diagnostic temporal artifacts, excavated from Site 5 Test Units, were the blue-bead, bronze ink pen tip, and skeleton key (see below).

![Figure 40. Site 5, blue-bead T.U.4, lev.3; iron door hinge T.U. 1, lev.3.](image)
The presence of elite items, such as bronze ink pen fob, a strong-box skeleton key, and high quality ceramics, would suggest the initial construction and occupation of this site in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, was by a family with education (writing), and significant prestige and wealth.

This Site 5 seems to be an early homestead site of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century (indicated as structures on the property of J. Heyliger noted on the 1781 Martin map), the site was apparently abandoned and then re-occupied in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, perhaps for later use with the Site 3 upland pasture.
Aspects of Social Memory at Site 5
Commentary by Dr. Joost Morsink

The site’s historical sequence of use, abandonment and subsequent reuse created a situation where people in the second phase of habitation must have had some recollection of the past inhabitants. Whereas the site’s inhabitants in the earlier phase built their home on a vacant lot, the second time around people moved into an already existing house. The reuse of already present structures must have evoked recollections of how things were in the past, what their inhabitants were like and how the old inhabitants were related to the people reusing the buildings. Much like archaeologists, the second wave of inhabitants interpreted and envisioned how life was in the past by the material remains they observed in the area.

This sharing and remembering of things past is called social memory in archaeological and anthropological literature (Connerton 1989; Morsink 2006, in prep; Van Dyke and Alcock 2003). Social memory is a collective notion how things were in the past, and functions as a framework of reference to interpret the present. What this means is that people basically use past experiences to understand present situations. People constantly observe and participate in situations and these situations establish a point of reference how things are supposed to be done. Then, when a similar situation occurs in the future, people behave in a way that corresponds to this past experience.

However, past situations are not always completely replicated. Also, people can consciously aims to change aspects to their or their group’s advantage. Social memory is a continuous process of negotiation, manipulation and affirmation. In the case of the homestead, people might have created a real or fictive kinship relation to lay claims on the land and establish their right to use it. Social memory can, therefore, act as a vehicle of power by dominant groups using notions of the past to ratify conditions in the present.

What is of specific importance to this site is the way social memory is communicated over time. The most important media that transmit social memory are bodily practices, commemorative rites, objects, and places (Connerton 1989, Van Dyke and Alcock 2003). Although commemorative rites are unlikely part of the media used at this particular homestead, the three other media were likely incentives to recollect and think about the past. The three media, bodily practices, objects and places, will be discussed here in reference to the homestead.

Bodily practices are basically mundane routines, such as cooking, maintaining gardens, cleaning etc. that are so engrained into daily lives that people do not consciously think about what they do and how they do it (Bourdieu 1977; Connerton 1989). It seems that people living at this homestead were mostly engaged in subsistence strategies for local consumption and exchange, rather than the global scale of plantations that are focused on export and larger scale
economies. The day-to-day practices of weeding, planting, harvesting plants and herding animals might have been similar between two the habitation periods in many ways. Although differences were undeniably present, it is also likely that a number of produced and consumed goods were similar. Inhabitants who reused the area likely recalled the ways how people did these things in the past through actually reusing the site. By engaging in economic practices related to the site, such as planting, harvesting and consumption, they created a link with the first inhabitants. The physical enacting of practices that were also done by past inhabitants induced ideas and perceptions of how things were done here. Past inhabitants and their practices became part of the framework of reference, on which decision on how to use the locations within the site were partially based. These memories would have never been evoked if people did not physically performed these bodily practices and inhabit the same area as the past inhabitants.

Objects also function as a medium of social memory. Objects can act as mnemonic devices that, through their physical aspects, evoke and communicate very specific ideas of the past (Appadurai 1986; Gell 1998; Gosden and Marshall 1999). Especially when objects have specific uses, such as tools and status objects, their material qualities reference situations in which they were used in the past. Despite their inability to move and act outside human interference, objects are incredibly important for the transmission and communication of social memory over time. In fact, their static and durable qualities are exactly the reason why objects have been so successful in communication social memory, as their fixed and unchanging stasis forms an ideal tool and stable backdrop to transmit continuity over long periods of time. Whereas human lives are ephemeral and short-lived, objects last and persist through time. As mentioned before, the inhabitants that reused the location must have found objects that were used by past inhabitants and these objects made them think about the site’s past use.

