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The cultures of non-indigenous Amazonian peasants, generically identified as *caboclos*, are typically regarded as materialist and adaptationist constructs within cultural and political ecology. These literatures emphasize "processes", whether historical, adaptive, or economic, over practices—the lived experience of place. Within these parameters, Amazonian peasants are frequently identified through the extractive services they provide to meet external demands for forest products, such as rubber and Brazil nuts. I depart from these perspectives by exploring two related theses on Amazonian peasants and place. The first is that everyday extractive activities are integral to place-making and identity formation. The second is that the past, including historical practice and memory, permeates the present-day landscape and continues to inform a "sense of place".

The *ribeirinhos* (riverine people) of the Iriri River in the Terra do Meio ("Land of the Middle") region of the state of Pará, Brazil, are an ideal peasant population for these inquiries because their presence in the region, the historic migration of their forbearers from Brazil's drought-stricken northeast, their economic activities, and the implementation of a newly created federal Extractive Reserve on most of the land they
occupy all derive from policy interventions by the Brazilian State. I bring phenomenologically informed concepts of dwelling, temporality, and taskscape into dialogue with political and cultural ecology literatures. I thus highlight an experiential perspective of these people and their places, the multi-scalar phenomena that form a part of that relationship, and the identities and sense of place that emerge from it.

I find that the ribeirinhos' extractive activities are simultaneously economic and affective tasks that (1) have led to a strong sense of place; (2) have created place, through movement, matter and materiality, and inscribing; (3) highlight the forces and contingencies of time and history experienced by the ribeirinhos in unanticipated and unappreciated ways; and (4) continue to play a role in the emergence of identity. This study thus recognizes the significance of the global-local dialectic and the need to examine Amazonian peasants in a relationist perspective, through the interactions of top-down forces and institutions and the experiences of emplaced Amazonian peoples.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The modern state achieves social progress through the delineation and engineering of its territories, thereby reducing both social and ecological complexity (Scott 1998) to make such places coherent, visible, and amenable to control (Foucault 1979; Thomas 1993). Delineated places of interest to the State are treated as fixed, stable, and devoid of detail (Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Scott 1998). The degree of abstraction of such places increases with distance and separation from them (Casey 1996; de Certeau 1984). This modernist approach is one of a landscape (or the “environment”) separate from humans (e.g., Daniels and Cosgrove 1988:1), a perspective that originates in the post-Renaissance, Western distinction between subject and object.

Applying this modernist approach to place is particularly detrimental to dislocated, non-native, or mobile people who are unrepresented (or underrepresented) by their own governments, and are thus either unaccounted for or inadequately addressed in policies that affect them. They are regarded as “in-between”: not in the city, but also not in the country; not indigenous, yet also not colonists; not part of either “culture” or “nature”.¹

This project challenges the assumption that people perceived as in flux, in between, or transient (i.e., “on-the-move”; Bender 2001) have a superficial relationship with place, what Bender (2001:76) refers to as a “thinness of experience”. Because people “on-the-move” or “in-between” neither adhere to nor persist in delineated places that characterize modern State policies, they are categorized as placeless, or as

¹ This tendency has been exacerbated by the shift noted by some scholars to a perceived condition of “hypermodernism” or “supermodernism” (Augé 1995) in the world, which emerged from globalization. Hypermodernism asserts that we exist in a seemingly constant state of in-betweenness and “non-places” that have emerged from increased and increasingly rapid transit and movement (Augé 1995:34).
existing in “non-places” (Augé 1995). The most obvious examples of such people include migrants, political refugees, and diasporic peoples. Yet less obvious are those who have been living in place but are unaccounted, and thus considered “invisible” (Nugent 1993) or even “nonexistent” in geographic space. Amazonian peasants often referred to as “caboclos” or “extractivists” are among these invisible populations.

The modernist convention calls into question at least four, interrelated aspects of peasants and place that I examine in this dissertation: (1) their relationship to the land; (2) their history; (3) their sense of place; and (4) their identity. First, there is an assumption that peasants are driven almost exclusively by capital accumulation: through their economic and social systems, they exploit resources and move on. They thus appear to exist only in relation to a larger world order (Redfield 1956; c.f. Wolf 1982). A corollary assumption is that capital is used to propel them out of the countryside into the city where they aspire to live, a process that appears to signify the cursory and superficial relationship they have with the places they inhabit and the social and material resources therein (e.g., Browder 1992).

Second, peasant history is generally denied, trivialized, or misinterpreted. It is subjugated to that of the modern world system, even as they form part of that system (Wolf 1982). When it is acknowledged, it delegitimizes them because of their historic movement. In the Amazon, in particular, peasants are often denigrated because they are reminders of the failure of State-sponsored integration efforts (Adams et al. 2009). Their own history is thereby denied or used against them.

Third, peasants are seen as somehow inherently out-of-place. Their relative mobility, relationship with the landscape, and history seem at odds with a sense of
place. Ironically, their mobility is a result of larger processes (e.g., regional, State, and global processes) and their responses to such processes (de Certeau 1984; Wolf 1982). Even as their movement is a byproduct of and response to larger processes, peasants are perceived as lacking commitment to place: because no place legally belongs to them, they are assumed to belong to no place.

Finally, the attempt to classify, categorize, and define peasants and other “in-between” peoples is a characteristic of modernity—to “fix” them categorically and spatially in times of flux, and to essentialize them for administrative purposes (Scott 1998). Their contributions to capitalist production are characterized as “petty”, “stagnant”, or “astructural” (c.f. Adams et al. 2009 and Nugent 1993), characteristics that also serve to identify them as “part-societies with part-cultures” (Kroeber 1948:284).

Peasants’ lack of visibility may be regarded a consequence of modernity and a product of it. However, there are a variety of reasons why marginalized peasants and other “in-between” populations and their relationship to place should be better understood. The most obvious is that peasants far outnumber indigenous peoples. The ramifications of not understanding their relationship to place outweigh the challenge of accommodating them in broader political frameworks. Second, as many studies demonstrate, peasants are not passive actors or victims of State interventions. They engage in power struggles, even if from subaltern, marginal positions or through mundane activities (de Certeau 1984). There is much to be learned about the role of place in the struggles of peasants presumed to be “placeless”. Third, peasants are, in many ways, the most politically vulnerable when it comes to the subject of place.

---

2 Indeed, peasant migration has been analyzed as a form of resistance against modern State policies and projects (Hyden 1980).
because of the immediacy of their livelihood strategies. In many cases, peasants and other people “on-the-move” are the landless poor, living a mostly subsistence lifestyle that is dependent upon daily engagement with land and natural resources and regional markets. Finally, peasant contributions to regional and national economies are well documented (Redfield 1956; Wolf 1982; for Amazonian populations, see Browder and Godfrey 1997 and Bunker 1985), yet they frequently lack due rights within their societies, including to land, education, and health care.

The Brazilian state, in particular, has undertaken several modernist projects within its national territory. Perhaps the most dramatic example is the development schemes implemented in the Amazon. Regarded as a hindrance to national progress (Goodland and Irwin 1975; Hecht and Cockburn 1989), the Amazon was the subject of a variety of interventions in the latter part of the 20th century intended to explore, exploit, and transform the forested landscape into productive lands, integrate it with the rest of the nation, and maximize its economic potential (Hall 1989; Moran 1981; Schmink and Wood 1992).

These interventions would not have been possible without the assistance of a recruited labor force from the northeast of Brazil. In response to these highly publicized interventions, nordestinos (northeasters) arrived to the Amazon in droves and during different economic periods for work, after which they were largely abandoned in the forest. Two distinct periods of State interventions in the Amazon exemplify this trend: (1) the rubber boom of 1850-1920 and a rubber resurgence (i.e., a “mini-boom”) from 1940-1944, and (2) economic development during the 1960s and 1970s. A third and current period, labeled here “conservation”, attempts to address the negative consequences of
modernist interventions while falling prey to some modernist assumptions along the way. In all three periods, it is possible to see how the “strategies” (de Certeau 1984) or “tools” of Statecraft (Scott 1998) used for making political decisions upon these places have been implemented from the vantages of distance and “seeing” that are characteristic of modernism (Foucault 1979; Helliwell 1996; Scott 1998; Thomas 1993).

**Research Question and Theses**

This project examines the relationship between a peasant population and place. Amazonian peasants are most often categorized according to some combination of their livelihood activities, the economic drivers that led them to the Amazon, and the particular circumstances of their “adaptation” to the Amazon. I depart from these categorizations and ask, What are the ways in which one peasant population has formed attachments to place and a place-based identity in the Amazon? Two specific theses are explored. The first is that everyday activities in the material landscape are integral to place-making and identity formation. The second is that the past, including historical practice and memory, permeates the present-day landscape.

In this study I treat landscape as a network of related places and practices gathered (sensu Heidegger 1977) in relation to each other (Casey 1996; Ingold 1993, 2000), from which identity and sense of place emerge. I use the term “place” to imply a sense of use, occupation, and ownership developed over time, from which affective feelings toward place, such as belonging, affection, and comfort, may develop (see also de Certeau 1984:117).³ Studies show that the landscape is inscribed by many

---

³ Another definition of place that is useful to this study is that of “a practiced space”, a definition adapted from de Certeau (1984:117), who uses the terms space and place in reverse, but otherwise conveys the same meaning.
indigenous populations, and that their traditions are evoked in the present through memory, practice, and discourse (Heckenberger 2005; Hirsch 1995; Lévi-Strauss 1963; Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998). I explore the ways in which an Amazonian peasant population has an analogously referential relationship with the riverine landscape.

**The Case Study**

To address my research question and explore my two theses, I use a case study of *ribeirinhos* (riverine people) in the eastern Amazonian state of Pará, Brazil. In 2006, a series of protected areas were delineated on places where the ribeirinhos had been dwelling for nearly a century. The creation of these new protected areas has posed interesting challenges and opportunities with regard to emic (insider; “folk”) and etic (outsider) perspectives of place, including permissible natural resource use, access to government services, and boundaries between protected areas.

The ribeirinhos form part of what would be considered the *caboclo* “pan-Amazonian archetype” (Nugent 1993:23). Nugent (1993:23) defines caboclo as “an historical Amazonian peasantry which has emerged amidst the abandoned colonial apparatus of empire and state.” Caboclos are regarded as a unique Amazonian group in Brazil (Chernela and Pinho 2004; Nugent 1993; Wagley 1976) that emerged following the rubber boom (Weinstein 1983), as northeasterners intermarried with indigenous *tapui o* populations (referred to as “deculturated native Amazonians”; Schmink and Wood 1992:xxiv).

Caboclos are considered both an elusive and ubiquitous category in the Amazon. They are particularly hard to define because they are identified by “that which they are not” (Nugent 1993:xxi) and are treated as an “invisible” population vis-à-vis the rest of
the Brazilian society (Nugent 1993). Caboclo is a derogatory term (Harris 2009; Wagley 1976) and the population is often viewed unfavorably. Yet they are also a pervasive population (Moran 1974a, 1981; Parker 1985b) and are known to play with the negative connotations of their identity in tactical ways (see de Certeau 1984; Nugent 1993).

Although the ribeirinhos are characterized as caboclos in the scholarly literature, I refer to them as they currently self-identify—as ribeirinhos—a term that is not sufficiently problematized in the scholarly literatures but that I explore throughout the dissertation. My informants are mostly the descendents of northeasterners who were recruited to tap rubber in the Amazon during WWII as part of an agreement between Brazil and the United States. After the war, the recruits were largely abandoned in the forest. As Brazil passed through a period of intense development in the 1960s and 1970s, including the building of the Transamazon Highway to the north, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri remained in the forest in relative anonymity, with the exception of middlemen with whom they swapped domestic products from the city for forest goods, and some contact from the Catholic Church, which was active in nearby indigenous lands (Tarcísio Feitosa pers. comm. 8/2006). It was not until the early part of this century that they reemerged as a “visible” population, when they became of interest to a regional social movement seeking to slow frontier expansion by safeguarding the dense tropical rain forests just south of it—including those places where the ribeirinhos live. Within a few years, the movement was able to achieve this goal through the support of over 150 regional, national, and international partners with similar objectives of conservation and sustainable development in the Amazon. As a result of these efforts, a protected areas

---

4 Those who arrived during WWII are also known as “rubber soldiers”, a term I explore in Chapter 3.
mosaic, called the *Terra do Meio* ("Land of the Middle"), was created. The mosaic, completed in 2007, was the final segment of land needed to complete the 26 million hectare Xingu Protected Areas Corridor (XPAC), which is comprised of other protected areas such as indigenous lands and national parks.

The *ribeirinhos* of this case study reside in the Iriri Extractive Reserve, created in 2006 as part of this process. The Iriri Extractive Reserve is one of three extractive reserves in the contiguous land known as the Terra do Meio. Per federal law, the *ribeirinhos* are not owners of the land, but are granted a land and resource use concession for a period of 30 years. The formal objective of the extractive reserve is to conserve the land and resources of the area while promoting sustainable livelihoods through subsistence activities, such as hunting, fishing, and agriculture, and economic activities, such as collecting Brazil nuts.

The visibility metaphor is useful to employ in the Terra do Meio because the *ribeirinhos* have experienced extended periods of "invisibility" and isolation from broader civil society. The region is densely forested. When I arrived, there were no government services in the region, including education and regular medical care. There was, and still is, no infrastructure, no roads that can take one into the Iriri, and no electricity. The primary means of transportation is by boat from Altamira.

---

5 Currently, the social movement is working with the municipal government to provide permanent health posts. An agreement was recently signed by the municipal Secretary of Health to dispatch three medical visits per year and to evacuate critical cases by air on an as-needed basis. Schools have since been constructed, albeit by the *ribeirinhos*, and while success has varied with materials and teachers sent by the municipal government these developments indicate progress is being made. See Chapter 7 for a complete update on these developments to which I have not been a direct witness.

