**1.Introduction**

A sixty-four-year-old resident remembers when a timber company began clandestinely logging in Boa Nova community territory in 1986 (Figure 1). He and his neighbours blocked *Igarapé Araticum*, the river along which logs were being extracted, by weaving a barrier from vines: "*We got them to stop and made the loggers leave ...We did not want [them], did not want [them], and look, thank God, we managed to [make them] stop*", he said proudly. Forty years later, Boa Nova and other communities find logging companies operating in their traditionally occupied territories once again. But now, logging comes labelled with the social and environmental certification stamp of the *Forest Stewardship Council* (FSC) - justified by hegemonic discourses in the language of 'development', 'job generation', 'sustainability', 'social responsibility', 'income generation' and 'compensation.' Locals say they are now "caught between resistance and negotiation." This is because companies today offer compensation for losses of territory and resources in the form of 'development' projects, providing basic social rights to which communities are constitutionally entitled anyway, ranging from the installation of electric power grids to paying for funerals, the provisioning of medical care, transport and fuel.

The changing forms of governance and power that communities have faced since the 1960s shape conditions for and forms that resistance takes. Forest peoples' ancestral territories were enveloped by a conservation unit, the 441,282.63ha Saracá-Taquera National Forest (FLONA) – created in 1989 (Figure 2), which permits 'sustainable use' of mineral and forest resources. The FLONA is managed by government environmental agencies the *Chico Mendes Institute of Biodiversity Conservation* (ICMBio) and the *Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources* (IBAMA), timber and mining companies, and NGOs. The FLONA is seen by these actors in terms of its 'natural vocation' for mining and timber concessions (Figure 2; Zhouri 2006). At the centre of the FLONA lie extensive bauxite reserves exploited by *Mineração Rio Norte* (MRN), the largest bauxite mining company in Brazil and the third largest in the world. The MRN has been involved in socio-environmental conflicts with the peoples of the FLONA since the late 1960s – yet represents itself as 'green' (MRN 2002).

We understand these shifts from 1960 to present day as a proliferation of forms of power exerted by industrial resource extraction: Fletcher's (2010:177/178) schema is useful here: *governmentality* (a generic 'conduct of conduct') is manifest in a interplay between distinct modalities of power coexisting in different mixtures at any given locale: *sovereign* (i.e. the power of life and death immanent in law and violence), *disciplinary* (i.e. internalization of norms and self-surveillance), *biopower* (nurturing and orchestrating (social-)life and populations), *neoliberalism* (manipulation of external incentive structures) and *truth* (particular conceptions of nature and reality).

Our theoretical intervention contributes to the theory of environmentality - the 'conduct of conduct' with regard to the environment - by emphasizing that it is constituted *as much by* 'counter-conducts' as it is by the 'conduct of conduct.' Counter-conducts illuminate practices and rationalities of protest and the identities and subjectivities forged in the performance of dissent (Death 2010:236). This enables a broader perspective on resistance foregrounding the production of resistant subjectivities whilst breaking with the resistance-domination binary. We adopt Foucault's late turn to 'techniques of the self' -

underappreciated in the governmentality literature. His earlier focus on how the Panopticon shapes self-discipline is complemented by a turn to care for and ethics of the self: practices of freedom through which subjects have the potential to transcend self-discipline (see Foucault 1988; 1990; 1997; 2005; 2011). We use this lens to empirically examine the production of green subjects in relation to 'green' logging and mining entailing governmental processes and counter-conducts to them.

The configuration of powers surrounding industrial resource extraction - timber and mining - in the FLONA today can be theorized as a spatialized rational-technical governmentality (c.f. Ferguson and Gupta 2002). Herein, existing sovereign power, deepened and strengthened by the creation of a national forest and legal-juridical apparatus for forest and mining concessions within in it, is joined by disciplinary and biopower in the contemporary period through attempts by governmental agencies to turn forest peoples into "green subjects". We explore how spatio-temporal configurations of powers in any given locale through which governmentality is enacted will shape the form that such counter-conducts will take - new ways of 'being otherwise' corresponding to these new forms of power (cf Lilja and Vinthagen 2014).

Government agencies, companies and NGOs collaborate in trying to establish hegemony over natural resource management by reconfiguring the cultural and economic environment to make their (viz., capital's) interests appear natural and inevitable. In doing so they seek to turn forest peoples into 'green,' subjects who practice 'rational' and 'sustainable' natural resource management. This means attempting to make people internalise beliefs by addressing them as if they already held those beliefs. The principal governmental instrument of a FLONA is its Management Plan (IBAMA 2002). which depicts logging and mining knowledge as 'sustainable' and denigrates of local knowledge as 'unsustainable.'

The 1988 Constitution and subsequent laws created the possibilities for new forms of counter-conduct through the act of claiming rights embedded in forest peoples' identity categories: indigenous, *quilombolas* (Afro-descendent peoples) and *riberinhos* (the forest peasantry) (Almeida 2008). We focus in particular on *riberinhos*, the least visible identity category with the weakest set of rights (Fraser, 2018). They do not have rights to a collective territory based on an 'ethnic' identity, like indigenous and *quilombolas* do, rather they have rights to continue to practice agroextractivist[1] livelihoods in different territorial units, in this case an Agroextractivist Settlement Project (PAE). We however also discuss their *quilombola* neighbours in the FLONA, whose counter-conducts have focused on the struggle to demarcate their territories Alto Trombetas 1 and 2 (Figure 2). These two groups are overlapping, having very similar livelihoods, historical trajectories and forms of natural resource management and are often related as kin. They have become differentiated as *political subjects* however, through counter-conductive acts of claiming and actualizing the distinct sets of rights afforded to each of two categories (O'Dwyer 2002).

*Riberinho* counter-conducts include struggles to realise their right to delimit their areas of use and occupation within the FLONA, granted by environmental legislation that

---

[1] 'Agroextractivism' here refers to forest peoples' knowledge and practice of the shifting cultivation of bitter manioc, homegarden-agroforestry, hunting, fishing and artisanal exploitation of timber and non-timber forest products, which should be distinguished analytically from industrial mineral and hydrocarbon extraction and industrial agriculture (see Fraser etal 2018).

2

85 governs the management of FLONAS - Law 9.985 / 2000 (Brazil, 2000) - which established
86 the National System of Conservation Units, along with Public Forest Management Law
87 (Article 6 of Law No. 11.284/2006). These struggles are necessary because in practice this
88 legislation is ignored by government agencies, companies and NGOs who collaboratively
89 govern the FLONA. Forest peoples also engage in direct action, critical discourse and the
90 reassertion of agroecological knowledge of the *roça* (manioc cultivation)*,* of forest and river
91 extractivism, which underpins their livelihoods, ways of life, and identities.