All these aspects of social memory are situational. This homestead is a very special place where people, in multiple time periods, concentrated activities. Bodily practices and objects were all brought together in this location and most daily activities occurred either within or in close proximity of the site. The homestead is a very special place and continues to evoke ideas of the past. The remnants of buildings, the artifacts and the structural layout of walls and boundary markers together form a complex whole of attributes located through the landscape that is unique and not found elsewhere on the slopes of the Quill. The place and all its characteristics also form a mnemonic device that creates social memory.

As a final note, we can extend this idea of the homestead and social memory to the present. Our archaeological investigations were specifically instantiated to recreate a social memory within a scientific paradigm. But as this report shows, it is much more than just facts and figures of what we found. Archaeologists investigate material remains to understand how people lived in the past. This interpretation and reconstruction of how things were in the past is
not just a summary of materials, but a story how people related to their lived-in environment and each other. This story is based on scientific data; a story of social memory based exclusively on observations in the field.

And the potential reuse of this site within the proposed resort will add another layer of social memory to the homestead. By integrating the homestead within the plans, visitors can see the remains of past inhabitants and will create interpretations of their own. The homestead will function as a material reference to visitors to think about the past and how people lived in the same location where they live for the moment. Walking in between the walls, the cistern and the house, people start reminiscing about the past, how nice and quiet a life would be with a constant view over the Caribbean Sea. Through the construction of these linkages with the past, people create an extra dimension to their stay on the island. Rather than just enjoying nature, the view and the tranquility of St. Eustatius, they now share this experience with people doing exactly the same thing hundreds of years ago. And this will add something unique to the visitor’s experience that cannot be gained elsewhere where archaeological sites are lacking.
5. Interpretations and recommendations

Interpretations

Based on all of the previously outlined historical documents reviewed and archaeological investigations at the JOREMI Property N-M-2, the following interpretations are given for this study.

It is presented here, that based on the documentary evidence, site features and artifact evidence there were at least three historical occupation sites, and an additional two locations of historical activities at this property area, dating from the early-middle 18th century until the middle 19th century.

It is presented here, that based on the archaeological evidence found, that there are various archaeologically significant areas within the surveyed property. These include;

1. Two historical site areas were identified where only small stone-mortar cisterns and limited additional structures were present (Sites 1 and 3). Site 1 seems to be a simple animal watering station, associated with ‘The Farm’ a plantation site off the survey property area to the north. Site 3 is a larger area site, having a small cistern and one other rectangular structure, both associated with dozens of small loose stone piles. This Site 1 area, located between two large ravines serving as natural barriers on either side, seems to be an upland pasture area. The small stone piles are the result of land-clearing loose stones for better movement of the animals on these steep hill slopes. Both of these Sites are predominately dated to the 19th century, based on the historical artifacts recovered at each site.

2. These are numerous dry stone-pile walls over the surveyed property, in variable states of preservation. These dry stone-pile walls are primarily the result of land-clearing for agriculture and removal of the stones to the outer boundaries of the properties. Therefore, it is not surprising that these walls tend to follow the land ownership boundaries indicated on various historical maps. The best examples of these historical dry stone-pile walls are indicated on the survey sites map of this report.

3. Site 2 is one of the three historical occupation sites on the property however it is the smallest in area and structural complexity, lacking significant mortared structural
features. This was certainly not a plantation house complex, and may indeed have been an extension of functional activities requiring limited structures relating to the Site 5 Homestead. Artifacts from this Site 2, suggest a date of occupation in the 18th century.

4. Site 4 is indicated on the 1781 Martin map as a cluster of structures, located between the properties of Ab. Heyliger and S. Cuvillier. This may well have been part of a Plantation complex, however the majority of the site evidence is off the survey property, thus outside the scope of this research. Structural features with mortared walls are present at this site, and extensive artifacts were presence over more than a hectare area. These artifacts date the site to the early 18th century, and are of such diversity to suggest a complex of activities at the site, to be expected from a Plantation.