6 There is an unreliable shuttle service provided by drivers of personal vehicles in exchange for money. The closest point at which to use this service is at a house and convenience store called "Maribel" along the Iriri River, north of where the protected areas are located. Roads from Maribel connect to the Transamazon highway, where there is access to Altamira if the road is passable. Maribel is a popular stopping point for many commercial fishermen and middlemen to drink cold beer and soft drinks and to do
When I went to the reserve, I accompanied the ribeirinhos who happened to be in Altamira for medical or other reasons related to the creation of the reserve. Our transportation tended to be a dugout canoe with a small, outboard motor called a *rabeta* that generates a few horsepower (hp), which enabled us to arrive in about five to eight days, depending on the location of the home and the season. While in transit, we slept in friends’ and acquaintances’ homes, or hung our hammocks on islands or the banks of the river. We ate piranha that we caught from the boat or the banks of the river, along with manioc flour, and we drank the water directly from the river. Other times, I accompanied gold miners, traders and middlemen, and fishermen into the region. These larger boats were equipped with some sleeping spaces in which to hang a hammock and a roof; the food was mostly processed and brought from the city. Although these boats and accompanying motors are larger, the journey usually took the same amount of time because of the various stops required to do business and to socialize. Other means of transportation include a community boat that was funded by the international philanthropic community and provided to the ribeirinhos as part of the effort to create the protected areas.

In spite of their remote location and the hardships that accompany such isolation, the ribeirinhos are quite cheerful and have a tremendous sense of humor. As an isolated people, they also leverage their networks for survival, news, and comaraderie. Like many Amazonians, they enjoy joking with one another, telling their stories, and sharing the latest gossip. They are creative, resourceful, and hard working. Days are business. The ribeirinhos infrequent this store and the car service, because it is unreliable, uncomfortable, expensive, and typically caters to townspeople doing business in the interior rather than to forest people like the ribeirinhos.
spent in a combination of activities, including working in the fields, making farinha, fishing, tending to the home, and caring for children. Nights are spent telling stories and visiting neighbors. Their survival depends upon their ability to provide a mostly subsistence-oriented lifestyle for themselves and their families, in connection with other families in the region and regional middlemen, fishermen, and miners. Most recently, this network expanded to include a regional social movement and an international environmental community.

The ribeirinhos of the Iriri were an ideal population with which to conduct a study of place and peasants in the context of State processes. The ribeirinhos’ presence in the region, their migration, and even their trades and associated identities (e.g., “extractivist”, “rubber tapper”) may be traced to different moments in Brazil’s recent political interventions. Even as they have arrived in the Amazon as a result of broader social, economic, and political processes, I argue that they have developed their own sense of place and identity through their extractive activities (their “tasks”; Ingold 1993) over time.

**A Role for Phenomenology**

Much of the existing scholarship on Amazonian peasants, including in anthropology, characterizes them as a non-native population that is a byproduct of broader economic, political, and environmental processes. Historically, the Brazilian State has treated them as displaced and unproductive. Departing from these approaches, I examine the ribeirinhos’ experience of place over time. To do so, I introduce a phenomenological perspective into my project that examines the ribeirinhos’ experiences and engagement with place as part of the riverine landscape. Philosopher Martin Heidegger (1977) refers to this fundamental understanding of the inseparability
of people and place as “being-in-the-world”; anthropologist Tim Ingold (2000:185), following Heidegger, describes it as the “dwelling perspective”. While phenomenology as it was originally employed by Heidegger (1977) is useful for this study, I rely on the ways Heidegger’s ideas have been expanded upon and adapted in recent anthropology. These studies reveal that ordinary practices in place may be acts of remembrance (Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), sources of identity (Gray 2003; Ingold 2000), and expressions of belonging (Bender 2002).

I build from the existing literatures by examining those extractive activities that provide for the ribeirinho household and are central to dwelling in the Amazon. To do so, I incorporate the concept of “taskscape” provided by Ingold (1993) as a conceptual refinement of landscape that highlights dwelling over time through tasks. Ingold (1993) refers to “temporality”, a phenomenological term that is a constant feature of dwelling that allows for multiple moments in time to be experienced in the present. I operationalize Ingold’s concept of the taskscape and develop it as a model in this study to understand the ribeirinhos’ tasks as central to their understanding of place and of self.

I came to this approach iteratively, through my own experiences with the ribeirinhos of the Iriri in my role as researcher trying to understand the role of people and place in relation to broader processes. I had studied cultural and political ecology extensively to understand Amazonian caboclo societies. I held general assumptions about the study population as non-native extractivists who engaged in economic activities to sustain the household, and who had a history of activism and participation to improve their quality of life. Specifically, I had studied the rubber tappers’ movement
of the Brazilian state of Acre in the 1980s, which led to the creation of the extractive reserve concept.

When I began my project the protected areas of the Terra do Meio, including the extractive reserves, were being declared by the government. The reactions in the city were distinctly divided. On the one hand, there was significant hostility and even violence from speculators and other extralegal interest groups who had been profiting from the expanse of forest in its undeclared, terra devoluta status. On the other hand, environmentalists and other social movement stakeholders rejoiced and then settled in for the hard work of planning, budgeting, and fundraising. Yet the so-called “extractivists” were not participating to the extent I had imagined.

When I arrived in the region, the “extractivists” seemed largely disarticulated from these monumental changes in policies that directly impacted their place and livelihood activities. They shared a somewhat different perspective of themselves and where they lived than that which was explored through the literatures in which I had been trained. They had limited knowledge of the social movement, and, ironically, were not clear about what an “extractive reserve” and “extractivist” were.

Rather, all of them, regardless of location, repeated statements that simultaneously expressed who they are (“ribeirinho”), where they live (“on the banks of the river”), how they live (their practices), and their legitimacy to place (“I was born and raised here; I am “of” this place”). Furthermore, they talked about themselves in relation to past eras in Brazil’s modernist history, particularly the rubber boom, but they did so in relation to “place”: the current, material landscape. They wanted to show me their past, literally and through material references (or “indexes”; Gell 1998) to other times. I spent
a lot of time looking at rubber trees, documents, tools, and even more time listening to stories of the rubber boom.

I came away from the first field season recognizing that their experience of place was different than that which is depicted in standard Amazonian literatures on peasant and caboclo populations. I suspected that their practices were not just economic practices, but decided I would have to find innovative ways to demonstrate it. Mostly, I recognized that I would have to explore alternative theories than those in which I had been trained to understand caboclo and “extractivist” societies.

When I returned to the United States, I immersed myself in the social science literatures that adopt a phenomenological perspective to people and place. From this review, I realized that not only would I need to incorporate new literatures into my project, but that I would also need to think critically about my own ontological assumptions. Specifically, I needed an alternative inquiry paradigm that regarded people as part of place rather than separate from it, and an epistemology that allowed for change and emergent phenomena, rather than approaching and “testing” people as static entities. This meant that I would be combining theories and methodologies in unique and innovative ways.

My fieldwork thus occurred during two extended stays of four months each during the summer (dry) season in 2006 and 2007. My time was divided between the port city to my fieldsite—Altamira, on the Xingu River, which could be considered the headquarters of the social movement—and the Iriri Extractive Reserve. In addition, exploratory research was conducted in Altamira in August of 2005; follow up occurred during February of 2008. The total time spent in Brazil was thus ten months, divided
between the Iriri Extractive Reserve (four months), Altamira (four months), and additional, exploratory and follow up visits to Altamira and the city of Belém, capital of the State of Pará (two months).

**Overview of the Study**

This project is comprised of seven chapters. This chapter (Chapter 1, Introduction) has described and defined the research problem. Chapter 2, Theory and Methodology, addresses the scholarly literatures of relevance to this study and reviews the particular metatheoretical approach and inquiry paradigm to which my elected theories belong. I review the discourses and typologies of caboclo societies provided by cultural ecology and political ecology literatures. These literatures are relevant to the problem on peasants and place that I will address, yet fall short of addressing my research problem. Cultural ecology tends to regard caboclo culture as an adaptation in isolation from broader economic and political processes; political ecology tends to characterize the Amazonian peasantry as an outcome of such processes. I suggest that a more robust understanding of ribeirinho and other “caboclo” or “extractivist” societies may be attained by examining phenomenologically informed practice theories. These theories, I suggest, provide a valuable perspective of ribeirinho experiences of place over time, through their activities in the material landscape.

As I also suggest in Chapter 2, the metatheoretical paradigms from which the dominant approaches to peasants belong are insufficient for this study. In order to examine the relationship between practice and place, as this study aims to accomplish, theories drawn from a different paradigm, methodological relationism, are necessary. I conclude Chapter 2 with a discussion of the relationist paradigm and its corresponding
ontologies and epistemologies. I also describe the various methods and data analyses used in subsequent chapters.

In Chapter 3, Rubber Soldiers, I contribute a phenomenologically informed perspective to more carefully examine the historical context of the rubber boom from which the majority of my study population descends. I approach this task through the lens of place, regarding their journey from the northeast to the Amazon as one from displacement to emplacement. I frame the narrative of this historical chapter as one in which two geographic regions—the northeast of Brazil and the Amazon—and two place-based identities—nordestino (northeasterner) and seringueiro (rubber tapper)—were propelled into visibility. As described in Chapter 2, the dominant literatures that describe the rubber boom attribute nordestino decisions to leave their places of origin to economic and environmental factors. However, a relationist approach recognizes that people’s practices are a product of history because agents and structures are coimplicated in practices (Giddens 1984). The discrepancy between the dominant literatures on the rubber boom and the personal experiences recounted by former rubber soldiers constitute an historical paradox that I explore in the chapter. Although the rubber tappers are regarded as a product of this historic era, over time the practices of rubber tapping became secondhand, commonplace, and mundane (de Certeau 1984); they became embodied (Bourdieu 1977). I incorporate the voices of elders of the Iriri River, who are former rubber soldiers, to explore these contradictions between nostalgia for, and displacement from, the northeast, and adoption of a new place and place-based identity through rubber tapping in the Amazon. I include a variety of historical data gathered from secondary sources, interviews with former rubber tappers,
and observations from the field. By combining the voices of former rubber soldiers to the dominant explanations for their arrival to the Amazon, I provide agency to a history explained through the lens of economic and environmental theories. I also link the theory and policy centered approach from Chapter 2 to the lived and contingent approaches that are developed in subsequent chapters, illustrating the relationship between micro and macro-scale analyses.

Chapter 4, The Ribeirinhos of the Terra do Meio in the Period of ‘Conservation’, introduces the ribeirinhos and their landscape as I encountered them during my fieldwork, during the period I refer to as “conservation”. This period marked an end to the frontier violence and the relative “invisibility” experienced by the ribeirinhos for decades following the rubber boom. During this period, the ribeirinhos were once again propelled into visibility as part of a State intervention. This intervention took the form of a protected areas mosaic called the *Terra do Meio*. However, its swift implementation may be attributed to the government’s concerted effort to end the frontier violence that had characterized the region for years, but had recently escalated to new levels. I use the frontier concept as developed by political ecologists to explore and describe the frontier of the Terra do Meio as a literal and metaphorical place in the landscape, in which different social groups have competing ideas of boundaries, territories, and practices; where “their” place begins and ends, and what should or should not occur within it. The *Terra do Meio* mosaic granted the ribeirinhos legal rights to lands on which they had been dwelling for a century. However, the new role of the government upon ribeirinho lands led to new challenges over conflicting ideas of place. This is best illustrated through the demarcation of the extractive reserve boundaries, which do not
fully reflect emplaced, ribeirinho use and occupation of the land and resources therein. This chapter thus documents the meeting point at which emic and etic perspectives and experiences are forced together in the context of political interventions, and the challenges that ensue from competing visions about place.

In the second part of the chapter, I aim to portray the ribeirinhos, their recent movement through the landscape, and their household economies during this period in order to contextualize the case study before the highly specific analyses of their tasks, identity, and sense of place that follow in Chapters 5 and 6. I introduce a household questionnaire implemented with each family during my 2006 field season, used to derive descriptive statistics (using SPSS) on the population and migration. This questionnaire was adapted from research conducted with rubber tappers in Acre, and proved an interesting instrument with which to identify the differences between the Acre and Terra do Meio extractive reserve experiences. I also provide ethnographic field observations, interview data, and maps. One of the maps is a georeferenced map of households, which shows that the ribeirinhos' settlements do not adhere to the State’s “proper places” (de Certeau 1984:121) imposed through etic boundaries. Finally, I include the results of a factor analysis, a statistical technique facilitated by SPSS that I used to identify and measure the dimensions of place attachment.

In Chapter 5, The Ribeirinho Taskscape, I operationalize Ingold’s (1993) concept of the taskscape and apply it as a model to the case study. I argue that similar to what anthropologists have noted among indigenous societies, the riverine landscape was created over time. Yet rather than created from myths and rituals, the riverine landscape emerges from the mundane, economic activities that sustain the ribeirinho household. I
identify and trace three recurrent operations—movement, matter and materiality, and acts of inscribing—that I identified when the ribeirinhos are engaging in extractive activities ("tasks"). Through these recurrent operations, it is possible to identify the relationships between places, to understand place as dynamic and emergent, and to appreciate the role of temporality in the taskscape.

The ribeirinhos are constantly referencing other times when engaged in current tasks. The ribeirinho taskscape is thus a network of interrelated places, tasks, and times that are "gathered" together. The data used to understand the taskscape are micro-level, detailed recordings of the steps required to carry out everyday tasks. These include the role of necessary tools, technologies, and knowledge for the transformation of matter into economic products, and the intersubjective relationship of people, matter, and place through tasks (sensu Miller 2005 and Munn 1986). Whenever possible, I collected the data during the extractive activity or in the place where the activity occurred in the past. The level of detail provided in this chapter informs understandings of the ways in which identity and sense of place emerge from the taskscape, the subject of Chapter 6.

In Chapter 6, Ribeirinho Topophilia, I explore identity and attachment to place as emergent from the taskscape. I identify the ways in which the mundane tasks that create places and link them into a network—such as walking trails, paddling a canoe, making farinha, and tending to the home—are simultaneously acts of remembrance (Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), sources of identity (Gray 2003; Ingold 2000), and expressions of belonging (Bender 2002). In other words, they are place-based tasks from which a sense of self (i.e., "identity") and place emerge.
Just as the taskscape is process, Amazonian identities are in process. Amazonian peasant identities and senses of place have both emerged and changed in relation to the ribeirinhos’ tasks over time—and therefore, in relation to the various economic and political periods during which the ribeirinhos have been intermittently visible. In spite of tremendous adversity, the ribeirinhos poignantly define and describe themselves as part of the places in which they dwell—a “topophilia”, defined by Bachelard (1969:xxxi) as “the human value of the sorts of space that may be grasped, that may be defended against adverse forces, the space we love”. The duration of the chapter is spent exploring ribeirinho topophilia in relation to the recurrent topic of nostalgia for the rubber boom and the defunct task of rubber tapping, salient throughout the dissertation; their attachment to place and relative demographic stability, identified in Chapter 4; and their hopes for the future, including for future generations. In contrast with the previous chapter on the taskscape, in which data were mostly non-discursive and collected during tasks or in the places where tasks occur, the data in this chapter are mostly discursive, based on interviews and descriptions of place and self in the present.