92 We examine two case-studies of *riberinho* localities effected by industrial resource
93 extraction in the north-east (timber) and south-east (mining) of the FLONA (Figure 2). The
94 first, centred on Boa Nova and Saracá, examines MRN's 'economy of restoration' (cf.
95 Fairhead etal 2012's 'economy of repair') wherein community residents are paid to replant
96 forests including Brazil-nut trees destroyed by the mining company, and are provided with
97 basic services (social or economic rights) to which they are already constitutionally entitled
98 such as water provisioning - in response to the pollution of streams. The community feels
99 forced to accept this situation, and its counter-conducts here are at the level of critical
100 discourse (Affonso 2018, Figure 1). Second, we examine counter-conducts to FSC certified
101 logging, at Acari community. This takes the form of counter-conducts to timber concessions
102 and the hegemonic discourses that represent them - enacted by the NGO IMAFLORA, timber
103 company and government agencies. These actors depict FSC-certified concessions as a
104 foregone conclusion, against which the community has deployed legal action, causing the
105 suspension of the FSC seal in March 2017, in addition to direct action such as blocking the
106 mouth of Lake Acari to prevent timber extraction (Nepomuceno 2017, Figure 3).

107 **2. Revitalizing Environmentality**

108 We contribute to a growing number of works in the field of "multiple environmentalities"
109 (Fletcher 2017) that have been productively building upon whilst also reworking the concept
110 since Agrawal's (2005) seminal paper. In that paper, Agrawal employed Foucault's original
111 conception of governmentality based on the sovereignty-discipline-government triad
112 presented in an excerpt from his 1977 lectures (Foucault 1991, Fletcher 2010:173). Agrawal
113 relies on Foucault's model of the subject from *Discipline and Punish.* This subject is
114 subjugated and subordinated to a particular social order by disciplinary strategies: Discipline
115 'makes' individuals speak, think and act similarly and shapes 'docile bodies' through specific
116 techniques of power (see Agrawal 2005:165, Singh 2013; Cortes-Vazquez and Ruiz-
117 Ballesteros 2018).

118 Singh (2013:190) and others have critiqued Agrawal's work for lack of attention to
119 subaltern agency, an ahistorical view of identity, self-making and processes of ''becoming.''
120 He overemphasizes 'techniques of power' at the expense of 'techniques of the self'. This is
121 because Agrawal relies on Foucault's original formulation of governmentality wherein power
122 is negative, disciplinary and repressing. But in Foucault's later work power is not only
123 'repressive' but also 'productive'. As Foucault puts it (1997:177) in his earlier work he
124 insisted too much on techniques of domination, at the expense of techniques of the self.

125 By the end of the 1978 lectures Foucault was defining governmentality as it is now
126 most commonly used by environmentality scholars: the "conduct of conduct" (Fletcher
127 2010:173, Fletcher 2017). From this expanded viewpoint, governing occurs across different
128 sites and at different scales: one governs the criminal, the mentally unwell; one governs one's

3

129 family, one governs children, one governs souls (religion) – and one governs ones' self
130 (Golder 2015:53, Davidson 2011:26). Governing *is* conducting, government *is* the conduct of
131 one's own and others' conduct – hence, the "conduct of conducts." So "conduct emerges as
132 the conceptual pivot upon which the late work turns: from power to ethics." Conduct has a
133 double dimension, herein the 'late' Foucault emerges: *his previous emphasis on power over*
134 *others as an objectifying register is joined by operation of power over oneself in a self-*
135 *subjectifying register* (Golder 2015:54).

136 Less well-known is the "immediate and founding correlation between conduct and
137 counter-conduct," both in history and conceptually (Davidson 2011:28). As Senellart puts it
138 "For Foucault the analysis of types of governmentality is inseparable from analysis of the
139 corresponding forms of resistance or 'counter-conducts'" (Foucault etal. 2007:389). For
140 Davidson, in "one of the richest and most brilliant moments" in *Security, Territory,*
141 *Population* – counter-conducts link the political and ethical axes of Foucault's thought
142 (Davidson 2011:26).

143 There has been relatively little engagement with counter-conducts in the
144 environmentality literature. A recent important exception is Asiyanbi *etal* (2019) who
145 introduce this concept in theorizing four key moments in techniques of the self (the subject of
146 hope, the moral subject, the unruly subject and the mobilising subject) within the frame of
147 multiple environmentalities. Our work is complementary to yet also distinct from Asiyanbi
148 *etal:* we similarly highlight the late-Foucauldian shift from power to ethics but in contrast
149 give a more central analytical role to counter-conducts in the formation of dissenting
150 subjectivities vis-à-vis the sovereign, disciplinary and biopower through which green
151 governmentality is enacted. We now turn to the question of how counter-conducts differ from
152 resistance and outline the advantages in its use.

*2.1 Counter-conduct: resistant subjectivities*

154 Resistance has often been conceived of in binary opposition to domination (Death 2010:235;
155 2016:201). From this viewpoint resistance is organized opposition to fixed and institutional
156 power. This binary has been "refined (but not abolished) by questioning both terms" (Ortner
157 2006:44). James Scott's hugely popular ''everyday resistance'' showed how people are aware
158 of their exploitation but resist more passively because of the overwhelming force of
159 dominance they are subjected to (Ortner 2006:7). Foucault showed us how power and
160 domination are ubiquitous, they both infuse social systems and are deeply rooted
161 psychologically. There is no ''outside'' of power. So, if Foucault draws attention to the less
162 institutional, more pervasive and everyday forms of power, Scott does the same for
163 resistance.

164 The advantages of counter-conducts over Scott's everyday resistance are twofold (c.f.
165 Pieck 2015:308): First, the former is broader as a concept. As Death (2010:236) puts it,
166 counter-conducts can elucidate "*specific practices and rationalities of protest, which*
167 *themselves work to constitute particular identities and subjectivities through the performance*
168 *of dissent.*" Second, it breaks the power-resistance binary because counter-conducts *are*
169 *present from the beginning* of the 'conduct of conduct', as the Davidson and Senellart quotes
170 above attest. Resistances, redirections and refusals of conduct do not come after or in
171 response to governmental guidance. Rather, there is an original relation between them: the
172 conduct of conduct develops in co-constitutive feedback with counter-conducts. (Odysseos

4

173   2016:183). Counter-conduct, it may be argued, sits at the very foundation of political
174   subjectivity—the crux of the entire Foucauldian oeuvre (Demetriou 2016:219). As Foucault
175   remarked in 1979 "politics is no more or less than that which is born with resistance to
176   governmentality" (Death 2016:216).

177        The action that opened the paper by Boa Nova community of direct action against the
178   timber company's incursions, is now more difficult in the context of the FLONA and its
179   forest concessions (legitimated by government agencies and FSC-certifier IMAFLORA),
180   which are implemented not only through sovereign violence by the state in collusion with
181   capital but also through more subtle mechanisms of subjection and control that try to tame,
182   discipline and make spaces governable. This has given rise to new forms of subjectivation as
183   forest people attempt to resist or to change existing power relations. Because sovereign power
184   is about the monopoly of violence and the ability to forcefully repress certain behaviours,
185   sovereign counter-conducts break such commands or repressions - doing what is illegal. In
186   Brazilian Amazonia, this is exemplified by Munduruku direct and violent action in defence of
187   their territories on the Middle Tapajós (Loures 2017).

