

1 Introduction

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

17 The changing forms of governance and power that communities have faced since the
18 1960s shape conditions for and forms that resistance takes. Forest peoples' ancestral
19 territories were enveloped by a conservation unit, the 441,282.63ha Saracá-Taquera National
20 Forest (FLONA) – created in 1989 (Figure 2), which permits 'sustainable use' of mineral and
21 forest resources. The FLONA is managed by government environmental agencies the *Chico*
22 *Mendes Institute of Biodiversity Conservation* (ICMBio) and the *Brazilian Institute of*
23 *Environment and Renewable Natural Resources* (IBAMA), timber and mining companies,
24 and NGOs. The FLONA is seen by these actors in terms of its 'natural vocation' for mining
25 and timber concessions (Figure 2; Zhouri 2006). At the centre of the FLONA lie extensive
26 bauxite reserves exploited by *Mineração Rio Norte* (MRN), the largest bauxite mining
27 company in Brazil and the third largest in the world. The MRN has been involved in socio-
28 environmental conflicts with the peoples of the FLONA since the late 1960s – yet represents
29 itself as 'green' (MRN 2002).

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

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

45 underappreciated in the governmentality literature. His earlier focus on how the Panopticon
46 shapes self-discipline is complemented by a turn to care for and ethics of the self: practices of
47 freedom through which subjects have the potential to transcend self-discipline (see Foucault
48 1988; 1990; 1997; 2005; 2011). We use this lens to empirically examine the production of
49 green subjects in relation to ‘green’ logging and mining entailing governmental processes and
50 counter-conducts to them.

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

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

69 The 1988 Constitution and subsequent laws created the possibilities for new forms of
70 counter-conduct through the act of claiming rights embedded in forest peoples’ identity
71 categories: indigenous, *quilombolas* (Afro-descendent peoples) and *riberinhos* (the forest
72 peasantry) (Almeida 2008). We focus in particular on *riberinhos*, the least visible identity
73 category with the weakest set of rights (Fraser, 2018). They do not have rights to a collective
74 territory based on an ‘ethnic’ identity, like indigenous and *quilombolas* do, rather they have
75 rights to continue to practice agroextractivist¹ livelihoods in different territorial units, in this
76 case an Agroextractivist Settlement Project (PAE). We however also discuss their *quilombola*
77 neighbours in the FLONA, whose counter-conducts have focused on the struggle to
78 demarcate their territories Alto Trombetas 1 and 2 (Figure 2). These two groups are
79 overlapping, having very similar livelihoods, historical trajectories and forms of natural
80 resource management and are often related as kin. They have become differentiated as
81 *political subjects* however, through counter-conductive acts of claiming and actualizing the
82 distinct sets of rights afforded to each of two categories (O’Dwyer 2002).

83 *Riberinho* counter-conducts include struggles to realise their right to delimit their
84 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).

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 et al 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

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 et al. 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.

153 *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

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

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.'

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

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 delimited 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 et al 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

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 Sapucaá-Trombetas
264 Agro-Extractive Settlement Project (PAE), created in 2010 (Figure 2). In spite 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 *Mineração 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

345

346 4. Resisting Green Subjectivity

347 Protests - as much as regimes of government – draw on regimes of knowledge (Death
348 2010:240). Analysis of these as discourses of truth means asking which forms of knowledge
349 are employed and which are excluded (Dean, 1999: 31). While the state uses statistics – the
350 ‘science of the state’ – protestors rearticulate alternative, subaltern or marginalized
351 knowledges. While the state uses ‘techniques of the self’ to create governable subjects, in this
352 case, the ‘green subject’ – forest peoples’ counter-conducts subvert and reinvent these
353 categories, and in the process give rise to new identities and subjectivities (Death 2010:248).