In Chapter 7, Conclusion, I summarize my chapters, highlight key findings, and identify possible implications for policy and areas for future research that are relevant for those who work with place, peasants, and other people “on-the-move”. I provide policy-relevant recommendations on Amazonian peasants and place, with particular attention to the Iriri Extractive Reserve in the Terra do Meio. Finally, I speak to the broader literatures with which I initiated the project—cultural and political ecology—and suggest ways in which phenomenology can be complementary to them.
CHAPTER 2
THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Most scholarship on Amazonian floodplain or upland forests categorizes, classifies, and otherwise attempts to define the rural Amazonian peasantry. In the social sciences, cultural ecology and political ecology represent the dominant literatures on Amazonian peasants. These literatures, which are interrelated, provide particular discourses and typologies of rural Amazonian peasants. These typologies have been periodically and strategically reworked and incorporated into broader movements and ideologies at different moments in Brazil’s history.

The majority of ribeirinhos with whom I work are the descendents of northeasterners recruited to the Amazon from their places of origin during the rubber boom, and arrived to participate in a difficult system of debt peonage in dangerous and exhausting working conditions in the forest. They were cleverly recruited, as part of a well-organized campaign, as soldados da borracha (rubber soldiers) for their role harvesting natural rubber for World War II efforts. After the war, they were largely abandoned in the forest by the rubber barons and the government program responsible for their recruitment. Over time, they became part of the broad, Brazilian social category of caboclo, a “mixed blood” person of low socioeconomic status (Wagley 1976).

Most recently, in the context of a global conservation and sustainable development movement focused on the Amazon, these discourses and typologies were adopted by social movements and into policies to promote peasant livelihoods and land rights. Indeed, the extractive reserve policy is one that was conceptually developed in

1 The rubber boom will be explored in depth in Chapter 3.
the western Amazon in the 1980s through the rubber tappers’ movement, allied with national and international human rights and environmental activists, researchers, and policymakers (Allegretti 1999; Almeida 2002; Schwartzman 1989; Keck 1995). This social movement, and the particular ways in which it was aligned with global environmental agendas at the time, gave rise to particular cultural identity constructs based on resource extraction and environmentalism that were used to create policy change for rural Amazonian peasants (Keck 1995).

These cultural constructs that originated in this context persist today, and have been universally applied and developed across the Brazilian Amazon. Specifically, “extractivist” and “rubber tapper” identities remain largely unquestioned in the scholarly literature. When defined, they are regarded as part of the strategy for the creation of extractive reserves, or a logical outcome of the rubber tappers’ movement. It is “identity as politics” (Harris 2000:7) in which identities can help marginalized people gain basic human rights to land and livelihoods. The ability to articulate a particular identity is a crucial step in “locating” (Harris 2000:7) it in policy, and thus is exemplary of the ways in which identities are strategically shaped and formed to conform to broader movements and policies.

In this chapter, I explore the ways these ideas emerged in the scholarship and were incorporated into policy by reviewing the dominant social science scholarly literatures of Amazonian peasants—cultural ecology and political ecology—and the historical contexts through which they emerged. Existing scholarship on peasants and the Amazon is dominated by cultural ecology approaches, which emphasize adaptation to the environment and reproduction of the household economy (e.g., Moran 1974a;
Political ecology emerged from cultural ecology as a popular framework to contextualize Amazonian peasants in broader political, economic, and social processes (Bunker 1985; Chibnik 1991; Pace 1997; Schmink and Wood 1992). Within each literature, I explore the ways the literatures and events have reified, shaped, and transformed peasant identity concepts in response to broader movements and ideologies.

However, as I will also show in this chapter, both literatures lend particular strengths to this study of ribeirinhos and place. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the ribeirinhos with whom I work would be considered “rubber tappers”, “caboclos”, and “extractivists” in the scholarly literature, in response to different periods in Brazil’s recent history. These periods—which I refer to as the rubber boom, development, and conservation—identify the ribeirinhos vis-à-vis their livelihood strategies, the material landscape, and the political context of a given time period. Indeed, the ribeirinhos were “rubber soldiers” in the past, an identity they adopted and look back upon with affection and nostalgia. These literatures thus offer preliminary steps toward “emplacing” the ribeirinhos in the landscape through their attention to the material landscape and the role of history and process in their lives.

However, during my fieldwork, I found that the sustainable development discourse and an “extractivist” identity are not part of the current vocabulary of the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River. Rather, these constructs have been assigned to them in the process of

---

2 In other parts of Brazil, the “rubber soldier” identity is one that is contested because of the difficulties and atrocities associated with the debt peonage system. In the Iriri, however, the rubber boom is a period that is regarded with nostalgia. I discuss this contradiction in Chapter 3.
the push for the Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic, including extractive reserves, which grant non-indigenous peasants concession to land and resources. I also came to find that the Iriri Extractive Reserve created on their lands did not conform to their experience and understanding of place--where place began and ended according to their historical experience and movement through the landscape. These realizations prompted me to find other literatures and approaches on peasant identity than those which were conventional in Amazonia, to adequately understand identity and place-making among the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River.

The incongruence I encountered between the scholarly representation of Amazonian peasants and the ribeirinhos of this case study made sense in the context of relevant social theory on space and place. According to Lefebvre (1991), space is “produced” by those who have authority, and State intervention in the organizing and administering of land is a function of modernity (Scott 1998). As an “invisible” people (Nugent 1993), Amazonian peasants do not usually adhere to the “proper places” (sensu de Certeau 1984:121) produced by the government and represented in authoritative and dominant media, such as political boundaries. These representations “mark…the historical operations from which [they] resulted” (de Certeau 1984:121). Instead, Brazil’s Amazonian peasants construct place (Certeauian “spaces”) regardless of political boundaries, and often do so in the interstices of boundaries that shift over time in response to various political, social, and economic periods. Indeed, in my case study, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River form part of what is considered by outsiders to be the Terra do Meio—the Land of the Middle--named for its interstitial location between

---

3 Extractive reserves are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
natural and man-made features of the Brazilian Amazonian landscape. This exemplifies the ways in which the ribeirinhos are considered an “in-between” and “invisible” population, both literally and figuratively.

To understand and address popular misperceptions of Amazonian peasant populations, as the most recent scholarship seeks to do (e.g. Adams et al. 2006, 2009; Harris 2009; Nugent 2009), we must understand them not only in relation to the State and historical periods, but also in place, through their practices and their perceptions of their world—through an exploration of how they have dwelled in place over time. I thus incorporate practice theories influenced by phenomenological philosophies to complement existing literatures on Amazonian peasants. In the philosopher Martin Heidegger’s essay, “Building, Dwelling, Thinking” (1977:326), he states, “We do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell.” Ingold (1995:76) refers to this notion as the “dwelling perspective.” Extractive reserves and the social movements that contributed to their creation were constructed with the intention of building a world in which the “extractivists” already dwelled. Although peasants form an intrinsic part of the Amazonian landscape, they are most often viewed as a mere product of process by the dominant theoretical approaches that have classified and categorized them. In contrast, I emphasize the ways peasants have actively created place and identity as they dwelled, in conjunction with (and response to) broader processes in the Amazon over time.

This assessment resonates with Bender’s (2001) analysis of the discrepancy in the contrasting anthropological literatures on the phenomenology of “place” and on diasporic, migrant, and other peoples “on-the-move”. She says, “I want to bring [the
diaspora and phenomenology literatures] into closer rapport, suggesting that the larger political and social terrain of diaspora involves intimate and personal engagement, just as the intimate and personal engagements with place and well-worn territory opens towards larger political and social landscapes” (2001:77). Following Bender, I wish to bring the cultural and political ecology literatures that exist on Amazonian peasant societies into closer rapport with phenomenology and practice theories. I take this approach to account for local experience of place and time, thereby emplacing Amazonian peasants, and ribeirinho populations in particular, not only historically and linearly vis-à-vis the Brazilian State, but also physically and temporally in the landscape. The concept of temporality (sensu Ingold 1993) acknowledges that multiple moments in time, and the affective and material dimensions of different time periods, may be present in a place.

The chapter proceeds as follows. In the first section, I review the cultural ecology and political ecology literatures. Within this review, I provide historical background on the relevant periods that have driven the existing scholarship of the Amazon, particularly 1970s-onward development and conservation. I explore the practical implications of perceptions of caboclo populations in the scholarship and policy over time. After offering some assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of these dominant literatures in the Amazon, I then review relevant phenomenology and practice theories that, when applied to caboclo societies in the Amazon, help overcome the shortcomings I seek to address in existing literatures for the purposes of my study.

These latter approaches specifically address the ways people experience place through their activities in the material landscape (Bourdieu 1977; de Certeau 1984; Gray
2003; Ingold 1996, 2000; Miller 2005), the role of time in the creation of place (Bender 2002; Hirsch 1995; Ingold 1993; Morphy 1995), and the “attachments” people form with place (e.g., Bachelard 1969; Basso 1996; Tuan 1976, 1977; Williams et al. 1992)—what Basso (1996) calls a “sense of place”. Of particular interest to this project is Ingold’s (1993) concept of the “taskscape” based on the dwelling perspective mentioned above (Heidegger 1977; Ingold 1995) that combines phenomenology and practice theories, and which I use as a model for my case study of the ribeirinhos of the Iriri. I also review relevant research on place attachment utilized by natural resource managers and planners that has been influential in my study for its success in bridging the divide between theoretical abstraction and policy-oriented research.

I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the research paradigm adopted in this study; namely, critical realism, a post-positivist ontology (Guba 1990:23). This section includes a description of the various methods and data analyses I elected in this study that will be further explained in the following chapters.

Cultural Ecology

Cultural ecology was established by Julian Steward in 1955. Steward developed cultural ecology to examine the ways in which distinct cultures adapt to specific environmental conditions, with emphasis on technology use and subsistence strategies. With attention to the relationship between the environment and labor, Steward argued for a classificatory system of culture “types” arranged hierarchically based on complexity. Steward (1955:21) asserted that culture types can be grouped according to “features” that comprise the “cultural core”: the features of a culture that derive from adaptive processes “through which a historically derived culture is modified in a particular environment”. Steward (1955:21) considered these “among the important
creative processes in cultural change”. Steward’s theory of culture change was based on the following premises: “(1) cultures in similar environments may have similar adaptations; (2) all adaptations are short-lived and are constantly adjusting to changing environments; and (3) changes in culture can elaborate existing culture or result in entirely new ones” (Sutton and Anderson 2004:20-21). According to Steward, culture change could occur in a variety of ways depending upon the subsistence systems afforded by the surrounding environment. Steward referred to this concept as “multilinear evolution” in a break with unilinear theories of the 19th century lambasted earlier for ethnocentrism (see Boas 1920).

Steward’s cultural ecology was influential in the development of cultural materialism, a related line of inquiry developed by Marvin Harris (Kottak 1999; McGee and Warms 2004:237). Like cultural ecology, cultural materialists were interested in Steward’s concepts of culture change and culture core, and in Marxist materialism and modes of production and reproduction. However, cultural materialism was proposed as a unique research strategy and a science of culture (Harris 2001) grounded in empiricism and a positivist epistemology. “Thus cultural materialism shares with other scientific strategies an epistemology which seeks to restrict fields of inquiry to events, entities, and relationships that are knowable by means of explicit, logico-empirical, inductive-deductive, quantifiable public procedures or “operations” subject to replication by independent observers” (Harris 2001:27). Cultural materialists assert that positivist, objective explanations can be found at the root of all cultural phenomena, and disregard all ideological explanations for taboos, rituals, and customs as irrational (Harris 1966).
In the 1960s and 1970s, a “new ecology” (Biersack 1999; Kottak 1999; Sutton and Anderson 2004) emerged within cultural ecology. Rather than emphasize culture and the environment, proponents of new ecology emphasized “population” as the primary unit of analysis (Rappaport 1967, 1968, 1990), linking it with emerging systems ecology during the time (Vayda and Rappaport 1968). Proponents of new ecology sought a “purer materialism” (Biersack 1999:6) in which different aspects of culture, such as ritual and religion, formed instrumental functions, such as regulating the balance of resources among human populations while limiting degradation to the environment (see Harris 1966; Piddocke 1969; Rappaport 1967). Roy Rappaport (1968:237-8), in particular, distinguished between “operational” and “cognized” models, the former being the scientist’s description of the world studied, the latter the ways that world is conceived by those being studied. Furthermore, the new ecology of Rappaport did not focus on how societies evolve according to environmental or other material constraints, but rather on the ways in which the two interact. This was done by incorporating biological and ecological principles that were prevalent during that time, particularly systems theories, into the approach. For example, ritual and religion were considered regulatory mechanisms within the ecosystem, with “ecosystem” defined as “the total of ecological populations and nonliving substances bound together in material exchanges in a demarcated portion of the biosphere” (Rappaport 1967:18).

However, the new ecology was heavily critiqued for its reductionist approach to culture. Indeed, the new ecology replaced the environmental possibilism of Steward’s cultural ecology with Rappaport’s environmental determinism (Biersack 1999:6). According to critic Robert Murphy (1970:165), the new ecology approach fell “into the
language and method of the biologist” (Biersack 1999:6), which, in his opinion, reduced culture to biological phenomena (Biersack 1999:6). With an overemphasis on functionalism in the human (cultural) sphere, the new ecology was inattentive to the symbolic, historical, and political factors, the “full-fledged poetics of nature focused upon the social construction of nature” (Biersack 1999:8).

By the 1990s, anthropologists were calling for a move from the “new ecology” to a plural, “new ecologies” approach (Biersack 1999) that departed from some of the earlier, environmentally deterministic premises of Steward’s cultural ecology (Kottak 1999, Sutton and Anderson 2004) and materialist explanations attributed to culture, a perspective prevalent in cultural materialism (Harris 2001). The “new ecologies” incorporated some of the lessons learned from Rappaport’s systems-based model while attempting to leave behind the reductionism associated with the rejection of culture (Biersack 1999). According to Biersack (1999), this approach incorporates what was lacking in prior ecologies: symbolic, historical, and political ecologies. It also contributed to the development of political ecology as a separate framework (discussed below). Biersack (1999) proposes a “new materialism” (Biersack 1999:11) within the “new ecologies” perspective. This “new materialism” is one that purports to combine nature and culture rather than divide them, as the “new ecology” did. The combination of concepts that were previously dichotomous is, in the new ecologies, “rooted in the activities and conceptualizations of human beings, a life-world, not merely in the phenomenological sense but in the stronger material sense, with respect to a world-out-there that has been appropriated, acted upon, crafted, transformed, a world generated in and through human-nature interactions” (Biersack 1999:11). Lebenswelt (“life-world”),
according to Biersack (1999:11), “refers to an indivisible material/ symbolic/ political/

social/ historical reality in which the nature-culture divide is bridged.” Yet as the previous

quote indicates, Biersack’s life-world continues to privilege materialism and determinism

above other approaches. While she attempts to incorporate phenomenological ideas

into her interpretation of lebenswelt, she inaccurately depicts phenomenology as

secondary to materialism and indeed somehow antimaterialist, while undermining

agency and individual experience.