188        Counter-conduct to disciplinary power is the refusal to participate in attempts to
189   construct new subjectivities, capacities, skills or organisations, or the transformation of these
190   constructions into something else not useful for power interests. As James Scott has
191   documented, this includes forms of everyday resistance such as foot-dragging, escape,
192   sarcasm, passivity, misunderstandings, disloyalty, slander, avoidance or theft (cf. Lilja and
193   Vinthagen 2014:114). This also includes flight and relocation to avoid slavery and indenture,
194   and so forest peoples' histories can also be read as resistance to both sovereign and
195   disciplinary power. But also, from this perspective, the persistence of forest peoples' ways of
196   life: their agroecological knowledge, management of land and resources as a commons, and
197   their territoriality, becomes a form of resistance in itself. These historically and
198   geographically situated ways of being in the world are reasserted and revalorized in
199   discourses against attempts to discipline them as 'green' 'sustainable' or 'rational' passive
200   recipients of scientific knowledge.

201        One example is autodemarcation (Garcia 2018), a process whereby subaltern groups
202   create and maintain territorial limits in the face of invasions by loggers, miners and land
203   thieves. While autodemarcation starts from struggles for the self-determination of subaltern
204   identities and land rights it moves to embrace goals of education, health and wider societal
205   recognition. In this process, new political subjectivities are generated, with formerly
206   antagonistic groups becoming allies (Torres and Brandford 2019, Chapter 15). This shows
207   how forest people resist certain kinds of subjectivity that are given in power relations by
208   transforming themselves in a different way, and herein 'counter-memories' and 'counter-
209   histories' are also important (Torres 2014).

210        Biopower seeks to manage the population, how its life is reproduced, increase
211   productivity, and improve behaviour, including forms of training and educating. Resistance is
212   about undermining these main techniques of biopower by being other ways (ibid:119). Since
213   it operates at the population scale, dissidence to biopower can also be read on this aggregate
214   level, at the level of the multitude as a kind of heterogenous 'counter-conductive population'
215   without a unified subject (cf Lilja and Vinthagen 2014:121). The clearest expression of
216   resistance to biopower in the FLONA is the struggle for the *quilombola* territories, Alto

5

217    Trombetas 1 and 2 and the reaffirmation of *quilombola* identity at the level of the subject
218    which accompanies this. This is analogous to Van Teijlingen's (2016:909) notion of 'counter-
219    territorialization.'

## 3.The spatialized rational-technical governmentality of FLONA Saracá-Taquera

220

221    The FLONA is zoned – 70% of its area comprises a "mining zone" and a "forest production
222    zone (IBAMA, 2002: 452). This can be conceived of as a spatialized rational-technical
223    governmentality, a corollary of this is that counter-conducts are also necessarily spatial. The
224    criterion for zoning is "vocation." Herein the governmentality of the FLONA simultaneously
225    justifies and naturalizes itself at the ontological level of 'truth': "*The Mining Zone ... was*
226    *defined by areas with mineral potential by* **natural vocation of the physical environment**. *Its*
227    *objective is the exploitation of bauxite, and, depending on the national and international*
228    *market, tends to be exploited to exhaustion*." (IBAMA, 2002: 472, our emphases). The
229    FLONA is similarly characterised as having a vocation for industrial scale timber production
230    (IBAMA, 2002: 23). Almost a third of the Saracá-Taquera National Forest has been
231    delimitated for forest concessions exploited by three companies (Nepomuceno, 2017). As
232    with mining operations, this involves the violation of the rights of *riberinho* communities,
233    including those provided for in the Public Forest Management Law (article 6 of Law
234    11.284/2006) which states "*public forests occupied or used by local communities shall be*
235    *identified for destination [as areas of traditional use] by the relevant institutional bodies*"
236    (MPF, 2009). None of the communities we spoke to were consulted to determine their areas
237    of traditional use, as is required by this law, however.

238    Forms of administrative control stipulated by contracts signed between the State and
239    companies restrict *riberinho* communities from extracting wood for domestic use, hunting, or
240    opening agricultural plots in areas under concession. Concessions do permit communities to
241    harvest a restricted range of non-timber forest products - only when logging is not occurring
242    (Nepomuceno, 2017:221). The *riberinho* communities have undertaken a struggle to redefine
243    the limits of the areas where loggers operate, demanding zoning of the forests that they have
244    traditionally occupied and used. This "land grab" has been joined more recently by what
245    could be characterised as a "green grab" (Fairhead etal 2012): FSC certified forest
246    concessions by timber companies in FLONAS enabled by the Public Forests Management
247    Law (No. 11284) of 2006. The Brazilian government has incentivised logging companies
248    obtain FSC labelling, offering them tax reductions (Nepomuceno, 2017).

249    The presence of *riberinho* and *quilombola* communities has been legally unclear since
250    the creation of this FLONA in 1989. Since their inception in the Forest Code of 1965 until
251    Decree No. 1,298 of October 1994, FLONAs did not permit "human occupation" (IBAMA
252    2004). Since law 9.985 of 2000, National Forests "admit" these groups occupy the area, but
253    require that they act in accordance with the provisions of the "Management Plan." The
254    *quilombola* communities inhabiting the north of the FLONA occupy what the management
255    plan designates a narrow "population zone" of 1000 meters from the Trombetas river,
256    accounting for 2.5% of the unit. These communities are in a longstanding and conflictive
257    process of titling their collective territories of Alto Trombetas 1 and Alto Trombetas 2. This
258    is spatialised counter-conduct to the FLONA using constitutional rights of *quilombolas*
259    (Figure 2). *Riberinho* communities, by contrast, are mentioned in the Management Plan, but
260    they have not been allocated a "population zone." Their ancestral areas of use for hunting and

6

261  forest products relegated to the status of "forest production zone", and, areas of more
262  intensive uses, such as homegardens and shifting cultivation fields, were designated
263  "recovery zones." The communities themselves are now located in the Sapucuá-Trombetas
264  Agro-Extractive Settlement Project (PAE), created in 2010 (Figure 2). Inspite of nominally
265  collective land ownership in practice land tenure is individualised, not least because of the
266  presence of cattle ranchers. We now turn to the question of how to theorize the relationship
267  between the conduct of conduct and counter-conducts as these changes unfolded.