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

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

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

374 Industrial timber extraction based on "scientific forest management " can be
375 considered the *raison d'être* of this model of conservation unit since its inception (Ioris,
376 2014) is defined as "*the way to obtain the maximum number of products without*
377 *environmental degradation*" (IBAMA, 2002: 651). *Riberinho* communities are highly critical
378 of industrial logging in the FLONA. They are banned from entering concessions when in use.
379 This means they are forbidden from cutting wood for domestic use (i.e. making canoes and
380 houses), hunting in areas under concession, or ability to open agricultural plots in them, while
381 companies are guaranteed exclusivity over the exploitation of resources (Nepomuceno,
382 2017). The *riberinho* communities’ counter-conduct is to try to redefine the limits of the
383 areas where loggers operate, demanding that the Management Plan include a new zoning to
384 reflect the forests that they have traditionally occupied and used.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

431 Conversely, *riberinhos*’ and *quilombolas*’ exploitation of natural resources and basic
432 activities for their socio-cultural reproduction, are considered to be devoid of “rationality”:

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

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

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

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

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

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

465 **5.Riberinho counter-conducts to ‘green’ timber and mining**

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

475

476 *5.1 Forest restoration at Boa Nova and Saracá*

477 *Boa Nova's* response to this new 'green' form of industrial resource extraction is distinct
478 from that of the 1980s which opened this paper. Unlike the physical and direct counter-
479 conducts to sovereign power in the confrontation of that decade - *riberinhos* – who are
480 emerging in decades since the 1988 Constitution as new form of political subjectivity - now
481 present a strategy of counter-conduct which they characterize as “*sem bater de frente*”
482 (*without confronting head on*), which can be read as their understanding of their inability to
483 overturn the sovereign power of the MRN and the FLONA. When they say that they are
484 “caught between resistance and negotiation” they mean that they feel compelled to at least
485 partially accept the ‘economy of restoration.’ Mining of the Almeidas plateau deprived Boa
486 Nova of Brazil-nuts, one of their main sources of income (Figure 1). According to MRN
487 (2002), about 30 community members collected up to 200 hectolitres of Brazil-nut per year in
488 this 344ha area. Without the Brazil-nut harvest, Boa Nova loses around 1500 USD per year
489 (MRN, 2002). Moreover, many of the streams in the community’s ancestral territory have
490 been polluted by mining, causing illnesses among locals who drink from them (Figure 1).

491 Among the compensatory measures proposed to Boa Nova by the company are:
492 acquisition of seeds of native tree species by the community for reforestation; development of
493 feasibility studies for planting Brazil-nut near the community; implementation of
494 Environmental Education Program for the use of Brazil-nuts (ironic, to say the least); support
495 from the Municipality of Oriximiná Program for the Development of Agriculture for the
496 community; establishment of an agreement with the Municipality of Oriximiná and the
497 construction of micro water supply systems for the communities of Lago Sapucaá (MRN,
498 2002).

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

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

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

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

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

531
532 *5.2. Rejecting FSC certification at Acari*

533 IMAFLORA - the NGO responsible for the legitimizing FSC certification of forest
534 concessions – began to recommend the FSC label to concessionaires in 2013 (IMAFLORA,
535 2013). Twice a year, the institution sends teams of auditors to assess the compliance of the
536 companies' practices to FSC principles and criteria. Such audits include consultation and
537 meetings with communities neighbouring the enterprise to evaluate company-community
538 relationships. In meetings, Acari community complained that FSC certified logging had
539 damaged the forest, scaring away game, killed flora they exploit, and prevented harvesting
540 timber to build houses and canoes (Nepomuceno 2017). They objected to the FSC seal being
541 granted to forest products extracted by timber companies from their ancestral territory.

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

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

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

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 *Mineração 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