   Cultural ecology constitutes a prominent body of literature in the Amazon. Indigenous societies comprise only five percent of the Amazon basin’s population

(Henley 1996:231) and a mere one percent of the specifically Brazilian Amazonian

population (Schwartzman and Zimmerman 2005). Amazonian peasants, by contrast,

constitute the majority of the population (Redford and Padoch 1992:131). Despite these

basic demographic facts, peasants have tended to be ignored or misrepresented in the

scholarly literature (Adams et al. 2009; Harris 1998; Nugent 1993, 2004) and remain the

poorest, most marginalized, and least represented population in the Amazon (Nugent


2000), and an entire volume recently devoted to Amazonian peasantry (Adams et al. 2009) trace the “invisibility” of peasants to inattention paid to the role of history in the

formation of peasant identity⁴ and to dominant theoretical trends in the scholarship on

the Amazon.

   In particular, two current bodies of literature developed in anthropology illustrate

the primacy granted to indigenous societies over peasant societies: (1) structuralist

⁴ This is a trend that appears in the literature on peasants in general (Kroeber 1948; Redfield 1956; Wolf 1982).
accounts of the symbolic and cognitive relationship Amazonian Amerindians have with their environment, and (2) recent cultural ecology\(^5\) studies of Amazonian societies that examine indigenous resource management strategies with implications for conservation.\(^6\) The former is a result of the discipline’s focus on structuralism in the analysis of native societies. In general, it attends to indigenous cosmographies, kinship, myths, and socialized nature (e.g., Descola 1996; Maybury-Lewis 1967; Lévi-Strauss 1992; Turner 1993; Viveiros de Castro 1992). The latter focuses on indigenous management practices, with implications for conservation. In particular, it emphasizes the value of traditional ecological knowledge for forest conservation and sustainable forest management (e.g., Balée 1989; Denevan and Padoch 1988; Posey 1983, 2001; Redford and Padoch 1992). Cultural ecology of indigenous societies emerged in response to environmental concerns in the Amazon in the 1980s in the wake of Brazil’s pro-development agenda of previous decades.\(^7\) It also emerged to overcome environmentally deterministic approaches that correlated Amazonian environmental conditions with low indigenous population density (e.g., Meggers 1977, 1996; Sales Barbosa 1992). For that reason, cultural ecology appeals to a broad base of scholars and practitioners, while traditional anthropological scholarship on indigenous society, utilizing structuralism and other methods to analyze culture, tends to be emphasized almost exclusively in academic social science.

---

\(^{5}\) Most recently, cultural ecology is used as an umbrella term that includes historical ecology, political ecology, and other approaches (Biersack 1999; Sutton and Anderson 2004).

\(^{6}\) This tradition has also been referred to as “ethnoscience” (Sutton and Anderson 2004:98), “ethnobiology” and “ethnoecology” (Ellen 2006:20). It has roots in cognitive anthropology.

\(^{7}\) Brazil’s modernist, development-oriented policies and their consequences are explored in the context of the political ecology literature, also reviewed in this chapter.
Since its emergence, cultural ecology was applied to Amazonian indigenous societies. Cultural ecologists suggested that indigenous societies possessed a simple social organization appropriate to small, mobile groups because of environmental constraints such as poor soil quality for swidden agriculture and dispersed and scarce protein sources (Meggers and Evans 1957; Steward 1949). Many of these interpretations are still defended (e.g., Meggers 1996; Sales Barbosa 1992). In general, however, these theories have proven untenable in different parts of the basin, where archaeological evidence indicates that some Amazonian societies were large, complex, and sedentary (see Balée 1989; Denevan 1992; Heckenberger 2005; Heckenberger et al. 2003; Heckenberger, Petersen, and Neves 1999; Roosevelt 2000), and that mobility and low population density did not necessarily result from environmental and technological inadequacies, but from the ravages of colonialism (Carneiro 1970; Denevan 1992; Lathrap 1970).

Cultural ecologists were the first to explicitly address Amazonian peasant societies beginning in the 1950s (e.g., Meggers 1950, 1954; Moran 1974a, 1981; Murrieta and Dufour 2004; Padoch 1989; Parker 1985a, 1985b; Ross 1978). Yet rather than study traditional ecological knowledge or the ways in which such societies sustainably manage the forest—approaches generally reserved for studies of indigenous societies—cultural ecologists working on peasant societies emphasized adaptation to the Amazon ecosystem. Some cultural ecology work emphasizes social evolution, including the interplay between caboclo diet, biological traits, and environmental conditions (e.g., Meggers 1950). Ribeirinho, when mentioned at all, is used as a sub-category of caboclo (Wagley 1976) to describe the inhabitant of a specific ecological
zone (Nugent 1993). According to Brondízio (2009:185), the Spanish equivalent riberiño “is a category—while geographical—that involves different social classes, while caboclos are essentially lower class.”

Subsequent work traces the emergence of caboclo society to historic and economic forces. Schmink (1985:143) explains how relations of exchange during the rubber boom “define” the caboclo character of one Amazonian community. In addition to environmental conditions, Moran (1974a, 1981) acknowledges the role of structural constraints when he acknowledges the caboclo culture as the mechanism by which humans adapt to change. However, the basic premises of adaptation theories persist in the literatures and research on caboclo societies, including resource scarcity, optimal foraging theory, and yield-to-effort ratios (Gavin 2007; Perry, Barlow, and Peres 2009; Smith 2005).

Charles Wagley, perhaps the most notable scholar of caboclo societies, was influenced by Harris’ cultural materialism even as he considered himself a Boasian culturalist (Adams et al. 2009:4). Wagley’s seminal monograph, “Amazon Town” (1976), was also the first to describe the complex ways in which caboclos emerged in the Amazon. According to Wagley (1976:32), caboclos are a mixture of cultures, including Amerindian, European, and African, that have “fused” since the arrival of Europeans to the New World.

Wagley’s approach to caboclo societies was novel during the middle of the twentieth century, when anthropologists were committed to evolutionary and materialist

---

8 Ribeirinho identity and its basis in the materiality of the riverine landscape is a subject of this study. In Chapters 5 and 6, I examine the role of practices in ribeirinho conceptions of identity and place.

9 Both Harris and Wagley were affiliated with the University of Florida until the end of their careers.
explanations for culture over historical ones. Nonetheless, the environmentally and biologically deterministic premises of cultural ecology are clear in his work. He states, “The main reasons why the Amazon Valley is today a backward and under-developed area must be sought in Amazon culture and society, and in the relationship of this region with the centers of economic and political power and with the sources of cultural diffusion (1976:17). Culture is responsible for Amazonian underdevelopment, yet such underdevelopment is also constrained by the biophysical characteristics of the Amazonian environment. For example, Wagley states, “Because Itá\textsuperscript{10} is a poor community without any special industry or natural gifts and without any special distinction, a study of Itá focuses a spotlight on the basic problems of the region” (Wagley 1976:22). Wagley (1976:295) concludes the book with the following statement in reference to caboclos: “When a culture, through lack of technological equipment and for reasons of social organization, fails to provide for the material needs of man beyond a mere survival level, that society and culture must be judged inferior.” These factors render “the Amazon a backward area” (1976:289). Wagley’s subsequent work continued to emphasize environmental and social conditions as an explanation for adaptation, and the presumed connection between race and culture (Wagley 1976).

Moran (1974a, 1981), Parker (1985a, 1985b), and Ross (1978) followed Wagley’s lead and advanced understandings of caboclo societies within a historical trajectory. However, they emphasize ecological constraints and regional economic conditions, both of which are materialist explanations for peasant underdevelopment in the Amazon. In an article titled “The Evolution of the Amazon Peasantry,” Ross (1978) identifies the

\textsuperscript{10} “Itá” was a pseudonym Wagley elected for the town of Gurupá.
ways in which Amazonian caboclos have adapted to the tropics through a combination of ecological and historical-economic factors. Ross pays particular attention to the settlement patterns of caboclos (isolated, nuclear families), their productive systems (subsistence and occasional exchange with regional extractive economies), and the constraints and opportunities presented by the ecological setting (the floodplain or the upland forest regions). This is generally supported in the broader literature on peasant economy, where adaptation is linked to the ability of the peasant to sustain and reproduce the household economy (e.g., Chayanov 1966).

Of all the scholarship on Amazonian caboclos, Moran’s work relies most heavily on ecological conditions to explain caboclo behavior. In a 1974 chapter titled “The adaptive system of the Amazonian caboclo”, Moran identifies the ways in which caboclo social organization emerged in response to the ecology of the tropics and microeconomic extractive systems. In clear reference to Steward (1955), Moran’s (1974a:136) caboclo is a “cultural type” that is constrained by the environment and technology. In the tradition of cultural ecology, Moran correlates caboclo development with environmental conditions, specifically focused on the difference in soil types between the rich soils of the floodplain (várzea) and the poorer soils of the upland forest (terra firme). In spite of its emphasis on environmental constraints, Moran’s work highlighted the importance of caboclo society for scholars, calling it “the most important adaptive system in the Amazon (1974a:136) and “the greatest human resource” of the Amazon (1974a:144). As a result, he also regards caboclo culture as “sufficiently strong to pose a serious challenge to Brazilian hopes for ‘national integration’” (1974b:213).
Parker (1985a:xxxiii) regards the emergence of caboclo culture as an adaptive system in itself. Parker's caboclo, however, is one that clearly emerges from not only ecological constraints, but also the “deculturation” of Amerinidians as a result of colonial processes and regional, extractive economies. Parker (1985b) refers to this process as “caboclization”. “The caboclo, as transformed Amerind, was the logical outcome of the relentless economic manipulation of the ecology and culture of the region, and this adaptation was the only alternative to extinction or isolation amidst the deep reaches of the rainforest” (1985b:39-40). For Parker, the response of caboclos to the unstable economies of the region is thus regarded as one of resilience and innovation.

**Political Ecology: A Response to the Limitations of Cultural Ecology**

Cultural ecology’s explanatory power is limited to small settings, making it difficult to use in analyses of change over extended periods of time and across scales. This latter point is well represented in Amazonian cultural ecology, which tends to focus on Amazonian “cultural types” in bounded geographic and ecological settings. It is also represented in the structuralist-inspired works of anthropologists such as Descola (1996) and Viveiros de Castro (1996) who, in their seminal research among Amazonian Amerindians, have identified but not sufficiently explored the relationship between economic and demographic aspects of a society, on the one hand, and symbolic and social change, on the other (Heckenberger 2005:17).

In addition, cultural ecology has been critiqued for being excessively functionalist, culturally reductionist, ignoring power relations, and occurring in the absence of broader economic and political dynamics (Peet and Watts 1996). In the early 1970s, Steward’s “Theory of Culture Change” was revised to include two final chapters on the role of state formation and demographic and economic shifts in local subsistence practices. Eric
Wolf, Steward’s student, was the first to coin the term “political ecology” in 1972 during this revision.

Contemporary political ecology is generally regarded as the pairing of political economy with cultural ecology (Paulson, Gezon and Watts 2003; Zimmerer 2004, 2006). Political ecology emerged from cultural ecology and other positivist social science approaches that could not adequately explain the political and economic dimensions of environmental problems (Robbins 2004). As Robbins (2004:7) quips, “If there is a political ecology, by implication there must exist an apolitical one.” The “constraining” phenomena of cultural ecology were considered mere contextual background. Political ecology helped foreground political and economic processes and multi-scale interactions over the more limited scope of environmental determinism and social evolution emphasized in cultural ecology.

Because it is a framework that is utilized by many disciplines, political ecology is variously defined. Definitions of political ecology illuminate, to varying degrees, the interaction of political economy, the environment, social relations, and agency. According to Blaikie and Brookfield (1987:17), political ecology “combines the concerns of ecology and a broadly defined political economy. Together this encompasses the constantly shifting dialectic between society and land-based resources, and also within classes and groups within society itself.” Peet and Watts (1996:6) use a definition that places more emphasis on social science than on ecology: “a confluence between ecologically rooted social science and the principles of political economy.” In a separate publication, Watts (2000:257) adds that political ecology helps understand “the complex relations between nature and society through a careful analysis of access and control
over resources and their implications for environmental health and 'sustainable livelihoods', while Little’s (2001) political ecology examines the ways in which social life shapes and is shaped by the environment. These applications of political ecology more directly address human engagement as part of the environment, rather than separated from it.

Political ecology is recognized as a useful theoretical framework to address complex human-environment interactions on multiple scales in the abstract. Fewer scholars have identified the ways it may be directly applied. However, Robbins (2004), Simmons (2004), Wood and Porro (2002), and Zimmerer (2000, 2006) provide concrete evidence of the utility of political ecology, moving it from a theoretical perspective into an applied framework. As Robbins (2004:xviii) states, “Whereas most summary texts on the state of global political ecology are designed to show political ecology as a body of knowledge, this book is designed also to show political ecology as something people do.” Schmink (1994:257) emphasizes local strategies that emerge “in the context of shifting social, economic, and political circumstances, or matrix, that frame their behavior”, which shows attention to local responses within the broader framework. The idea of a framing “matrix” was subsequently applied by Simmons (2004) and Wood and Porro (2002), who offer comprehensive diagrams of the framework. These diagrams illustrate the ways political ecology can be used to chart the complex relationships between social, political, and ecological phenomena at a variety of scales. In addition, Robbins (2004) adds that political ecology is a method though which to examine complex ecological and social interactions across scales.
Interestingly, the line between academic discourse and political agendas of academics can become blurred in political ecology. Zimmerer (2000:356) states that political ecology “seeks to contribute both to sound environmental management (including nature conservation) and to the empowerment of disadvantaged social groups.” It is clear from this description that Zimmerer’s political ecology is one with a political agenda focused on conservation. In a general overview of political ecology, Robbins (2004:14) identifies four “theses” of political ecology, the following three of which make it difficult to distinguish a theoretical framework from politics: (1) environmental conflict, (2) conservation and control, and (3) environmental identity and social movement. Although political ecology is presented as a theoretical framework and growing body of literature in the academy, it is often used to further contemporary agendas, particularly environmental ones, in developing nations.