268  *3.1. Rights claims as counter-conducts*

269  This section traces the emergence of political subjects - *riberinhos* and *quilombolas* – as
270  counter conducts to the FLONA from new movements based on ethnic and territorial criteria
271  in response to rights' enshrined in the 1988 constitution. Our ethnographic material focuses on
272  *riberinhos*, but we start by examining their relation to *quilombolas* in order to show how the
273  unequal constitutional rights of these two forest peoples' identity categories produce
274  divergent forms of political subject through spatialized counter-conduct within the
275  governmentality of the FLONA as they struggle actualize distinct bundles of rights.
276  *Riberinhos* and *quilombolas* have had experiences of conflict with other social and economic
277  groups and defence of their territories against the *Mineracão Rio Norte* (MRN), cattle farmers
278  and timber companies from the 1970s forward. By the 1990s in the face of a set of conflicts
279  and threats to their use of land and their way of life, by cattle farming, or the State, that is the
280  FLONA, new forms of organisation and identification emerged.

281      Governmentality studies have shown how human rights function as a liberal
282  governing technology but have been inattentive to how historically specific struggles
283  actualize rights (Odysseos 2016). This has divorced critical rights scholarship from political
284  struggles, reifying rights and obscuring the agency of "the governed" who deploy rights
285  claims in struggles to resist and destabilize "power that conducts"— as part of the repertoire
286  of counter-conducts. Struggles to realize rights shape forest peoples' subjectification as an
287  outcome of the re-articulation of historic identity and livelihoods required in order to
288  actualize rights, and to reject attempts by the state to reshape them as green subjects. The lens
289  of counter-conducts restores agency to subaltern peoples. For Golder (2015:21) *rights claims*
290  *are a form of counter-conduct.*

291      The rights of *quilombola* peoples to the lands comprising their ancestral territories
292  were established by Article 68 of Brazil's 1988 Constitution. The Trombetas region in which
293  the FLONA lies one renowned for its *quilombola* peoples who migrated there as a form of
294  resistance to slavery and indenture during the 19th Century (Castro 1988). Because
295  *quilombolas* have clear constitutional collective 'ethnoterritorial' rights (since rights to
296  territory are predicated on an 'ethnic' identity), their counter-conducts have centred on the
297  attempt to realise these.

298      *Riberinhos*' weaker recognition from the state means that they do not have the same
299  constitutional rights to 'ethnoterritories' as *quilombolas* in spite of having emerged from the
300  same socio-historical milieu as, broadly from 17th to 19th centuries, through extractive booms
301  of rubber and other forest products. They were only recognised as an identity category under
302  the amorphous signifier "*traditional populations*" by Decree 6.040 in 2007. The
303  heterogeneous origins, European, African and Native Amazonian heritages, from the
304  perspective of states, governments and international law are impossible to fit into

7

essentialised 'indigenous' or 'tribal' categories used in the ILO169 and the Brazilian Constitution of 1988 (Fraser 2018).

This stronger recognition from the state of this identity category has been instrumental in the *quilombolas*' successful resistance to forest concessions planned on their disputed territories, they have managed to keep the area destined for the concession 23 km away from their communities due to the ongoing process of territorial recognition of Alto Trombetas 1 and 2 (Figure 2; Nepomuceno, 2017). Conversely, all of the *riberinho* communities to the west have had parts of their ancestral territory incorporated into the FLONA and which are now being exploited as forest concessions (Figure 1-3). The *riberinhos* are struggling to realize their right to delimit their areas of use and occupation within the FLONA, supported by environmental legislation that governs the management of FLONAS (Law 9.985 / 2000, see Brazil, 2000).

We now turn to the question of how new kinds of subaltern political subject emerge as a form of counter-conduct to the FLONA (and wider societal domination) in attempts to actualize these different bundles of rights. This is supported by oral histories which show that historically, there was little distinction between these two signifiers. At Acari *riberinho* community, on the northern side of the FLONA, elder residents, when asked to recall life prior to the 1980s, would normally say something along the lines of "everyone was the same", or, "before, that *quilombola* he was called a *riberinho*"; that there was "no distinction" between communities now identifying as *quilombola*, and those now identifying as *riberinho*. That these political subjects are the effects of rights claims is evident in the following narrative of an elder from Acari:

> *They [quilombolas] didn't exist. But when they discovered the right to be*
> *quilombolas, now what did they do ?... the quilombolas have their rights now. There*
> *used to be no [quilombola/riberinho] distinction. Now that [the rights] arrived, they*
> *went and found them. There's lots of prejudice, isn't there? Then they went and they*
> *found out.*

*Riberinhos* emphasize shared practices, social conditions and land use, in the past and today, with *quilombola* communities: "*As to how they live and make their homes, how they eat together, it's the same thing [as us], there is almost no difference. In relation to the land, there is none. The same work that they do, we do as well. There is no difference*" one informant told us, after returning from living for nine years in a *quilombola* community.

*Riberinhos* distinguish their more collective way of life (and that of the *quilombolas*) from that of the individualised *fazendeiro* (cattle rancher):

> *"I'm a riberinho [and] I've always been [one] ... a farmer is a guy who has his own*
> *things ... He arrives and uses some kind of documentation, and he makes his property*
> *there, fences it ... does this, does that. And the riberinho is different. The riberinho is*
> *that person who lives ... kind of from extractivism, right? We live by fishing, planting*
> *manioc, hunting ... we do not have a project, so ... riberinho [is a person] without*
> *support, I can even say that, right? Without support.*

**4. Resisting Green Subjectivity**

8

Protests - as much as regimes of government – draw on regimes of knowledge (Death 2010:240). Analysis of these as discourses of truth means asking which forms of knowledge are employed and which are excluded (Dean, 1999: 31). While the state uses statistics – the 'science of the state'– protestors rearticulate alternative, subaltern or marginalized knowledges. While the state uses 'techniques of the self' to create governable subjects, in this case, the 'green subject' – forest peoples' counter-conducts subvert and reinvent these categories, and in the process give rise to new identities and subjectivities (Death 2010:248).

As already established, the FLONA is managed by the state, companies and NGOs through a spatialized rational-technical governmentality based on the 'vocation' of different zones for industrial mining and logging. This governmentality, although underwritten by the sovereign threat of legal action and violence for infractions, also attempts to reshape forest peoples as green subjects through disciplinary and biopower, and this section examines these processes, and associated counter-conducts.

The FLONA as a legal-juridical space is underwritten by sovereign power that restricts hunting and agriculture. A point of tension is the requirement for legal authorization of productive activities, such as the opening of manioc fields. This led IBAMA in 2003 to fine a woman in her eighties for 'unauthorized deforestation' of a 0.5-hectare manioc field she had opened from secondary forest. In this case, they resisted sovereign power by not paying the fine (Nepomuceno 2017), although it is likely it made people more reticent to open manioc fields.