653 **References cited**

- 654 Affonso, H. 2018. Reservas de capital: A disputa das unidades de conservação como
655 territórios tradicionalmente ocupados e espaço destinado a concessões minerais e
656 madeiras. Estudo de caso a partir dos conflitos na floresta nacional de Saracá-
657 Taquera, Oriximiná, Pará. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do
658 Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.
- 659 Agrawal, A. 2005. Environmentality: Community, Intimate Government, and the Making of
660 Environmental Subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology* 46 (2):161-190.
- 661 Almeida, A. W. B. d. 2008. Terras de quilombos, terras indígenas, “babaçuais livres”,
662 “castanhais do povo”, faxinais e fundos de pastos: terras tradicionalmente ocupadas.
663 Manaus, PGSCA-UFAM.
- 664 Asiyambi, A. P., E. Ogar and O. A. Akintoye 2019. Complexities and surprises in local
665 resistance to neoliberal conservation: Multiple environmentalities, technologies of the
666 self and the poststructural geography of local engagement with REDD+. *Political*
667 *Geography* 69: 128-138.
- 668 Brazil. 2000. Ordinary Law No. 9,985, of July 18,. Available at:
669 <www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/L9985.HTM>. Accessed on: 10 Apr. 2015.
- 670 Butler, J. 1995. Subjection, resistance, resignification. In: John Rajchman, ed. *The identity in*
671 *question*. New York: Routledge, 229–250
- 672 Castro, R.A.E. 1988. *Negros de Trombetas: guardies de matas e rios*. Belem, Para, Brazil:
673 FPA-NAEA
- 674 Cepek, M. L. 2011. Foucault in the forest: Questioning environmentality in Amazonia.
675 *American Ethnologist* 38 (3):501-515.
- 676 Cortes-Vazquez JA, Ruiz-Ballesteros E. 2018. Practising Nature: A Phenomenological
677 Rethinking of Environmentality in Natural Protected Areas in Ecuador and Spain.
678 *Conservation and Society*. 16:232-42
- 679 Davidson, A. I. 2011. In praise of counter-conduct. *History of the Human Sciences*, 24(4),
680 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695111411625>
- 681 Dean, M. 1999 *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- 682 Death, C. 2010. Counter-conducts: A Foucauldian Analytics of Protest. *Social Movement*
683 *Studies*, 9:3, 235-251.
- 684 Death, C. 2016. Counter-Conducts as a Mode of Resistance: Ways of “Not Being Like That”
685 in South Africa, *Global Society*, 30:2, 201-217, DOI:
686 10.1080/13600826.2015.1133566
- 687 Odysseos, L. 2016. Human Rights, Self-Formation and Resistance in Struggles against
688 Disposability: Grounding Foucault's “Theorizing Practice” of Counter-Conduct in
689 Bhopal, *Global Society*, 30:2, 179-200, DOI: 10.1080/13600826.2016.1141178
- 690 Fairhead J., Leach, M. and Scoones, I. 2012 Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature?
691 *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39 237-261
- 692 Fraser, J.A. (2018) Amazonian Struggles for Recognition. *Transactions of the Institute of*
693 *British Geographers*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12254>
- 694 Ferguson, J. and Gupta, A. (2002), *Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal*
695 *Governmentality*. *American Ethnologist*, 29: 981-1002.
- 696 Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*: Vintage Books.

- 697 Foucault, M. 1991. Governmentality. In: The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality
698 (eds. Burchell, G., C. Gordon and P. Miller). Pp. 87–104. Hemel Hempstead:
699 Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- 700 Foucault, M., P. Rabinow, and R. Hurley. 1997. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*: New Press.
701 Foucault, M. 1988. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3: The Care of the Self*: Vintage Books.
702 Foucault, M. 1990. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure*: Vintage Books
703 Foucault, M. 2005. *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981-*
704 *-1982*: St Martins Press.
- 705 Foucault, M., P. Rabinow, and R. Hurley. 1997. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*: New Press.
706 Foucault, M., A. I. Davidson, and G. Burchell. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population:*
707 *Lectures at the College De France, 1977 - 78*: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- 708 Foucault, M. 2011. *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College de France,*
709 *1982-1983*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 710 Fletcher, R. 2010. Neoliberal environmentality: Towards a poststructuralist political
711 ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, 8: 171-81.
- 712 Fletcher, R. 2017. Environmentality unbound: Multiple governmentalities in environmental
713 politics. *Geoforum* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.009>
- 714 Fraser JA. Amazonian struggles for recognition. *Trans Inst Br Geogr.* 2018;43:718–732.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12254>
- 716 Fraser, J.A. Cardoso, T. Steward A. & L. Parry (2018) Amazonian peasant livelihood
717 differentiation as mutuality-market dialectics, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 45:7,
718 1382-1409, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2017.1296833
- 719 Garcia, F. 2018. A luta Borari e Arapim por um território encantado no Rio Maró:
720 Autodemarcação e retomadas. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade
721 Federal do Oeste do Pará, Santarém, Brasil.
- 722 Golder, B. 2015. *Foucault and the Politics of Rights*: Stanford University Press. Stanford.
723 Hale, CR. 2011. Resistencia para que? Territory autonomy and neoliberal entanglements in the
724 “empty spaces of Central America. *Economy and Society* 40, 184-210
- 725 IBAMA 2002 Management Plan of the Saracá-Taquera National Forest. Available at
726 [http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-planos-de-](http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-planos-de-manejo/pm_flona_saraca_taquera.pdf)
727 [manejo/pm_flona_saraca_taquera.pdf](http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-planos-de-manejo/pm_flona_saraca_taquera.pdf) Accessed on: 14 Oct 2018
- 728 IBAMA 2004. Management Plan of the Tapajós National Forest . Volume I - General
729 Information. Available at:
730 [http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/imgsunidades-](http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/imgsunidades-coservacao/flona_tapajoss.pdf)
731 [coservacao/flona_tapajoss.pdf](http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/imgsunidades-coservacao/flona_tapajoss.pdf) Accessed on 14 Oct 2018
- 732 Ioris, EM. 2014. A forest of disputes : conflicts over spaces, resources and social identities in
733 the Amazon . Florianópolis: UFSC.
- 734 IMAFLORA. 2013 Resumo Público de Avaliação de Certificação de Manejo Florestal da
735 Ebata Produtos Florestais Ltda. em Oriximiná-Pará-Brasil. Piracicaba: Imaflora. p.
736 19. Available at:
737 <http://fsc.force.com/servlet/servlet.FileDownload?file=00P4000000G6yw7EAB>
738 Accessed 14 Oct 2018

