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

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

2. Revitalizing Environmentality

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

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

By the end of the 1978 lectures Foucault was defining governmentality as it is now most commonly used by environmentality scholars: the “conduct of conduct” (Fletcher 2010:173, Fletcher 2017). From this expanded viewpoint, governing occurs across different sites and at different scales: one governs the criminal, the mentally unwell; one governs one’s
family, one governs children, one governs souls (religion) – and one governs ones’ self (Golder 2015:53, Davidson 2011:26). Governing is conducting, government is the conduct of one’s own and others’ conduct – hence, the “conduct of conducts.” So “conduct emerges as the conceptual pivot upon which the late work turns: from power to ethics.” Conduct has a double dimension, herein the ‘late’ Foucault emerges: his previous emphasis on power over others as an objectifying register is joined by operation of power over oneself in a self-subjectifying register (Golder 2015:54).

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

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

2.1 Counter-conduct: resistant subjectivities

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

The advantages of counter-conducts over Scott’s everyday resistance are twofold (c.f. Pieck 2015:308): First, the former is broader as a concept. As Death (2010:236) puts it, counter-conducts can elucidate “specific practices and rationalities of protest, which themselves work to constitute particular identities and subjectivities through the performance of dissent.” Second, it breaks the power-resistance binary because counter-conducts are present from the beginning of the ‘conduct of conduct’, as the Davidson and Senellart quotes above attest. Resistances, redirections and refusals of conduct do not come after or in response to governmental guidance. Rather, there is an original relation between them: the conduct of conduct develops in co-constitutive feedback with counter-conducts. (Odysseos
Counter-conduct, it may be argued, sits at the very foundation of political subjectivity—the crux of the entire Foucauldian oeuvre (Demetriou 2016:219). As Foucault remarked in 1979 “politics is no more or less than that which is born with resistance to governmentality” (Death 2016:216).

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

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

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

Biopower seeks to manage the population, how its life is reproduced, increase productivity, and improve behaviour, including forms of training and educating. Resistance is about undermining these main techniques of biopower by being other ways (ibid:119). Since it operates at the population scale, dissidence to biopower can also be read on this aggregate level, at the level of the multitude as a kind of heterogenous ‘counter-conductive population’ without a unified subject (cf Lilja and Vinthagen 2014:121). The clearest expression of resistance to biopower in the FLONA is the struggle for the quilombola territories, Alto...
Trombetas 1 and 2 and the reaffirmation of quilombola identity at the level of the subject which accompanies this. This is analogous to Van Teijlingen’s (2016:909) notion of ‘counter-territorialization.’

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

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

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

The presence of riberinho and quilombola communities has been legally unclear since the creation of this FLONA in 1989. Since their inception in the Forest Code of 1965 until Decree No. 1,298 of October 1994, FLONAs did not permit “human occupation” (IBAMA 2004). Since law 9.985 of 2000, National Forests “admit” these groups occupy the area, but require that they act in accordance with the provisions of the “Management Plan.” The quilombola communities inhabiting the north of the FLONA occupy what the management plan designates a narrow “population zone” of 1000 meters from the Trombetas river, accounting for 2.5% of the unit. These communities are in a longstanding and conflictive process of titling their collective territories of Alto Trombétas 1 and Alto Trombetas 2. This is spatialised counter-conduct to the FLONA using constitutional rights of quilombolas (Figure 2). Riberinho communities, by contrast, are mentioned in the Management Plan, but they have not been allocated a “population zone.” Their ancestral areas of use for hunting and
forest products relegated to the status of “forest production zone”, and, areas of more intensive uses, such as homegardens and shifting cultivation fields, were designated “recovery zones.” The communities themselves are now located in the Sapucuá-Trombetas Agro-Extractive Settlement Project (PAE), created in 2010 (Figure 2). Inspite of nominally collective land ownership in practice land tenure is individualised, not least because of the presence of cattle ranchers. We now turn to the question of how to theorize the relationship between the conduct of conduct and counter-conducts as these changes unfolded.

3.1. Rights claims as counter-conducts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This authority does not go unchallenged. At another meeting at the MPF in Santarem, with representatives of government, company and community present, technicians of the logging company tried to persuade the attorney chairing the meeting that the whole conflict was the fault of the riberinhos, who did not know what forest management was. In response, the Acari community coordinator’s counter-conduct was to turn the argument against the technician, saying that the technician did not know or understand the community’s management of the forest, so she would not be able to explain the problems that the community was facing. This is a counter-conduct to disciplinary power - the subversion of dominant discourses by their re-articulation with slightly different meanings (Butler 1995:236 cited in Lilja and Vinthagen 2014:115). The Federal Court suspended FSC certification of
timber in March 2017. Currently, to restore the FSC seal, loggers are intensifying their policy of delivering constitutional rights as favours.

6. Concluding discussion

We argued that forest peoples’ reassertion of identity, livelihood, knowledge and ways of being in the world and the new forms of political subjectivity that come with this can be read as forms of counter-conduct to the historically shifting forms of governmentality enacting a ‘green grab,’ through sovereign, disciplinary and biopower - wherein capital, the state, and NGOs seek to turn them ‘green’ subjects. The FLONA Saracá-Taquera provides the legislative architecture for this process that started with Mineracão Rio Norte from the 1970s forward, taking on new dimensions with the current FSC-certified forest concessions.

Hegemonic discourse represents industrial resource extraction - ‘green’ logging and mining - as sustainable and rational, and the knowledge of forest peoples as backward, irrational and destructive.

Two political subjects - quilombolas and ribeirinhos - emerged through the process of trying to claim different bundles of rights enshrined in the 1988 Constitution and subsequent laws. Quilombolas right to collective territory based on identity has had a more powerful effect on subject formation than the ribeirinho identity, which is consequentially less incorporated into techniques of the self than quilombola identity is. We examined two ribeirinho localities effected by mining and timber respectively and their counter-conducts to the rational-technical governmentality of the FLONA and its attempt to shape green subjectivities among them. At Boa Vista and Saracá, locals felt they had no choice but to accept involvement in the MRN’s ‘economy of restoration’ – a reforestation scheme - but remained critical. At Acari, meanwhile, community members rejected attempts by IMAFLORA to get them to accept FSC-certified logging.

The political subjectivities emergent here could easily be missed by approaches to resistance that focus on the extent to which social movements can transform hegemonic power-relations. The acknowledgement of counter-conduct as a form of critique draws our attention to “the physical, embodied practice and performance of critique: acts of “voluntary insubordination” and having “the audacity to expose oneself as a subject”. Practices which risk being rejected by a ‘resistance approach’ for being insufficiently transformative can be re-evaluated through a counter-conducts approach as ethical self-formations and alter modes of being in the world (Death 2016:216).

Critiques of environmentality can be reassessed through a counter-conducts lens. Cepek (2011) showed how a conservation program does not transform the Cofán people into “environmental subjects.” He uses Marx’s “alienated labour,” to explore how Cofán people maintain a critical consciousness of the activities. This is insightful, but their political agendas and cultural perspectives - including tsampima coiraye (caring for the forest) could also be fruitfully examined as counter-conducts, rather than being outside of environmentality per se.

Finally, in October 2018 potentially massive change was heralded by the victory of Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil’s presidential elections. Amazonian forest people’s rights are under existential threat: the neo-colonial sovereign power of land speculation, mining and timber already unleashed by Bolsonaro can be resisted only through sovereign counter-conducts – and this is a recipe for lethal conflict as history has repeatedly shown in Amazonian history.
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Figure 1: Timber concessions and bauxite plateaus overlap with areas of historic use and occupation by Boa Nova and Saracá

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

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