Political ecology represents a prominent body of literature in Amazonian scholarship, where it gained popularity for its relevance in understanding the complex interaction of political, social, and economic factors that resulted in radical social and environmental transformations. While it emphasizes history in ways cultural ecology of the Amazon did not, this history tends to focus on post WWII development policies for the Amazon, mainly in the form of roads, colonization projects, and subsidies for big business. These modernist projects were conceptualized in Brazil’s capital and urban centers in the 1950s, and subsequently impacted the Amazon during the 1960s and 1970s. By the 1980s, Brazil’s development-driven ideologies were challenged by a global interest in sustainable development and environmental activism in the Amazon. A series of key developments emerged from social movements and strategic alliances in
the Western Amazon in the 1980s, giving rise inter alia to the extractive reserve model of relevance to this study (see Chapter 4). From the 1980s to present, political ecologists examined these complex social, economic, and environmental “processes” to understand their interactions across multiple scales.

Next, I briefly outline the recent history of Brazil’s Amazon region and the way it articulated with national and international policies and ideologies. I subsequently examine the key works in political ecology relevant to this history and the ways in which they helped define Amazonian peasants as “extractivists”.

In 1960, Brazil’s capital was relocated from the vibrant and historic Rio de Janeiro to the nearly unoccupied plateau of Brasília in 1960, for the exclusive purpose of encouraging development in the country’s interior. The project, conceived by President Kubitschek in 1956, engineered the arid landscape of the Brazilian cerrado (savanna) to support the expected population surge, house the administrative centers of government, and, importantly, to create water supply where there was none. Kubitschek honored his development-oriented slogan, “50 years in 5”, and by 1960 the capital city was nearly complete. The architecture is deliberately modernist and futuristic: an aerial view of the city reveals that it was designed in the image of an airplane. The administrative offices form the body of the plane, while residential and shopping areas extend out the wings.

At the height of the country’s modernist aspirations, the Amazon and its inhabitants represented the biggest challenge and obstacle to development (Goodland 1975; Hecht and Cockburn 1989). To overcome these challenges, the Brazilian government created a modernization plan to “inundate the Amazon forest with civilization” (Hecht and Cockburn 1989:102-103) through three strategies: (1) improve
Brazil’s foreign exchange with the increased exploration and exploitation of the Amazon, (2) endorse national integration, and (3) implement widespread colonization programs (Hall 1989).

In 1953, the Superintendency for the Valorization of the Amazon (SPVEA) was created by President Vargas to develop the Amazon region. The SPVEA’s most significant accomplishment was the construction of the 2000 kilometer Belém-Brasília Highway (BR-010) linking the Amazon to the capital city. In 1964, the country fell under military rule, and modernization became tightly linked with a national security agenda that prioritized populating the perceived “empty spaces” of the Amazon (Schmink and Wood 1992:69). The military plan for Brazil referred to as the “Brazilian miracle” was implemented from 1968-1974 (Schmink and Wood 1992) and sought to attract foreign investment and stabilize regional economies. In 1966, this plan took effect in the Amazon through the military’s “Operation Amazônia”, which provided incentives and tax breaks to attract large-scale investments (Almeida 1992; Hall 1989; Moran 1981; Schmink and Wood 1992). The SPVEA was replaced by the Superintendency for the Development of the Amazon (SUDAM) to attract capital investment to the Amazon through generous fiscal incentives, including extended tax breaks for ranchers, miners, and timber producers in the Amazon (Hecht 1985).

By the 1970s, a decade Almeida (1992:1) describes as the “decade of colonization”, the military government promoted a variety of large-scale settlement and highway development projects with the intention of modernizing the Amazon, which comprises 54% of the national territory, and achieving its economic integration it with the rest of the country by means of development (Moran, Brondízio, and VanWey 2005;
Schmink and Wood 1992). Most significant was the massive, 5000 kilometer Transam­azon Highway, which begins in the east of the country in the states of Maranhão and Pará, bisects the Amazon basin, and connects to the westernmost state of Acre on the border with Bolivia. In 1970, President Médici unveiled a plan, implemented between 1971 to 1974, to open the “empty” public lands of the Amazon to migrants after a visit to the country’s impoverished northeast (Moran, Brondízio, and VanWey 2005; PIN 1971; Schmink and Wood 1992). Called the Plano de Integração Nacional (National Integration Plan-PIN), the plan proposed colonization projects in the Amazon to create a middle class comprised of 100,000 families on both sides of the major highways. The goal, according to President Médici, was to connect “men without land to a land without men” (Moran 1981:75) in reference to the country’s northeasterners who were recruited as the labor source and resident population for its corresponding colonization and settlement programs. The plan was developed by way of contrast to the existing subsistence and extractive economies that seemed antithetical to development (Schmink and Wood 1992:71).

Brazil’s development and colonization agendas had a variety of unforeseen social and environmental consequences. Small-scale farming opportunities afforded by the colonization projects appeared an innovative policy approach to developing the interior while promoting rural livelihood systems. However, agricultural production amongst small-scale farmers was the biggest challenge and failure of the colonization project (Wood and Schmink 1978). Obtaining credit was difficult, and the costs of production and transportation outweighed the prices received for produce.
During this period, the forest-based peasant populations suffered the consequences of development policies. In the Western Amazon, subsidies that existed for rubber shifted to ranching and logging, and were accompanied by a development ideology promoting road construction, logging and ranching, and speculation, thereby increasing the value of land (Schmink and Wood 1992). Rubber patrons abandoned their estates during this period, selling their land through questionable titles to migrant ranchers coming from the south of Brazil, without consideration for the rubber tapper families residing on the estates. Without any clear land rights, the rubber tappers became an invisible, forest-dwelling population in Brazil. In order for the new landholders to obtain land titles as fast as possible, they evicted the rubber tappers from their settlements through the use of violence, force, and forest clearance, removing the traditional livelihood base upon which the rubber tappers depended (Almeida 2002; Keck 1995).

The forest-based populations that preceded the development and colonization projects were pushed further into the interior as their lands were colonized and developed. The highways provided access for illegal land grabbers, opportunists, and other informal entrepreneurs to stake claims to Amazonian land. Speculation and land grabbing driven by the opening of roads in the forest occurred in the absence of environmental and social regulations, leading to unprecedented deforestation in the Amazon (Hall 2000) and violent conflict (Fearnside 2006).

In 1974 in the western Amazonian state of Acre, rubber tappers, with the support of the Catholic Church, began to organize, unionize, and resist expulsion from their lands. They engaged in forceful empates (standoffs) against the ranchers who had
appropriated their lands, clearing the forest to convert it to pasture (Allegretti 1999; Keck 1995; Schwartzman 1989). The empates represented the primary resistance tactic against expulsion from the rubber estates they had inhabited for generations (Allegretti 1994). The empate consisted of a large group of rubber tappers banding together and cordonning off the trees being felled by ranchers and their hired labor on the rubber tappers’ traditional lands. Allegretti (1994:22; my translation) describes the empate as “a spontaneous tactic against forest clearance, by which the rubber tappers collectively organize, with their families, and prevent tree felling planned by the rancher.” While the rubber tappers did not inflict physical harm upon the ranchers, in some cases they used forceful tactics such as setting fire to the ranchers’ headquarters (Keck 1995:412).

The empates were organized and led by Wilson Pinheiro, President of the Rural Workers’ Union in the small town of Brasiléia in Acre, until his assassination by ranchers at his union office in 1980, and subsequently by Francisco (Chico) Mendes, President of Rural Workers’ Union in the small town of Xapuri, Acre. Both Pinheiro and Mendes were raised among illiterate, poor rural families that had relied upon rubber and Brazil nuts for generations. In 1981, Mendes described the relationship the rubber tappers had with their land as follows:

You have to see the rubber tappers! . . . they have a love for the rubber tree, the Brazil nut tree, since . . . that is what they and their families survived from for the last century . . . For them, to stop deforestation is to defend the rubber tree and the Brazil nut tree. They also consider that the only source of wealth of the state, in spite of all the destruction, is still rubber and Brazil nuts . . . When they go out to stop deforestation, really they are defending the life of the rubber tree and the Brazil nut tree, which for them is everything (Allegretti 1999; http://www.edf.org/article.cfm?ContentID=1551).

By 1985, the empates were doing very little to encourage political change (Almeida 2002) and the rubber tappers’ struggle adopted a more proactive than reactive
approach. Indeed, the movement was based more on liberation theology and *sindicalismo* ("unionism") and the rubber tappers’ alliance with the Catholic Church rather than any key national or international agenda.

Chico Mendes, already recognized as a trade union leader, worked with the rubber tappers and strategic alliances in international arenas to demand adequate land reform for the rubber tappers. These alliances were facilitated by Brazilian and foreign anthropologists, researchers, and activist brokers, including the Brazilian anthropologist Mary Allegretti, former Secretary for the Amazon within Brazil’s Ministry of the Environment, and Stephan Schwartzman, an American anthropologist with the nongovernmental organization Environmental Defense Fund. Schwartzman introduced Mendes to the international environmental movement and identified the potential for a partnership between environmental causes and the rubber tappers’ movement. After the creation of the National Rubber Tappers’ Council and their first meeting in Brasília in 1985, facilitated by Allegretti, the extractive reserve model was created and proposed. From there, the rubber tappers’ movement garnered international attention and support through the use of the same brokers. Schwartzman and the Environmental Defense Fund, and representatives from the National Wildlife Federation and the Natural Resources Defense Council, gained strategic support of members of the U.S. Congress to bring attention to the World Bank’s participation in the POLONOROESTE program, which settled approximately 45,000 small-scale migrant farmers in the state of Rondônia, on the basis of environmental infractions (Schmink and Wood 1992:114; Schwartzman 1989). This led to a heightened awareness of multilateral bank interventions in Brazil, including the careful monitoring of the paving of the BR-364
(Rondônia-Acre) highway, disbursements of which were temporarily halted as a result (Schmink and Wood 1992).

Public denouncement of the environmental infractions caused by multilateral lending institutions and the publicity garnered for the rubber tappers’ movement overseas launched Mendes into international arenas as a guardian and defender of the rain forest. Mendes was brought to Washington D.C. to speak with members of Congress, the World Bank, and the Interamerican Development Bank (IDB), leading to the formal endorsement of the extractive reserve proposal by the World Bank and the IDB (Keck 1995). In July 1987, Mendes received the United Nations Environment Program’s Global 500 reward. While his international recognition moved the debate forward, it also contributed to his demise, as he was quickly recognized as a barrier to the informal frontier politics that had been at play in the Brazilian Amazon for decades. Like Pinheiro, Mendes was killed in December of 1988 by ranchers at the back door of his home in Xapuri.

Much to the surprise of Brazilian citizens and leaders, Mendes’ death led to unprecedented international outcry. While many leaders had been assassinated before him, the way in which the rubber tappers’ movement aligned itself with key players was particularly effective at garnering strong international support. This exacerbated Brazil’s reputation as environmentally irresponsible (Keck 1995), strengthened environmental and social organizations across scales, and iconized Chico Mendes as an environmental martyr. The rubber tappers’ identity as extractivists was solidified. After Mendes’ death, the first four extractive reserves in Brazil were created in 1990, the first two of which were established in Acre. One, the eight million hectare Chico Mendes
Extractive Reserve, bore his name (Schwartzman 1989). Since this period, and in part because of this period, Brazil has emerged as a leader for government initiatives that strive to balance social equity, conservation, and development in Amazonian forests (Mittermeier et al. 2005).

As this overview of Amazonian events and scholarship demonstrates, political ecology became an extremely useful framework through which to examine the impact of development and colonization policies and projects on the environment and its peoples, including peasants, as well as the ways in which the debate was reframed from 1970s development to the current context of conservation and social justice (e.g., Anderson, May, and Balick 1991; Browder and Godfrey 1997; Bunker 1984; Hall 1989; Hecht 1989; Schmink and Wood 1984, 1992; Wood and Porro 2002). Political ecology also provided a useful framework through which to examine social response to Brazil’s development oriented policies. These multi-scalar struggles over natural resources gave rise to shifting “frontier” spaces in the Amazon.

Schmink and Wood (1992) and Little (2001) use political ecology to show the ways different social actors define, delineate, and contest land in a development and post-development Amazonian frontier. Schmink (1994), Schmink and Wood (1992), and Wood and Porro (2002) are most attentive to the shorter term; specifically, the “contested frontiers” that emerged from unintended consequences of post WWII development policies outlined above, and particularly from the 1970s forward. Little (2001) devotes considerable attention to the role of time and scale in the formation of frontiers. He resurrects the concept of cosmography, introduced by Boas (1887), to show “the process of establishing human territories” (Little 2001:5) that have created
and recreated Amazonian frontiers over time. Little’s concept of the frontier as “perennial” is an important one: frontiers open and close repeatedly in response to territorial struggles among different social groups and structural forces.

Although political ecology addresses the limitations of cultural ecology, it is not without critics. In general, political ecology has a knack for critique. Many political ecology works read as a critique of social-environmental problems, without lending suggestions for resolution. For example, political ecology helps elucidate the context in which environmental degradation occurs, but presents no concrete alternative on ways to move forward (Bryant and Bailey 1997).

Furthermore, political ecology overemphasizes the political and economic drivers that create a cycle of environmental degradation and social pressures on the environment. As identified by political ecologists, this cycle maintains people, particularly the poor and marginalized, with few alternatives for natural resource use that could provide a more sustainable and productive future (Stott and Sullivan 2000). Political ecology’s emphasis on the “cycle of poverty”, rather than on innovation and agency, objectifies rural people as either passive participants in State schemes by which they are constrained, or as inherently unnatural colonists upon an otherwise natural landscape in which they make environmentally “unfriendly” decisions and perpetuate economic backwardness. Stott and Sullivan (2000:4), for example, use political ecology to identify “the political circumstances that forced people into activities which cause environmental degradation in the absence of alternative possibilities.” This perspective is a clear reference to the determinism inherent in cultural ecology.
In an insightful paper on the frontier concept in the Brazilian Amazon, Cleary (1993) identifies classical political economy theory, which is central to political ecology, at the crux of this problem. Theories of capitalist production, by which capital is accumulated and technology improved over time, do not easily apply in the Amazon (Bunker 1984:1019). Rather, regional economies based on informal debt-for labor swaps have remained the norm since the colonial era (Bunker 1984, 1985). While these purely economic assessments of the particularities of the Amazonian regional economy are accurate, they identify the Amazon’s extractive economies as a limiting factor to progress and modernization. Cleary (1993) criticizes political economy’s overemphasis on production as the outcome of development. In the process of achieving a centralized, nationalist economic agenda, Amazonian peasants are characterized as passive recipients. Cleary (1993:338) states, “In discussions of capital accumulation in the Brazilian economy, and how Amazonia is articulated to it, one loses any sense of the Amazonian economy as a sphere of human agency, let alone social organization. It becomes a sub-system of a sub-system of a system.” Yet as the case of Brazilian Amazon demonstrates, these are fundamentally social processes that have had unintended consequences. The post-development Amazon is heterogeneous, both socially and economically.