While FLONAS "admit" that forest peoples occupy them, they are "destined" to use by mining and logging companies. This apparent contradiction is resolved by claiming that industrial resource extraction is conducted under rigorous technological and scientific parameters of rationality and sustainability, conversely, agroecological knowledge of *riberinhos* and *quilombolas* is irrational and unscientific. This resonates with political ecology work around colonial discourses blaming local populations for environmental problems such as soil erosion and deforestation (Leach and Mearns 1999).

Industrial timber extraction based on "scientific forest management " can be considered the *raison d'être* of this model of conservation unit since its inception (Ioris, 2014) is defined as "*the way to obtain the maximum number of products without environmental degradation*" (IBAMA, 2002: 651). *Riberinho* communities are highly critical of industrial logging in the FLONA. They are banned from entering concessions when in use. This means they are forbidden from cutting wood for domestic use (i.e. making canoes and houses), hunting in areas under concession, or ability to open agricultural plots in them, while companies are guaranteed exclusivity over the exploitation of resources (Nepomuceno, 2017). The *riberinho* communities' counter-conduct is to try to redefine the limits of the areas where loggers operate, demanding that the Management Plan include a new zoning to reflect the forests that they have traditionally occupied and used.

Yet, as we saw in the final *riberinho* narrative against IBAMAs "doctors" in the previous section – "*we live from the roça, from extractivism*", the reassertion of these lifeways qua territoriality are counter-conducts to the biopolitical and disciplinary effects of these discourses as an apparatus of power. Counter-conducts are here the 're-appearance' of subjugated knowledges and ontologies (see Sauma 2013) in the aesthetic of self-creation (Kulynych, 1997, p. 328, cited in Death 2010:238).

The *riberinho* category is deployed to express a collective feeling of injustice, and in defence of "our land." This was evident in the discourse of a community leader is illustrative in showing how, in the face of IBAMAs "doctors:"

> *It was at the time that IBAMA 'limpando o pico' (delimiting) what they say is theirs. I went there with them [to IBAMAs offices], and they wanted to humiliate me there. There, she was a doctor from Santarém, they were all from there ... they were three doctors, right? Then they asked me if it was I who had invaded the reserve area, that's when I answered him, I said, "look, I know that it was you who invaded our lands, you created a reservation here .. You are not even from here." Then they said, 'You will not cut any more trees there.' I said, "Look, doctor, I live from this, I live from the roça. We, riberinho people, live from it: from extractivism, from the roça"*

What *riberinhos* are rejecting here is the denial by rational-technical governmentality (and so by the State, companies and NGOs) of their being knowledge producers. It is this alleged "lack of knowledge" in the management of the environment which allows their livelihood activities of fishing, hunting small-scale extraction of timber and non-timber forest products and shifting cultivation, to be criminalized. So here, green grabbing is justified by the depiction of one form of knowledge - industrial timber and mining as rational, scientific and environmentally sustainable, against that of *riberinhos* and *quilombola* local knowledge - denigrated as backward, irrational, and unsustainable.

Local people are conceived of as one of the most significant problems to the management of the FLONA, a situation that, according to the Management Plan, supposedly would only be solved if the communities incorporated the concept of "sustainability" prescribed by IBAMA into their everyday lives and practices which is incompatible with the current practices and "habits" of these groups:

> **The dilemma is to incorporate concepts of sustainability in the exploitation of natural resources to the practices and habits historically acquired by the local communities**. **Regardless of whether local populations recognize the importance of conservation,** the first impact of living with the reality of the National Forest is the **restriction and modification of habits** (IBAMA, 2002, p.263, our emphases).

Although the document recognizes that mining has an impact, it emphasizes *environmental activities implemented by MRN*" and the wide range of studies developed by the company regarding the recovery of degraded areas and environmental control and monitoring programs (cf. IBAMA, 2002: 375), indeed, it is through this "economy of restoration" that the mining company represents itself as "green":

> **large-scale mining projects can help protect nature.** The mining areas are generally located in protected areas, with mining being restricted to relatively small portions, and the rest of the area may be inspected by the companies and better managed by the responsible agencies, **which can greatly reduce the pressure from hunting and degradation of environments, of the fauna**. (Sudam / Undp, 1994 quoted in IBAMA, 2002, p.227, our emphases)

Conversely, *riberinhos'* and *quilombolas'* exploitation of natural resources and basic activities for their socio-cultural reproduction, are considered to be devoid of "rationality":

The population resident in the FLONA established … a time before and after the "IBAMA law". Before there was the use of wood, fish, fur and game meat, the clearing of the forest for the establishment of clearings **without concern for compliance with parameters and standards of sustainability and rational use of such resources**. To change the habits of the local population it is **necessity to insert principles of sustainability and rationality into the exploitation of the natural resources** (IBAMA, 2002, p.306, our emphases).

The Management Plan seeks to learn from MRN, which has carried out "environmental education" programs since before the creation of the FLONA.

Another major challenge … was the **environmental "concientization" of the population** …there were no books, manuals, films or other materials that could serve as guidance. The **concientization** work [of the MRN] aimed at reaching both adults and children... For adults, we showed the consequences of deforestation, the impacts of the company's industrial activities, the need for recovery of the areas, while for children we presented arguments for the importance of human-environment integration and the consequence of overfelling trees. (IBAMA, 2002, p.29, our emphases)

This section has shown how the rational-technical governmentality of the FLONA attempts to reshape forest peoples as green subjects. IBAMAs perception that *riberinho* and *quilombola* communities in general do not incorporate concepts of "sustainability" or "rationality" into their practices and relationship with the "environment", along with the depreciation of their knowledge and management practices of the environmental resources of their territories, generates the view of the state bureaucracy: they do not serve conservation unit objectives. They are seen as a problem to the management of the FLONA, unlike the mining and logging enterprises, seen as partners of the agency.

This situation is seen by the *riberinhos* as unjust and unreasonable, this view often is expressed when they compare how they are treated by ICMBio with how the MRN is treated: "*law only exists for the rich*." Counter-conducts against the disciplinary effects of law are evident in discourses such as this one from a community leader explained:

"*I do not know how this business works, because we have rights, but people come here, saying that it was authorized by the government, that the land belongs to the government, then they come, we do not know anything, what can we do?*

**5.*Riberinho* counter-conducts to 'green' timber and mining**

We now turn to two examples of counter-conducts to mining and logging respectively, at localities to the south-east and north-east of the FLONA (Figure 2). First, we examine Boa Nova and Saracá's experience of MRNs 'economy of restoration;' Second, we look at Acari's relationship with timber concessions and the NGO performing FSC certification, Imaflora. In order to make communities accept the advance of industrial resource extraction, the companies present compensatory measures which can also be seen as an attempt to transform *riberinhos* into "green subjects" who take an active role in softening the impacts of the company upon them and their environment, as the discourses from the Management Plan presented above indicate in terms of the need for them to modify their practices.