- 739 IMAFLORA. 2015. Resumo Público de Auditoria de Verificação de Ações Corretivas
740 (CVA). Piracicaba: Imaflora p. 5. Available at:
741 <http://fsc.force.com/servlet/servlet.FileDownload?file=00P3300000YVweGEAT>
742 Accessed 14 Oct 2018
- 743 Lilja, M. & Vinthagen, S. 2014. Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: resisting
744 what power with what resistance? *Journal of Political Power*, 7: 1, 107-126.
- 745 Kulynych, J. J. 1997. Performing Politics: Foucault, Habermas and postmodern
746 participation. *Polity*, 30(2) 315–346.
- 747 Demetriou, O. 2016 Counter-Conduct and the Everyday: Anthropological Engagements
748 with Philosophy, *Global Society*, 30:2, 218-237, DOI:
749 10.1080/13600826.2015.1133568
- 750 Leach, M. Mearns, R eds. 1996. *The Lie of the Land: Challenging Received Wisdom on the*
751 *African Environment*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann..
- 752 Lilja, M., and S. Vinthagen. 2014. Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower:
753 resisting what power with what resistance? *Journal of Political Power* 7 (1):107-126.
- 754 Loures, R. S. P. 2017. *Governo Karodaybi: o movimento Ipereğ Ayũ e a resistência*
755 *Munduruku*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do Oeste do
756 Pará, Santarém, Brasil.
- 757 O'Dwyer, E.C. 2002 ed. *Quilombos: identidade étnica e territorialidade*. Rio de Janeiro :
758 Editora FGV, 296p.
- 759 Ortner, S.B. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory*. Duke University Press.
- 760 MRN, 2002 Additional information to the Environmental Impact Study, Platô Almeidas,
761 MPF, 2009. Attorney of the Republic in Santarém. Public civil action n.
762 2009.39.02.001530-0. Santarém: Judicial Branch of Santarém.
- 763 MPF, 2016. Procuradoria da República em Santarém. Ação civil pública com referência no
764 Inquérito Civil Público nº 1.23.002.000263/2014-52. Pedu a suspensão da
765 certificação FSC® da Ebata Produtos Florestais LTDA
- 766 Nepomuceno, I.T.R. 2017. *Conflitos territoriais entre comunidades tradicionais e concessões*
767 *florestais: um estudo de caso a partir da Floresta Nacional de Saracá-Taquera,*
768 *Oriximiná, Pará*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. Universidade Federal do Oeste do
769 Pará, Santarém, Brasil.
- 770 Pieck, S. K. 2015. “To be led differently”: Neoliberalism, road construction, and NGO
771 counter-conducts in Peru. *Geoforum* 64: 304-313.
- 772 Sauma, J.F. 2013. *The Deep and the Erepecuru: Tracing transgressions in an Amazonian*
773 *Quilombola territory*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University College London.
- 774 Torres, M. 2014. O escriba e o narrador: a memória e a luta pela terra dos ribeirinhos do
775 Alto Tapajós. *Tempo Social* 26: 233-257.

- 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

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

789

790

791

792

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

794

795

796

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

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