Another critique of political ecology, and indeed among political ecologists, is that it pays significantly less attention to the role of the environment than its title would suggest (Vayda and Walters 1999; Zimmerer and Bassett 2003; see Blaikie and Brookfield 1987 for a notable exception). Rather than view the environment as a dynamic part of the framework, it tends to be described through phrases like
“environmental politics” or “politicized environments”. The framework thus limits the “ecology” of political ecology to a mere setting in which social and political processes unfold.

Above, I indicated that Little’s (2001) work is a notable exception to some of the shortcomings of political ecology. Little’s approach has greater temporal depth than most political ecology. His conception of territories is permeable and shifting. Unlike most political ecologists, Little seeks to incorporate the affective and symbolic aspects of territory making into his analyses. However, his emphasis on the regional over the local makes it difficult to incorporate subjectivity into his analyses. Furthermore, Little argues against a separation of nature and culture and does not regard the biophysical environment as mere background for territorial struggle. However, by emphasizing “two-way interactions between and among social and natural factors” (Little 2001:4) in Amazonian watersheds, inherent in this is approach is a clear distinction between the biophysical and cultural aspects of society. By focusing on their interaction, Little (1999:2) begins from the perspective that the two are mutually exclusive. Furthermore, his attention to “historical processes of biophysical adaptation” is another clear reference to political ecology’s continued emphasis on the fundamentals of cultural ecology.

In sum, cultural ecology and political ecology have highlighted important aspects of history, political economy, and use of the material landscape for this study of place. Specifically, cultural ecology was the first to identify caboclos’ intricate relationship with the material world, while political ecology situated them in broader historical and political processes and the social and environmental impacts of such processes. Both literatures
emphasize the ways in which peasants are resilient in the face of economic hardship over various historical periods in the Brazilian Amazon. With a few notable exceptions, discussed above, these literatures generally do not explicitly examine agency or local identity. Rather, these two bodies of literature contextualize peasants as a result of some combination of ecological and economic factors. Cultural ecology tends to relegate caboclos to an adaptive “outcome” of the material environment, depriving them of agency and history, while political ecology tends to privilege macroeconomic and political processes over local practices. As a result, peasants are a mere product of history and constrained by their surroundings, to which they “adapt” and “respond” (e.g. Moran 1974a, 1981).

Cultural and political ecology emphasize the constraints, material and structural, in the formation of peasant identity and society. In doing so, they present peasants, their practices, and their cultural identity as separated from the environment. These literatures emphasize “processes”, whether historical, adaptive, or economic, over practices—the lived experience of place. Indeed, although Steward was the first anthropologist to theorize the relationship between humans and their environment as a cultural phenomenon, his cultural ecology radically separated humans from the environment because of their use of technology, which differentiated them from other species (Sutton and Anderson 2004:21).

Attempts at redress have fallen back on the materialist premises that undermined the significance of place, agency, and identity in the first place. The “new ecology” of Rappaport attempted to address this oversight by treating humans as part of the ecosystem. However, touting a “purer materialism” (Biersack 1999:6), the new ecology
reduced human complexity to systems dynamics, at the expense of culture. Finally, the emergence of the “new ecologies” approach, which includes political ecology, was similarly amiss in its attention to place, prioritizing process with place (environment) as background. In the Amazon in particular, political ecology is the most salient literature of present, but could be more attentive to local experience as distinct from the localized impacts of larger-scale processes.

Phenomenology and Practice Theories

Introduction

The social, economic, and political processes that have been the focus of recent efforts in the Amazon have overlooked the ways ribeirinhos identify themselves and negotiate identities and territorial boundaries imposed by the State and social movements. As a result of this oversight, the relationship between Amazonian peasants, the environment, and the broader policies that (mis)represent them remain misunderstood. These limitations result from the dominant theories: their inherent scale of analysis, embedded ontologies, and resultant epistemologies (and see the final section of this chapter). At base, cultural and political ecology draw from a paradigm of methodological holism (e.g., Ritzer and Gindoff 1994) which assumes that macroscalar forces or processes are the source of explanation of microscale phenomena. These theories adopt a positivist ontology and dualist epistemology (explained below). They are derived from the assumption that social entities are identifiable from their essential qualities that are recognizable through observation and measurement. In order to examine the relationship between practices, identity and sense of place, as this study aims to accomplish, theories drawn from a different paradigm, methodological relationism, are necessary.
In this section, I address the key issues of place, practice, and identity using anthropological theories and methods drawn from phenomenological philosophies and practice theory. The next part of this chapter briefly reviews the theories of "being and dwelling" (Heidegger 1977; Ingold 1993, 2000) and practice (as developed by Bourdieu 1977), influenced by phenomenology, that are central to this study of Amazonian peasants and place. These theories gained popularity in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g., Gell 1998; Jackson 1996; Munn 1986; Ortner 1984; Strathern 1988). I argue that these theories complement the existing literatures on cultural and political ecology, reviewed above. Yet the more recent development and application of these theories to contemporary anthropological inquiry are directly relevant to this study. Within this larger body of theories—phenomenology and practice—I highlight concepts and models that are used in the remainder of the study. Specifically, I explore the concepts of practice, place, and identity and “dwelling” that have been applied in fieldwork (Gray 2003; Richardson 2003), the role of time (temporality) in the creation of place (Bender 2002; Hirsch 1995; Ingold 1993; Morphy 1995), and the formation of “attachments” to place (Bachelard 1969; Basso 1996; Tuan 1976, 1977; Williams et al. 1992; also referred to as a “sense” of place by Basso [1996]). Finally, I introduce the concept of the taskscape (Ingold 1993) as process; it is the material expression of practice-in-place, what Ingold (1993:162) refers to as an “embodied landscape”. In this study, I operationalize the taskscape and apply it as a model to understand the relationship of people, practice, and place (see Chapter 5).

Finally, I assess how the analysis of place can be tackled from different ontological and epistemological approaches. I conclude this chapter by identifying my elected
epistemology, post-positivism, which is critical to understanding the corresponding methods that I employed in my research design and data analyses.

**Being, Dwelling, and Practice**

Basic ideas developed in major works by philosopher Martin Heidegger (1977) and anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977) are particularly relevant for this project because of their focus on the concept of “being” and the development of a theory of practice, respectively. In this subsection, I briefly review these theories to focus on recent ways in which these concepts have been developed and applied in anthropology that can serve as models for this study of ribeirinhos and place.

Modern phenomenology was developed in contrast to the “natural attitude” of modern science rooted in objectivism and materialism (Casey 1996:13). For phenomenologists, meaning emerges from one’s perception and experience of “things” (phenomena) encountered consciously and intentionally in daily life (in the *lebenswelt*—“life-world”; Husserl 1970). Materiality is central to phenomenology, but uniquely distinct from the ways it is approached by cultural ecologists, cultural materialists, and political ecologists. Heidegger’s (1977) most influential notion is *dasein*, which is usually translated as “being-in-the-world” as opposed to mere “being”. The former illuminates the ways the individual engages as part of the world: that the world exists by the “being” within it and the relationship of the subject to surroundings. The latter infers that an individual can exist (“be”) in abstraction from the material surroundings.

Heidegger developed his philosophy of being-in-the-world from what he perceived to be an important distinction between being, building, and dwelling. Conventional wisdom would have it that we must build before we can dwell. However, for Heidegger, to be is to dwell; it is the way in which “we human beings are on the earth” (1977:322).
Heidegger reminds readers that in German, *bauen* ("to build") literally translates as "to dwell". Further extensions of the word’s meanings, according to Heidegger (1977:321), are to settle, work the land, and create a home. Heidegger presents the following in favor of this perspective:

1. Building is really dwelling
2. Dwelling is the manner in which mortals are on the earth.
3. Building as dwelling unfolds into the building that cultivates growing things and the building that erects buildings (Heidegger 1977:326).

Therefore, Heidegger asserts that before we build from the material environment, humans first dwell within it. Heidegger developed his philosophy in recognition that humans are immersed in and experiencing the world, which includes other beings and objects, all of which form part of dwelling.

The relationship between dwelling and "place" is central to this study because only through dwelling does place emerge. Dwelling is "to be in a place"; as Casey (1996:18) states, "there is no knowing or sensing a place except by being in that place, and to be in a place is to be in a position to perceive it." Building is an activity that "gathers things" (Heidegger 1977:330)—an assemblage of parts, such as those required to build a structure—into "locations" (Heidegger 1977:336). With the dwelling perspective primary, places (Heideggerian "locations") gather or assemble through human engagement with the material world.

Bourdieu (1977) extends the Heideggerian concept of dwelling into an anthropological theory of practice in anthropology. In his seminal work, Outline of a
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11 Practice theorist Michel de Certeau (1984) is also influential in this study, but as his work applies primarily to Western, urban settings, I have elected to focus on Bourdieu as most useful in this section. However, I reference specific ideas and concepts of de Certeau throughout the dissertation.
Theory of Practice (1977), Bourdieu argues for a new understanding of structure that adopts neither an objectivist position in which structure exists prior to human agency (e.g., Lévi-Strauss 1963; Parsons 1951) nor a subjectivist one, based on existentialism and unconstrained individual free will (e.g., Sartre 1973). Rather, Bourdieu’s approach combines Marxist materialism with phenomenology (Miller 2005) to understand structure through what people do: their practices.

Bourdieu’s theory of practice identifies the ways in which the materiality of one’s surroundings\footnote{Bourdieu (1977:83) refers to materiality as the “world of objects”.} represents the basic rules (or schema) of a society (“structures”; 1977:83). The material world thus provides cues as to how one should think and act, which are unconsciously learned from birth and embodied through practice over a lifetime. Through this process, the material world of objects thus conditions actions. Bourdieu (1977:214) referred to this as the habitus, a “system of generative and structuring dispositions that constitutes and is constituted by an actor’s movement through space.” Through the use of the material world (practices), the meaning of objects is revealed (Bourdieu 1977:90; see also Connerton 1989:82). Furthermore, the material world becomes part of a body hexis, in which the posture, gesture, and movement of the body are linked to the habitus as a “durable manner of standing, speaking, and thereby of feeling and thinking” (Bourdieu 1977:93-94).

To demonstrate his point, Bourdieu (1977) uses the Algerian Kabyle house as a metaphor for social and symbolic relations of the universe, in which the physical and spatial relations inside the house enforce and reproduce gender and other socio-symbolic relationships in Berber society. As embodied, the practices do not materialize
through objective conditions, and are thus not mechanical; they are a product of history. Over time, practices become “durably installed” (Bourdieu 1977:78) in the unconscious of the subject. People’s practices (their “movement through space” [Bourdieu 1977:214]) are thus the unconscious and unselfconscious embodiment of structure, which play a key role in the social organization and reproduction of society. The material components of the Kabyle house serve as a reference for informing and enforcing Berber spatial and social relations, such as cultural knowledge and behaviors between men, women, and children in the home. Materiality thus socializes, reinforces, and reproduces Berber society, what Miller (2005:6) calls the “ability of objects to implicitly condition human actors.”

Bourdieu (1973) considered the outside world to be the inversion of the house. According to his analysis, places other than the house were understood in terms of the more familiar house. By contrast, among the ribeirinhos of the Iriri, places beyond the house are central to the engraining and habituating of memory and identity. I thus expand the more house-centric approach of Bourdieu (1973) and other phenomenologists who emphasize the house (e.g., Bachelard 1969; Heidegger 1977), to analyze other places that are central to ribeirinho sense of place and identity.

Bourdieu also overemphasizes the unconscious embodiment of structures. For this study of ribeirinhos and practice, Bourdieu’s work does not provide an explanation for conscious, discursive expressions of knowledge. It also does not allow for social change. The work of sociologist Anthony Giddens (1984) allows for both discursive and non-discursive, practical knowledge in his theory of structuration. Similar to Bourdieu’s habitus (1977:83), Giddens (1984:25) asserts that “structure” is not external to
individuals. Rather, agents and structures are coimplicated in practices; therefore, social systems exist as reproduced social practices (Giddens 1984:25). Unlike Bourdieu (1977), Giddens' (1984:7) emphasis on social practices includes intentional engagement in social activities (discursive consciousness) and knowledgeable engagement with intentions and strategies (practical consciousness). Giddens’ emphasis on discursive and practical knowledge provides additional theoretical insight into this study, because practical and discursive knowledge form part of ribeirinho sense of place (see “methods”, below). Similarly, the work of cultural anthropologist Keith Basso (1996) among the Apache indicates that place-related discourse is especially important to the ethnographer. “Ordinary talk”, Basso (1996:73) says, “provides a readily available window onto the structure and significance of other peoples’ worlds. For as native concepts and beliefs find external purchase on specific features of the local topography, the entire landscape acquires a crisp new dimension that seems to move it more surely into view.” For the purpose of this study, Giddens (1984) and Basso (1996) complement Bourdieu’s emphasis on unconscious embodiment of structure with attention to the practical, discursive, and conscious practices in which people engage.

Since the 1990s, British anthropologist Tim Ingold (1992, 1995, 2000) has been developing a dwelling perspective that builds on Heidegger’s (1977) “being-in-the-world” and Bourdieu’s (1977) theory of practice. The dwelling perspective is defined by Ingold (1993:152) as “bringing to bear the knowledge born of immediate experience, by privileging the understandings that people derive from their lived, everyday involvement in the world.” The dwelling perspective departs from the idea that humans are separated from the environment—an approach that has its foundations in Cartesian mind-body
dualisms that are common in modern science—and focuses instead on the “mutualism of person and environment” (Ingold 1992:40). For example, in reference to Bourdieu (1977), Ingold asserts that the habitus does not materialize in practice, but rather “subsists in it” (Ingold 2000:162), a distinction that is also apparent in the difference between “being” and “being-in-the world” (Heidegger 1977).