11

475

*5.1 Forest restoration at Boa Nova and Saracá*

*Boa Nova's* response to this new 'green' form of industrial resource extraction is distinct from that of the 1980s which opened this paper. Unlike the physical and direct counter-conducts to sovereign power in the confrontation of that decade - *riberinhos* – who are emerging in decades since the 1988 Constitution as new form of political subjectivity - now present a strategy of counter-conduct which they characterize as "*sem bater de frente*" (*without confronting head on*), which can be read as their understanding of their inability to overturn the sovereign power of the MRN and the FLONA. When they say that they are "caught between resistance and negotiation" they mean that they feel compelled to at least partially accept the 'economy of restoration.' Mining of the Almeidas plateau deprived Boa Nova of Brazil-nuts, one of their main sources of income (Figure 1). According to MRN (2002), about 30 community members collected up to 200 hectolitres of Brazil-nut per year in this 344ha area. Without the Brazil-nut harvest, Boa Nova loses around 1500 USD per year (MRN, 2002). Moreover, many of the streams in the community's ancestral territory have been polluted by mining, causing illnesses among locals who drink from them (Figure 1).

Among the compensatory measures proposed to Boa Nova by the company are: acquisition of seeds of native tree species by the community for reforestation; development of feasibility studies for planting Brazil-nut near the community; implementation of Environmental Education Program for the use of Brazil-nuts (ironic, to say the least); support from the Municipality of Oriximiná Program for the Development of Agriculture for the community; establishment of an agreement with the Municipality of Oriximiná and the construction of micro water supply systems for the communities of Lago Sapucuá (MRN, 2002).

The negotiations between *riberinhos* and the MRN, over adequate compensation, remain unresolved. The most emblematic case is the acquisition of seeds of native species for reforestation as compensation for the loss of the Brazil nut stands" (MRN, 2002). The Brazil-nut grove, where the *riberinhos* worked autonomously, was replaced by a relation of dependence on the mining company. The *riberinhos* felt they had no choice but to accept the program, because mining in the FLONA is protected by the federal government since its creation. So their counter-conducts as ethical practices of freedom manifest in counter-discourses, like this example from a female resident of the Saracá:

> *I think this …is not a benefit. It's just a danger to each of us who picks up this list [of seeds to gather]. We risk being bitten by animals, falling from a tree, it's dangerous. But mainly not to be stirring up other people's things, because going onto [the] land, [of neighbouring communities] they might fight with us and my God, we could die. Even so, this [the forest restoration programme] does not restore the forest. Because the nature for us is very good, and no, people break seedlings' branches, end the tree. Then after a couple of months, when the person gets there, the tree died, it's dead. I do not think that's a benefit.*

So even whilst locals feel they must take these opportunities for work, they refuse green subjectivity through counter-discourse. But even the work of collecting seeds for the MRN is now threatened by the implementation of the forest concessions, as seed matrices are

12

themselves degraded by logging. So, the restoration of ecology destroyed by one form of industrial resource extraction - mining - is undermined by another - the logging of forest concessions.

Today, the communities of Boa Nova and Saracá are upset with the limited number of seed lists available and now bargain separately with the company to try to increase them whilst before they negotiated with the MRN together, they are in the weaker position of bargaining separately due to misunderstandings, strengthening MRN's hand. This case has shown the constraints of a situation where the communities feel that they have no choice but to accept the compensation – and counter-conducts are limited to critical discourses which do not have the power to change the situation. The fact that community members 'restore' the environmental damages caused by the company, itself is part of the disciplinary and biopolitical strategies intended to transform them into green subjects, yet such environmental recovery practices are ultimately accepted (even with severe criticism) by communities.

*5.2. Rejecting FSC certification at Acari*

IMAFLORA - the NGO responsible for the legitimizing FSC certification of forest concessions – began to recommend the FSC label to concessionaires in 2013 (IMAFLORA, 2013). Twice a year, the institution sends teams of auditors to assess the compliance of the companies' practices to FSC principles and criteria. Such audits include consultation and meetings with communities neighbouring the enterprise to evaluate company-community relationships. In meetings, Acari community complained that FSC certified logging had damaged the forest, scaring away game, killed flora they exploit, and prevented harvesting timber to build houses and canoes (Nepomuceno 2017). They objected to the FSC seal being granted to forest products extracted by timber companies from their ancestral territory.

The community initially sought IMAFLORA as an ally in the referral of demands for rights to public agencies, as well as requesting its intervention in problems directly with the timber company. In October 2014, at the Federal Prosecution Service (MPF) in Santarém, IMAFLORA signed a document with the community representatives of Acari and the Federal Attorney, promising, within six months, to conduct a technical study of areas of traditional use, to review of concession areas in the FLONA to exclude traditionally occupied areas, and to review the zoning of the FLONA so its perimeter is destined as a "Zone of Population Use". This has not yet taken place however as of February 2019, owing to lack of agreement between companies and communities.

The various ongoing conflicts over logging, fishing and the autonomy and integrity of the territory occupied for generations, have been qualified by the NGO as merely a "discomfort" (IMAFLORA, 2015, p. 3). Adopting what they call an approach of "continuous improvement", the certifier has invested in encouraging "negotiation" between the community and enterprise, while maintaining certification.

This was unacceptable to Acari and led their formal complaints to the ICMBio local office, and in coordination with organizations representing the communities in Oriximiná in search of political support, objections to the FSC seal being granted to companies were sent to the MPF together with neighbouring communities. There was also direct action to disrupt logging through by closing the mouth of the lake Acari to prevent the passage of ferries.

13

561   In March 2015, IMAFLORA suspended FSC-certification of the enterprise, only to
562   reactivate it, to strong community opposition, in July of that year. At a meeting IMAFLORA
563   representatives explained that certification was reactivated because the timber company
564   showed evidence - which it refused to reveal- that it would be addressing the complaints
565   made previously by the community.

566   In March 2016, in the face of unsuccessful attempts at out-of-court settlement
567   between certifier and communities, and taking into account damages to the consumer by
568   inappropriate assignment of the FSC seal the MPF requested a preliminary injunction from
569   the Federal Court in Santarém for the suspension of certification, "*in case of non-compliance*
570   *, for obvious abusive practice, misleading advertising and affront to the principle of*
571   *transparency in consumer relations*" (MPF, 2016:79).

572   In response, representatives of the company, certifier and government began to seek
573   conciliation by intervening in internal political sphere of the community by trying
574   (successfully) to get community residents (non-leaders) to speak for the community in favour
575   of reinstalling FSC certification against the will of the community and its leadership. We also
576   noticed a growing effort to hire residents of Lake Acari, a strategy often employed by these
577   types of enterprise in Amazonia. Among those offered jobs were leaders who had publicly
578   disputed the company. Some locals rejected while others accepted offers of employment. The
579   company sought to engage key people in the spaces created within its organizational
580   structure, dedicated to the treatment of "community relations". Today, the company has a
581   subcontractor to deal exclusively with conflict (and its "prevention") with neighbouring
582   communities, which involves holding meetings and other activities in the Acari and region,
583   including giving "educational" lectures on "low impact forest management" to *riberinhos*.