5. Site 5 is by far the most significant historical site identified in this survey. This is not on the large scale of a Plantation site, but rather it is a Homestead site, serving the basic needs of a single family unit, with perhaps a few associated enslaved workers. The structural features at this site are very well constructed (buttressed walls) and of quality materials (yellow brick and cut-stone). As well, there is a very intelligent and protective access placement of this site on a steep ridge top between two deep ravines. Based on the artifacts recovered from this site it seems the original construction was in the early-mid 18th century, with extensive elite status items present. Some of these items suggest both literacy and writing skills, as well as prestige and wealth. On the 1781 Martin map, this Site 5 is evident at the very southern boundary of the J. Heyliger property. Remembering back to the historical background, we know that many wealthy merchants had both town houses and country houses, including Johannes Heyliger a Commander of Statia in the mid-18th century, and namesake of this precise property.

6. At Site 5 we also see indications of an occupational re-use of the site in the 19th century, with the cleaned cistern having only post-18th century artifacts, and 19th century wall repairs on the house structure. It is suggested here that the 19th century re-use of Site 5, may well be associated with the Site 3 upland pasture area, which is in visual proximity on the next ridge. It is further suggested that the 19th century re-use of this site may have been a squatter use rather than the original family use, with the further suggestion that it may have been a (Free?) African (presence of a blue-bead) tending animals in the upland pastures.
It is presented here, that we did not identify any human burial grounds, nor any sites of prehistoric Amerindian cultures, in these surveyed areas at the JOREMI property.

Therefore, with this report the archaeological assessment of proposed development areas at the JOREMI Property has been completed, thereby allowing for the further development of those specific areas as planned.

**Recommendations**

Based on the above archaeological evidence identified during the 2012 JOREMI Survey by SIMARC-SECAR, the following recommendations are made by the authors.

It is strongly recommended that the archaeological sites identified in this report are specifically integrated into the project designs of the JOREMI Development concept. This could be implemented via the subtle use of archaeological features, such as keeping the dry stone pile walls along the new project roadways, and the small cisterns in public space, for an historical atmosphere distinctive of St. Eustatius.

Yet of utmost importance is the preservation designation of specific areas, particularly Site 5, as protected green areas for educational and touristic park use within the development plans. This Site 5 could be a wonderfully scenic place for a heritage park, and with the compliment of further research a small museum (including some of the unique artifacts found in this survey) could even be there as an iconic symbol of the area’s heritage theme. Furthermore, the very nature of Site 5 being an elite Homestead of the 18th century, falls ideally into the JOREMI concept to create luxury villas in the same surroundings as this site. Exemplifying the same settlement concept through the centuries, and the continuity of social memory as noted in this report.

Clearly it is strongly recommended here to preserve all the identified archaeological features noted in this report as in-situ sites, however, in the event that some of the archaeological features identified are not able to be preserved within the JOREMI development plans, it is essential that further archaeological investigations be conducted on those sites to be impacted in order to preserve them ex-situ. Of course, the final decision on preservation, whether in-situ or ex-situ, rests with the St. Eustatius Executive Council (the competent authority) and thoughtful insights of the JOREMI developers.
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Appendix 2
Expenses summary
**JOREMI SIMARC-SECAR Survey, St. Eustatius**

**Expenses Summary as of December 30, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMARC Foundation services</td>
<td>3000.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECAR services</td>
<td>3000.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Principle Investigator for 14 days* @ $70 p.h.</td>
<td>1400.-</td>
<td>4480.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Project Archaeologist for 18 days* @ $40 p.h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4320.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Field Technicians for 18 days* @ $25 p.h.</td>
<td>600.-</td>
<td>4300.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One lab assistant for 10 days* @ $25 p.h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One roundtrip air-tickets/taxes (SXM-EUX), and 7 days per diem @ $200 p.d. Principle Investigator</td>
<td>1600.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-Lab equipment/materials</td>
<td>1500.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>700.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-storage facility materials</td>
<td>800.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforeseen</td>
<td>500.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report preparation</td>
<td>1500.-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses paid</strong></td>
<td><strong>US$ 14,600.-</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses pending payment</strong></td>
<td><strong>US$ 14,600.-</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Payment Amount agreed on August 14, 2012**  US$ 29,200.-

**Retainer Payment by JOREMI N.V. August 21, 2012**  US$ 14,600.-

**Total Final Payment, as completion of the project**  US$ 14,600.-

Final Payment can be made through the SIMARC Foundation bank account on St. Maarten (Windward Islands Bank Acct #022122805), same as the previous retainer payment was made. Should there be problems, please immediately contact us at SIMARC, tel. +599-542-0201 or via jhaviser@hotmail.com.