Heidegger’s (1977) development of “being” versus “being-in-the-world” and Bourdieu’s development of a theory of practice were influential in my study of the ribeirinhos of the Iriri. The immediate relevance of these works to place is that humans are inseparable from their material surroundings. The ribeirinhos’ mundane practices in the material setting play an integral part of who they are and how they not only think about place, but more directly experience place. Humans and the material world are co-constituted; they “interanimate” each other, to use Basso’s (1996:55) phrase. Through dwelling, including engaging in practices over time, place emerges and is embodied.

As my research demonstrates, ribeirinho livelihood practices reveal much about the themes of practice, identity, and sense of place that are central to their society, but that remain underexamined in the dominant literatures of Amazonian peasants. However, although phenomenologically informed perspectives are well-developed theoretically, Ingold (2000:171) indicates that they are difficult to apply in research. Two ethnographic projects have influenced my own efforts in this direction. The first uses Heidegger’s “being-in-the-world” to examine the role of materiality in world building in Costa Rica (Richardson 2003). The second examines place-making among shepherds in the Scottish borderlands (Gray 2003).
Richardson (2003) develops a method for Heidegger’s concept of being-in-the-world in the setting of the plaza and market in Cartago, Costa Rica to demonstrate the role of the material setting on people’s identity, social interactions, and actions. Borrowing from Heidegger, Richardson (2003) asserts that the world does not exist “out there” in physical space, but rather comes into being through actions. According to Richardson (2003:75), the market and the plaza are two distinct worlds that acquire their meaning in relation to each other; specifically, through the ways people act and interact in each one. This renders the market and plaza “intersubjective” worlds. These actions and interactions become “fixed” in the material culture of each world (Bourdieu’s (1977:91) “world of objects”). The study illuminates the influential role of material culture on human behavior and social interaction, observed through people’s practices as they dwell.

Gray’s (2003) ethnographic study among shepherds in the Scottish Borders describes the practice of hill shepherding. The primary place in the hills is the hirsel, which refers both to the sheep and the hills they graze (Gray 2003:231). Gray draws from practice theory as it is developed by de Certeau (1984) to examine place-making. Specifically, de Certeau (1984:117) refers to space as “a practiced place.” In de Certeau’s urban analysis, the basic act of walking builds places and transforms and appropriates space into meaningful places (de Certeau 1984:97; Gray 2003:226-227). In the context of the borderlands, “going around the hill is motivated [sic] shepherds’ abiding concern for the welfare of sheep as sources of farm income and personal
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13 De Certeau (1984:117) distinguishes between space and place in the opposite manner than most theorists. I borrow from de Certeau’s definition of space yet reverse the terms such that place is “a practiced space”.
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identity” (Gray 2003:233). In the Scottish borderlands, the act of walking or biking around the hirsel contributes to active place making that is at once material and meaningful, sensory and experiential. Place is created according to the topography and the movement of the sheep (2003:231). Through the sheep, the shepherds dwell.

Gray identifies four aspects of dwelling that are important for this study. The first concerns “lack of distance” (Gray 2003:232-233) inherent in dwelling. As people engage in practices and incorporate the material world into their activities, there is no separation between them and the world. The second concerns the referential function of dwelling. The creation of place through practice—for example, the use of objects, or the creation of footpaths through repeated acts of walking in place—makes reference to other places, objects, and times. Third, as a result of (1) and (2), dwelling is a “way of seeing” that references all manner of experience, and is thus distinct from “seeing” as distancing (Scott 1998; see Chapter 1). Fourth, when people use objects in their practices they also “gather” them referentially and spatially, forming meaningful place (Gray 2003:232-3). As discussed above, the idea of places “gathering” referentially originates with Heidegger. Building is an activity that “gathers things” (Heidegger 1977:330) into “locations” (Heidegger 1977:336). Herding sheep is an act of gathering them to create the hirsel (Gray 2003:234). It is through the sheep, and the referential function of objects and locations related to the sheep’s movement around the hills, that place (the hirsel) is formed.

**Time and the landscape (temporality)**

The dwelling perspective and the referential functions of the material landscape have an inherent temporal component—practices take place in and through time, and refer to the past and future in the present. Indeed, as Ingold (1993:152) states, “to
perceive the landscape is to carry out an act of remembrance.” Yet most often in
anthropology, studies of time and its relationship to place are reserved for native
societies, including those of the Amazon (see Descola 1996; Heckenberger 2005; Hill
and Wright 1988; Lévi-Strauss 1992; Maybury-Lewis 1967; Santos-Granero 1998;
Turner 1988; Viveiros de Castro 1998). But place for the ribeirinhos of the Iriri is also
recursive, referential, and backgrounded; it is, as Ingold (1993:153) states, “pregnant
with the past” and evoked through their engagement with it (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Active engagement in the material world (e.g., the use of tools and footpaths; Gray
2003) may serve as a reference to other time periods, demonstrating that places gather
spatially and temporally. As defined in Chapter 1, landscape is a network of related
places, gathered (sensu Heidegger 1977:330) from the references that link them to one
another (see also Casey [1996] and Ingold [1993, 2000]). Dwelling in the landscape and
the referential function of the material world as a person dwells give rise to a unique
sense of time that Ingold (1993) connects with the experiential concept of “temporality”.
Ingold uses the term to describe the landscape as process, “constituted as an enduring
record of—and testimony to—the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt
within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves” (Ingold 1993:152).
Specifically, the landscape “enfolds the lives and times of predecessors who, over the
generations, have moved around in it and played their part in its formation” (Ingold
1993:152).

Hirsch (1995) provides insight into the recursive aspect of dwelling through an
analysis of the landscape and the processual relationship between “foreground” and
“background”. Foreground may be considered as the present, reality, “everyday social
life” or “the way we are now.” Background may be an idyllic, potential, “the way we might be” (Hirsch 1995:3) and, I would add, “the way we once were.” According to Hirsch (1995), the practices and experiences from which landscape emerges involve the recursive engagement by actors of these two aspects of social life: foreground and background, proximate and distant, real and imagined. It is in this way that landscape is process (see also Bender 2002).

Morphy (1995) contributes additional insights to the recursive aspect of dwelling. In his study of the Australian Aboriginal Dreaming, Morphy recognizes that ancestral events and the changes aboriginal society endured as a result of colonialism are encoded in the material environment of the landscape. In his case study, these events are experienced by the Yolngu Aboriginals in the present, who orient themselves by means of interpreting the surrounding landscape. Morphy (1995:186) states that as he travelled with his informant, Narritjin, in isolated places, “he [Narritjin] would be continually trying to place himself in the landscape, interpreting signs in the land that could link it with the mythological past, which to him remained very much part of its present.” The material world thus keeps social memory present, and interaction with the landscape allows for the social reproduction of Aboriginal society (Morphy 1995:185-7). In this case, time is subordinate to place (Morphy 1995:188), and “people learn about the past simply by moving through the landscape” (Morphy 1995:196).

Similar to Morphy (1995), Santos-Granero’s (1998) work among the Yanesha of the Peruvian Amazon analyzes the ways in which memory, events, and rituals inscribed as “topographs” onto the landscape transmit knowledge about Yanehsa territory to its inhabitants. Like the Yolngu landscape, the Yanesha landscape has undergone
changes in a more recent history of territorial colonization and modern development. Thus, both ancestral and contemporary events are inscribed onto the landscape as acts of consecration and desecration (Santos-Granero 1998:131). In both cases, the landscape transmits the story of the Yanesha and their territorial occupation of the landscape to present generations.

The ways in which these studies emphasize process and time among indigenous and aboriginal peoples is distinct from the dominant literatures of peasants. As I noted above, the recursive component of time and place tends to be reserved for indigenous societies. By contrast, in cultural and political ecology, history is linear and process is relegated to the overarching themes of economy, policy, and history. Peasants are often treated as part of the problem in the transformation of indigenous landscapes. This echoes the work of Bender (2001:76), who indicates that people “on-the-move”, such as the displaced ribeirinhos, are usually regarded as “out-of-place”.

However, subjective and objective understandings of place are not wholly incompatible. Part of recursivity is acknowledging and incorporating changes that come from outside and actively change and shape local place. Attention to recursivity and process lends depth and precision to local understandings of place and identity. Treating landscape as process (Bender 2002; Hirsch 1995; Morphy 1995) enhances traditional approaches by adding the critical dimension of time to space, referred to as the “temporality of the landscape” (Ingold 1993).

Ingold’s (1993, 2000) concept of temporality challenges the typical function of time in place in the Western tradition, and holds value for this study of Amazonian peasants and place. Because of temporality, one can “move from one present to another without
having to break through any chronological barrier” (Ingold 2000:159). The work of Hirsch (1995), Morphy (1995), and Santos-Granero (1998) provide useful application of the concept of temporality to indigenous societies that I extend in the ensuing chapters to this case study of Amazonian peasants.

**Attachment to place**

The work described above by Gray (2003:233) is exemplary of the ways practice, in this case shepherding, “is an activity of creating places that entails a sentimental attachment to them.” Although the act of shepherding is a livelihood (i.e., an economic necessity), the shepherds acquire a sense of place that supersedes and subsumes its economic potential. This sense of, or “attachment to”, place is prevalent among the ribeirinhos of the Iriri, as I will show in succeeding chapters.

Appreciation of attachment to place begins with the recognition that the material and emotive aspects of livelihood practices (and therefore, of dwelling) are inseparable. According to Gray (2003:225), “The hills are not just spaces for work”: the material and social resources that surround people enable them to dwell. Mundane practices, including walking from one place to another (de Certeau 1984; see also Ingold 2000), tending to sheep (Gray 2003), or buying food in a Costa Rica market (Richardson 2003) are key to dwelling because they are simultaneously acts of remembrance (Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), sources of identity (Gray 2003; Ingold 2000), and expressions of belonging (Bender 2002). As recursive practices with material and affective dimensions, they produce a “sense” of, or “attachment to,” place, which is indicative of dwelling. Basso (1996:54-55) expresses this as follows: “Sensing places, men and women become sharply aware of the complex attachments that link them to features of the physical world.”
Furthermore, forming an attachment to place is an act of Heideggerian "building". As Heidegger (1977:326) indicates, building follows dwelling. The aforementioned work of Basso (1996), Gray (2003), Morphy (1995) and Santos-Granero (1998) illustrate that discursive and non-discursive knowledge and practices are indicative of building. Basso (1996:73) claims that when places are named, they "move more surely into view"; in a sense, named places become "buildings". Gray (2003:234) concludes his analysis of the hirsel as a site (place) created by the sheep and the practice of shepherding. The physical and natural attributes of the landscape, as described by Morphy (1995) and Santos-Granero (1998), are also buildings. In other words, buildings are not only physical infrastructure of a dwelling; physical features of the landscape to which people become attached represent buildings in their ability to invoke a sense of place and belonging, to protect, and to provide for those who dwell therein.

Attachment to place is variously defined and explored. The philosopher Gaston Bachelard (1969:xxxi) coined the term “topophilia” (“love of place”) to “determine the human value of the sorts of space that may be grasped, that may be defended against adverse forces, the space we love.” Basso (1996:54) refers to the concept of place attachment as “that close companion of heart and mind, often subdued, yet potentially overwhelming, that is known as sense of place.” In 1976, geographer Yi-Fu Tuan (1976, 1977) also used the terms “sentiment” and “attachment” interchangeably in his two treatises on the subject of place. He developed the idea of “geopiety” (Tuan 1976) as a profound sense of belonging to one’s native land (or “homeland;” Tuan 1977:158).

The concept was adopted and further developed by a variety of disciplines such as psychology, architecture, urban planning, geography, and gerontology (Altman and Low
the scholars of which “would like to evoke ‘a sense of place’” in their work (Tuan 1977:3). A comprehensive definition of attachment to place that I have selected is one formulated by environmental psychologist James Ponzetti (2003) who defines it as the “elaborate interplay of emotion, cognition, and behavior in reference to place.” This definition accounts for sense of place, people’s ideas of place, and people’s place-based practices.

Of particular relevance to this study is the way in which the concept has been analytically applied by natural resource managers in North American protected and recreational areas (Davenport and Anderson 2005; Kruger and Jakes 2003; Vaske and Kobrin 2001; Williams et al. 1992; Williams and Vaske 2003). Specifically, this body of research examines the functional and symbolic attachments visitors have to wilderness and recreation areas, including those senses of place evoked through past experiences in a particular landscape, and those that may not be attributed to observable features in the landscape. This work emerged in response to increasing demand by United States government agencies, which recognized that land-use planning and management could be improved by understanding people’s place-based behaviors motivated by affective attachments to place. Kruger and Jakes (2003:820) describe this emergent trend:

“Managers are seeking ways to incorporate this [affective, experiential and material] knowledge of place into resource planning and management, and social scientists have called for tools and conceptual frameworks that allow managers to access, assess, inventory and monitor sociocultural meanings of places in order to incorporate socially relevant meanings into social inquiry and planning processes.” These meanings are spiritual, symbolic, and historical, and are generally not included in quantitative,
economic, and knowledge-based measures of success in natural resource and recreation areas.

In these studies, the material and economic aspects of place, as well as the spiritual, symbolic, and historical meanings described above, were defined according to two “dimensions”: place identity and place dependence. The concept of place identity originated with environmental psychologists, who deduced that human-environment interactions lead to a cognitive development model that includes memories, ideas, feelings, and attitudes (Proshansky et al. 1983). They define place identity as an emotional attachment that includes identity and belonging, and tends to develop over time. In contrast, Williams and Vaske (2003:831) define place dependence as a functional attachment, whereby the place of interest provides particular characteristics that help the user attain goals or engage in desired activities. In Chapter 4, I present the results of a factor analysis based on a questionnaire adapted from these studies, in which place identity and place dependence emerged as salient dimensions of the ribeirinhos’ sense of place. However, unlike these studies, my analyses follow from phenomenology and do not adhere to the ontological separation between “functional” attachments (e.g., place dependence) from affective attachments (e.g., place identity) to place.

Taskscape

In this study, I also rely on Ingold’s (1993, 2000) concept of a “taskscape” as a refinement of “landscape.” For Ingold (1993:158, 2000:195), the practices that constitute dwelling are “tasks,” the “constitutive acts of dwelling” that are the embodiment of technical and social activities. The landscape is “not ‘land’, it is not ‘nature, ‘and it is not ‘space’” (Ingold 2000:190). Rather, over time, it has been transformed into a
“taskscape,” an ensemble of utilitarian and symbolic activities or practices (Ingold 2000:195). As Ingold (1993:162) states, the taskscape is to landscape as embodiment is to the body. The taskscape thus represents the dwelling perspective; specifically the practices (“tasks”) that enable people to dwell in place.