584   In this process of trying to bring about this rational-technical governmentality, we
585   observed experts who, from their privileged social position and the authority conferred upon
586   them - tried to impose "legitimate" knowledge about the effects of forest exploitation. In one
587   example, a representative of the company - linked to the department of 'community relations'
588   – tried to explain how forest management techniques of the company are of 'reduced impact'
589   when compared to other technologies:

590   *There is an ignorance of what is forest management, people [addressing the riberinhos],*
591   *okay ? What is Forest Management? The practices that the company adopts, not only here,*
592   *but everywhere, are bound by the law. It is of reduced impact, it is tied to the law. There is a*
593   *need for you to go there, to learn, we cannot question something we do not know, right? So*
594   *we need to know, it's information.*

595   This authority does not go unchallenged. At another meeting at the MPF in Santarem, with
596   representatives of government, company and community present, technicians of the logging
597   company tried to persuade the attorney chairing the meeting that the whole conflict was the
598   fault of the *riberinhos*, who did not know what forest management was. In response, the
599   Acari community coordinator's counter-conduct was to turn the argument against the
600   technician, saying that the technician did not know or understand the community's
601   management of the forest, so she would not be able to explain the problems that the
602   community was facing. This is a counter-conduct to disciplinary power - the subversion of
603   dominant discourses by their re-articulation with slightly different meanings (Butler 1995:236
604   cited in Lilja and Vinthagen 2014:115). The Federal Court suspended FSC certification of

605 timber in March 2017. Currently, to restore the FSC seal, loggers are intensifying their policy
606 of delivering constitutional rights as favours.

607

608 **6.Concluding discussion**

609 We argued that forest peoples' reassertion of identity, livelihood, knowledge and ways of
610 being in the world and the new forms of political subjectivity that come with this can be read
611 as forms of counter-conduct to the historically shifting forms of governmentality enacting a
612 'green grab,' through sovereign, disciplinary and biopower - wherein capital, the state, and
613 NGOs seek to turn them 'green' subjects. The FLONA Saracá-Taquera provides the
614 legislative architecture for this process that started with *Mineracão Rio Norte* from the 1970s
615 forward, taking on new dimensions with the current FSC-certified forest concessions.
616 Hegemonic discourse represents industrial resource extraction - 'green' logging and mining -
617 as sustainable and rational, and the knowledge of forest peoples as backward, irrational and
618 destructive.
619 　　　　Two political subjects - *quilombolas* and *riberinhos* - emerged through the process of
620 trying to claim different bundles of rights enshrined in the 1988 Constitution and subsequent
621 laws. *Quilombolas* right to collective territory based on identity has had a more powerful
622 effect on subject formation than the *riberinho* identity, which is consequentially less
623 incorporated into techniques of the self than *quilombola* identity is. We examined two
624 *riberinho* localities effected by mining and timber respectively and their counter-conducts to
625 the rational-technical governmentality of the FLONA and its attempt to shape green
626 subjectivities among them. At Boa Vista and Saracá, locals felt they had no choice but to
627 accept involvement in the MRN's 'economy of restoration' – a reforestation scheme - but
628 remained critical. At Acari, meanwhile, community members rejected attempts by
629 IMAFLORA to get them to accept FSC-certified logging.
630 　　　　The political subjectivities emergent here could easily be missed by approaches to
631 resistance that focus on the extent to which social movements can transform hegemonic
632 power-relations. The acknowledgement of counter-conduct as a form of critique draws our
633 attention to "the physical, embodied practice and performance of critique: acts of "voluntary
634 insubordination" and having "the audacity to expose oneself as a subject". Practices which
635 risk being rejected by a 'resistance approach' for being insufficiently transformative can be
636 re-evaluated through a counter-conducts approach as ethical self-formation and alter modes
637 of being in the world (Death 2016:216).
638 　　　　Critiques of environmentality can be reassessed through a counter-conducts lens.
639 Cepek (2011) showed how a conservation program does not transform the Cofán people into
640 "environmental subjects." He uses Marx's "alienated labour," to explore how Cofan people
641 maintain a critical consciousness of the activities. This is insightful, but their political
642 agendas and cultural perspectives - including *tsampima coiraye* (caring for the forest) could
643 also be fruitfully examined as counter-conducts, rather than being outside of environmentality
644 per se.
645 　　　　Finally, in October 2018 potentially massive change was heralded by the victory of
646 Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil's presidential elections. Amazonian forest people's rights are under
647 existential threat: the neo-colonial sovereign power of land speculation, mining and timber
648 already unleashed by Bolsonaro can be resisted only through only through sovereign counter-
649 conducts – and this is a recipe for lethal conflict as history has repeatedly shown in
650 Amazonian history.

651

15

652

## References cited

Affonso, H. 2018. Reservas de capital: A disputa das unidades de conservação como
territórios tradicionalmente ocupados e espaço destinado a concessões minerais e
madeireiras. Estudo de caso a partir dos conflitos na floresta nacional de Saracá-
Taquera, Oriximiná, Pará. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do
Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.

Agrawal, A. 2005. Environmentality: Community, Intimate Government, and the Making of
Environmental Subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology* 46 (2):161-190.

Almeida, A. W. B. d. 2008. Terras de quilombos, terras indígenas, "babaçuais livres",
"castanhais do povo", faxinais e fundos de pastos: terras tradicionalmente ocupadas.
Manaus, PGSCA-UFAM.

Asiyanbi, A. P., E. Ogar and O. A. Akintoye 2019. Complexities and surprises in local
resistance to neoliberal conservation: Multiple environmentalities, technologies of the
self and the poststructural geography of local engagement with REDD+. Political
Geography 69: 128-138.

Brazil. 2000. Ordinary Law No. 9,985, of July 18,. Available at:
<www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9985.HTM>. Accessed on: 10 Apr. 2015.

Butler, J. 1995. Subjection, resistance, resignification. In: John Rajchman, ed. The identity in
question. New York: Routledge, 229–250

Castro, R.A.E. 1988. *Negros de Trombetas: guardies de matas e rios.* Belem, Para, Brazil:
FPA-NAEA

Cepek, M. L. 2011. Foucault in the forest: Questioning environmentality in Amazonia.
*American Ethnologist* 38 (3):501-515.

Cortes-Vazquez JA, Ruiz-Ballesteros E. 2018. Practising Nature: A Phenomenological
Rethinking of Environmentality in Natural Protected Areas in Ecuador and Spain.
*Conservation and Society*. 16:232-42

Davidson, A. I. 2011. In praise of counter-conduct. History of the Human Sciences, 24(4),
25–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695111411625

Dean, M. 1999 Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society. London: Sage.

Death, C. 2010. Counter-conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest. *Social Movement
Studies*, 9:3, 235-251.

Death, C. 2016. Counter-Conducts as a Mode of Resistance: Ways of "Not Being Like That"
in South Africa, *Global Society*, 30:2, 201-217, DOI:
10.1080/13600826.2015.1133566

Odysseos, L. 2016. Human Rights, Self-Formation and Resistance in Struggles against
Disposability: Grounding Foucault's "Theorizing Practice" of Counter-Conduct in
Bhopal, Global Society, 30:2, 179-200, DOI: 10.1080/13600826.2016.1141178

Fairhead J., Leach, M. and Scoones, I. 2012 Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature?
Journal of Peasant Studies 39 237-261

Fraser, J.A. (2018) Amazonian Struggles for Recognition. Transactions of the Institute of
British Geographers. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12254

Ferguson, J. and Gupta, A. (2002), Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal
Governmentality. American Ethnologist, 29: 981-1002.

Foucault, M. 1977. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. 1991. Governmentality. In: The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality (eds. Burchell, G., C. Gordon and P. Miller). Pp. 87–104. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M., P. Rabinow, and R. Hurley. 1997. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*: New Press.
Foucault, M. 1988. The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3: The Care of the Self: Vintage Books.
Foucault, M. 1990. The History of Sexuality, Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure: Vintage Books
Foucault, M. 2005. The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981--1982: St Martins Press.
Foucault, M., P. Rabinow, and R. Hurley. 1997. Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth: New Press.
Foucault, M., A. I. Davidson, and G. Burchell. 2007. Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977 - 78: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
Foucault, M. 2011. The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College de France, 1982-1983: Palgrave Macmillan.
Fletcher, R. 2010. Neoliberal environmentality: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. Conservation and Society, 8: 171-81.

Fletcher, R. 2017. Environmentality unbound: Multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. Geoforum https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.009

Fraser JA. Amazonian struggles for recognition. Trans Inst Br Geogr. 2018;43:718–732. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12254

Fraser, J.A. Cardoso, T. Steward A. & L. Parry (2018) Amazonian peasant livelihood differentiation as mutuality-market dialectics, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 45:7, 1382-1409, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2017.1296833

Garcia, F. 2018. A luta Borari e Arapium por um território encantado no Rio Maró: Autodemarcação e retomadas. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.
Golder, B. 2015. *Foucault and the Politics of Rights*: Stanford University Press. Stanford.
Hale, CR. 2011. Resistencia para que?Territory autonomy and neoliberal entaglements in the "empty spaces of Central America. Economy and Society 40, 184-210
IBAMA 2002 Management Plan of the Saracá-Taquera National Forest. Available at http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-planos-de-manejo/pm_flona_saraca_taquera.pdf Accessed on: 14 Oct 2018

IBAMA 2004. Management Plan of the Tapajós National Forest . Volume I - General Information. Available at: http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/imgsunidades-coservacao/flona_tapajoss.pdf Accessed on 14 Oct 2018

Ioris, EM. 2014. A forest of disputes : conflicts over spaces, resources and social identities in the Amazon . Florianópolis: UFSC.

IMAFLORA. 2013 Resumo Público de Avaliação de Certificação de Manejo Florestal da Ebata Produtos Florestais Ltda. em Oriximiná-Pará-Brasil. Piracicaba: Imaflora. p. 19. Available at: http://fsc.force.com/servlet/servlet.FileDownload?file=00P4000000G6yw7EAB Accessed 14 Oct 2018

17

IMAFLORA. 2015. Resumo Público de Auditoria de Verificação de Ações Corretivas (CVA). Piracicaba: Imaflora p. 5. Available at: http://fsc.force.com/servlet/servlet.FileDownload?file=00P3300000YVweGEAT Accessed 14 Oct 2018

Lilja, M. & Vinthagen, S. 2014. Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: resisting what power with what resistance? Journal of Political Power, 7: 1, 107-126.

Kulynych, J. J. 1997. Performing Politics: Foucault, Habermas and postmodern participation. Polity, 30(2) 315–346.

Demetriou, O. 2016 Counter-Conduct and the Everyday: Anthropological Engagements with Philosophy, Global Society, 30:2, 218-237, DOI: 10.1080/13600826.2015.1133568

Leach, M. Mearns, R eds. 1996. The Lie of the Land: Challenging Received Wisdom on the African Environment. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann..

Lilja, M., and S. Vinthagen. 2014. Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: resisting what power with what resistance? Journal of Political Power 7 (1):107-126.

Loures, R. S. P. 2017. Governo Karodaybi: o movimento Ipereğ Ayũ e a resistência Munduruku. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.

O'Dwyer, E.C. 2002 ed. Quilombos: identidade étnica e territorialidade. Rio de Janeiro : Editora FGV,  296p.

Ortner, S.B. 2006. Anthropology and Social Theory. Duke University Press.

MRN, 2002 Additional information to the Environmental Impact Study, Platô Almeidas,

MPF, 2009. Attorney of the Republic in Santarém. Public civil action n. 2009.39.02.001530-0. Santarém: Judicial Branch of Santarém.

MPF, 2016. Procuradoria da República em Santarém. Ação civil pública com referência no Inquérito Civil Público n° 1.23.002.000263/2014-52. Pede a suspensão da certificação FSC® da Ebata Produtos Florestais LTDA

Nepomuceno, I.T.R. 2017. Conflitos territoriais entre comunidades tradicionais e concessões florestais: um estudo de caso a partir da Floresta Nacional de Saracá-Taquera, Oriximiná, Pará. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.

Pieck, S. K. 2015. "To be led differently": Neoliberalism, road construction, and NGO counter-conducts in Peru. Geoforum 64: 304-313.

Sauma, J.F. 2013. The Deep and the Erepecuru: Tracing transgressions in an Amazonian Quilombola territory. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University College London.

Torres, M. 2014. O escriba e o narrador: a memória e a luta pela terra dos ribeirinhos do Alto Tapajós. Tempo Social 26: 233-257.

18

776    Torres, M. Branford, S. 2018. Amazon Besieged: By Dams, Soya, Agribusiness and Land-
777           Grabbing. Practical Action Publishing.

778    Van Teijlingen, K. 2016. The 'will to improve' at the mining frontier: Neo-extractivism,
779           development and governmentality in the Ecuadorian Amazon. The Extractive
780           Industries and Society 3(4): 902-911.

781    Zhouri, A. 2006.Transnational activism for the Amazon: between political ecology and
782           results environmentalism. Anthropological Horizons. 12(25):139-169

783

784

785

786

**Figure 1:** Timber concessions and bauxite plateaus overlap with areas of historic use and occupation by Boa Nova and Saracá

789

790

791

792

**Figure 2:** The Saracá-Taquera National Forest (FLONA)

794

795

796

**Figure 3:** Acari and neibouring Samauma and Carimum communities households and areas of traditional use overlap with the FLONA and timber concessions.

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

20