Ribeirinhos’ “tasks” are those that support the household economy through the extraction of natural resources and engagement in the basic activities of everyday life (sensu de Certeau 1984). In Chapter 5, I operationalize the concept of taskscape and apply it as a model in the study to identify and explore the ways in which the ribeirinhos' extractive activities enable them to dwell and form a sense of self and place in the Amazon. Like the Yanesha (Santos-Granero 1998) and the Yolngu (Morphy 1995), the ribeirinho landscape was created over time. Yet rather than consecrated by myths and rituals and desecrated by colonization (e.g., in Santos-Graneros’ terms; 1998:131), their practices are rooted in economic activities that sustain the household. Unlike the literatures on place and dwelling among indigenous societies, the ribeirinhos’ practices do not generally reference elaborate myths and rituals. In fact, they are mostly a result of policy interventions over the last century that were imposed upon them. Even so, these practices have led them to develop a physical, material, and symbolic sense of place (a “topophilia”; Bachelard 1969) and a place-based identity.

Conclusion: phenomenological philosophy

A dwelling perspective that includes a temporal component is one in which the practical activities in which people engage over time shape place through the recursive, referential “gathering” of memories, activities, and memories of past activities. The result is a “taskscape” (Ingold 2000) that is rich with material and symbolic meaning as
well as economic resources, emerges from engagement, and to which attachments are formed.

Places and a place-based identity are created through people’s practices as they dwell. However, with few exceptions, these ideas have been developed by anthropologists among indigenous societies. I find that they also hold significance for the peasant society that constitutes my case study (see Chapters 5 and 6). Yet as this theoretical overview also suggests, the analytical concept of “attachment to place” (as opposed to “sense of place” [Basso 1996]) has usually been measured among Western societies.

The Western distinction between “nature” (or the “environment”) and “culture” that would appear to inform a study of “attachment to place” seem to imply a separation between materialist and symbolic aspects of place. However, as Ingold (1993:158, 2000:195) states,

One of the greatest mistakes of recent anthropology—what Reynolds (1993:410) calls ‘the great tool-use fallacy’—has been to insist upon a separation between the domains of technical and social activity, a separation that has blinded us to the fact that one of the outstanding features of human technical practices lies in their embeddedness in the current of sociality.

The ways in which attachment to place studies have been designed and analyzed represent a useful conceptual and methodological bridge between disparate ontological perspectives in modern science. As philosopher Edgar Casey (1996:18) says, “There is no knowing or sensing a place except by being in that place, and to be in a place is to be in a position to perceive it. Knowledge of place is not, then, subsequent to perception but is ingredient in perception itself. To live is to live locally, and to know is first of all to know the places one is in.” The ways in which attachment to place is employed in
environmental resources studies (e.g., Williams et al. 1992) is promising for future, applied studies on “sense” of place because it accounts for people’s knowledge, behavior, and incorporates the economic, materialist, “technical” (Ingold 1993) dimensions of place referred to as “place dependence”, as well as the temporal, symbolic, and affective meanings of place referred to as “place identity”, both of which are represented in the theoretical literatures developed in this chapter.

Having identified the theoretical perspectives I have chosen to employ in this study, in the next section, I discuss their ontological and epistemological components, as well as the appropriate methods, that accompany this project. I also identify the challenges of developing a research project informed by phenomenology and practice theories alongside what I have identified as the strengths of cultural and political ecology. I then present a comprehensive approach to methods to accomplish this task. This approach is necessary eclectic, diverse, and triangulated. Qualitative and quantitative data, brought to bear in subsequent chapters, support my thesis on the emergence of ribeirinho identity and place, with implications for regional planning and policymaking in the Terra do Meio and perhaps for peasants more generally.

**Methodology**

At the beginning of the chapter, I described how I intended to build on the strengths of cultural and political ecology literatures that exist on Amazonian peasant societies by bringing them “into closer rapport” (Bender 2001:77) with phenomenology and practice theories. Bender’s (2001) work on diaspora and phenomenology was my inspiration for such a task.

This task comes with unique challenges, however. These two bodies of theory—cultural and political ecology on the one hand and phenomenology and practice theories
on the other—belong to incommensurate metatheories and paradigms and conform to different ontologies and epistemologies. While these two bodies of theory cannot be integrated, they may be uniquely applied to understand different aspects of my research problem.

I begin this final part of the chapter by introducing three metatheories in the social sciences: methodological holism, methodological individualism, and methodological relationism (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994), the last of which I rely upon in this project. I also identify the ways in which these metatheoretical perspectives may guide the researcher into particular inquiry paradigms and their corresponding ontologies, epistemologies, and methods. In particular, I discuss positivism as the dominant inquiry paradigm relied upon in science (writ large) that has been adopted by many social scientists, and specifically cultural ecologists; and postpositivism, which I utilize because it builds from the strengths of positivism and addresses its critical shortcomings. The chapter concludes with a description of specific methods that I utilize in the dissertation that fall within a postpositivist paradigm

**Metatheories**

The existing literatures on Amazonian peasants that I have highlighted in this chapter reflect a high order of theory in the sciences—a metatheory, or theory of theories—that derives knowledge from the essential, present-oriented qualities of the object of study. Ritzer and Gindoff (1994) distinguish three metatheories that have developed in sociology since its founding: methodological holism, methodological individualism, and methodological relationism (see Gillespie 2001 for a brief review of these metatheories within anthropology).
Theories in which macro-phenomena—the whole of structures or institutions—are regarded as constraining or enabling individuals belong to the category of “methodological holism” (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994:12). In methodological holism, microphenomena exist but macrophenomena, such as infrastructure, economy, environment, or ecology, are regarded as the source of explanation. In the tradition of methodological holism, individuals are granted little agency; rather, they are regarded as “epiphenomena” with limited capacity for transforming the larger systems or structures (Gillespie 2001:73) in which they are embedded.

In contrast to methodological holism, methodological individualism is a metatheory in which “explanations of all social phenomena must be rendered in terms of individuals and their actions” (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994:11). Methodological individualists, also referred to as “subjectivists”, emphasize agency at the expense of structures or other macro phenomena in the life of the agent. In other words, individualists attend to the subject, yet overlook the broader social context in which the subject is embedded.

Metatheories are organized around existing theories. The theories of cultural ecology and political ecology, for example, belong to the metatheory of methodological holism because practitioners of these theories locate explanation in a priori systems or structures. According to this perspective (and in the context of modern policy that also tends to employ this approach), landscape is treated as empty “space” that can be engineered, planned, settled, and organized according to the objectives of the State (Scott 1998). Phenomenological theory, by contrast, is often categorized as a methodological individualist theory because it highlights experience (“being”) over the objective nature of “the world” (see Bender 2001 for a review of these
phenomenological theories and a rebuttal to this perspective of phenomenology as individualist or subjectivist).

Methodological holism and methodological individualism reify the macro/micro dichotomy that I seek to overcome in this study of peasants and place. Holist and individualist approaches are equally reductionist, because they treat phenomena—macro or micro—as discrete and separate from one another. Holist and individualist approaches by themselves are insufficient for this study. As discussed in Chapter 1 and above, the ribeirinhos dwell in the interstices of political, natural, and social boundaries that shift over time in response to micro- and macro-scalar processes. The limitations of existing theories of Amazonian peasants, particularly those that belong to cultural ecology, were not directly addressed until the 1990s with the work of Nugent (1993; see also 1997, 2004, 2009), who indicated that the category caboclo is not a static “cultural type” (e.g., Moran 1974a; Steward 1955; Wagley 1976) that is the result of “systems” (Rappaport 1968) or structures. Rather, Nugent (1993) and the work of more recent scholars argued that Amazonian peasant identities are likely multiple, fluid, and ambiguous, and the result of historical processes (Adams et al. 2009; Harris 2009).

Adams et al.’s (2009), Harris’ (2009) and Nugent’s (1993, 2004, 2009) work on Amazonian peasants arrived on the tail of a theoretical shift in anthropology during the 1980s and 1990s away from holist and individualist approaches. Beginning in the 1980s, anthropologists began to critically examine the science of anthropology. At that time, Ortner (1984) anticipated a move toward an inherently relationist approach that emphasized “practice” (also known as “praxis”, and “action”; see Ortner 1984:127) over subject/object and individualist/holist approaches. Anthropologists such as Gell (1998),
Munn (1986), Ortner (1984), and Strathern (1988) pioneered this approach in their own work, propelling anthropology into the 21st century at a time when factions and divisions between holist and individualist approaches threatened the discipline (see Ortner 1984 for an overview of anthropological theory, including these divisions, since the 1960s). This perspective is one that is applicable to my research, and may be referred to as “methodological relationism” (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994), a metatheoretical perspective that accounts for the complex, shifting relationships and linkages between micro- and macro-scalar phenomena or sometimes characterized as structure and agency (e.g., Giddens 1984). Practice theories, especially those influenced by phenomenology, belong to this particular metatheory.

Ritzer and Gindoff (1994:14) define methodological relationism as follows:

Methodological relationism contends, first, that explanations of the social world must involve the relationships among individuals and society. Second, relationists do not deny the existence of either individuals or wholes. Third, individualistic and holistic concepts may be useful for gaining an understanding of social phenomena, but relational concepts must be employed if our goal is explanation.

In the Iriri, methodological relationism enables me to understand the various ways in which the ribeirinhos identify themselves in relation to the world in which they dwell. It accounts for holistic concepts, such as the “environment”, policy, and society, but does so in relation to subjective experience. In other words, methodological relationism enables me to understand the emergence of ribeirinho place and place-based identity in relation to larger order processes, not distinct from them.

---

14 Methodological relationism is one of several characterizations that emerged to overcome the limitations of holist and individualist (i.e. subjectivist) accounts. Other names for this characterization include “structuration theories” (Giddens 1984) and “Third Sociology” (Sztompa 1994).
Inquiry Paradigms

Differences between various theoretical approaches also emerge from their embedded ontologies and epistemologies and corresponding methods. Individual theories may be classified according to unique inquiry paradigms that possess specific ontological, epistemological, and methodological qualities. Guba’s (1990) discussion of inquiry paradigms provides a useful overview of the differences between ontologies, epistemologies, and methods. Speaking of inquiry paradigms, Guba (1990:18) distinguishes between ontological, epistemological, and methodological questions that are useful to include here:

Ontological: What is the nature of the “knowable”? Or, what is the nature of “reality”?

Epistemological: What is the nature of the relationship between the knower (the inquirer) and the known (or knowable)?

Methodological: How should the inquirer go about finding out knowledge?

Western science is traditionally regarded as adhering to the inquiry paradigm of positivism and its corresponding set of ontological, epistemological assumptions that have been raised, addressed, and replicated, generally using empirical methods, by researchers. Positivism is regarded as the traditional and dominant paradigm of scientific inquiry (Guba 1990; Bhaskar and Lawson 1998). Guba (1990:20) provides the following breakdown of the ontology, epistemology, and methods associated with the positivist paradigm:

---

15 Guba (1990) characterizes methods as “methodology”, a term I avoid because it infers a higher order of theories (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994). I use the term “methods” to refer to techniques in data collection and analysis.

16 Positivism is often used interchangeably with empiricism. It is the term most often used to represent empirical research, particularly that which employs the scientific method, within the social sciences (Bernard 2002; Harris 2001:11).
Ontology: Realist—reality exists “out there” and is driven by immutable natural laws and mechanisms. Knowledge of these entities, laws, and mechanisms is conventionally summarized in the form of time- and context-free generalizations. Some of these latter generalizations take the form of cause-effect laws.

Epistemology: Dualist/objectivist—it is both possible and essential for the inquirer to adopt a distant, noninteractive posture. Values and other biasing and confounding factors are thereby automatically excluded from influencing the outcomes.

Methodology: Experimental/manipulative—questions and/or hypotheses are stated in advance in propositional form and subjected to empirical tests (falsification) under carefully controlled conditions.

For positivists, ontology—the “nature of the knowable” (Guba 1990:18)—originates in the mind (cognition). Epistemologically, research is conducted in a neutral, disengaged position with research subjects; doing otherwise would confound the study with biases. Positivist methods are experimental, controlled, and generally test hypotheses or answer specific research questions. Data are subjected to rigorous tests of validity and reliability (Guba 1990:20). The cultural ecology of Rappaport (1967, 1968, 1990), for example, is renowned for positivist, methodological rigor; Rappaport’s work included detailed and controlled measurements of energy input and output of his research subjects.

As Hellliwell (1996:129) states, the shortcomings of a positivist approach in social science derive from the ontological primacy granted to cognition and structure, which “accord bounded social entities a higher facticity” because they are visible in the present moment and may be directly observed and measured. For example, the political and cultural ecology literatures treat “caboclos” and “extractivists” as discrete and bounded cultural categories, a clear reference to the realist ontology in positivism. Positivism is

---

17 Cartesian dualisms become apparent in these paradigms. In a similar vein, phenomenology is often associated with relativism.
inherently less attentive to emergent phenomena\textsuperscript{18} that are always in a state of becoming and therefore cannot be completely understood through their essential qualities. In other words, positivism inadequately addresses critical aspects of society that are not directly observable because they are in flux in relation to macro-scale phenomena (e.g., policy) and micro-scale phenomena (e.g., subjective, experiential, and sensory). Anthropology is an historical science (Aberle1987; Kroeber 1963); it addresses "entities and groups of entities that have traceable continuity over time, but that also change" (Aberle 1987:556). There is a definite historical component to my analyses of who the ribeirinhos "are" at different times. Positivism, by contrast, is a present-oriented paradigm that deals with observable phenomena as they are right now.

The theories I have elected belong to a postpositivist paradigm. Postpositivism emerged from positivism as an alternative to the shortcomings of positivism (Guba 1990; see also Bhaskar 2008; Collier 1998; Gosden 1994). The ontological, epistemological, and methodological premises of positivism and postpositivism, as developed by Guba (1990:20-23), are below:

Ontology: Critical realist—reality exists but can never be fully apprehended. It is driven by natural laws that can be only incompletely understood.

Epistemology: Modified objectivist—objectivity remains a regulatory ideal, but it can only be approximated, with special emphasis placed on external guardians such as the critical tradition and the critical community.

Methodology: Modified experimental/manipulative—emphasize critical multiplism. Redress imbalances by doing inquiry in more natural settings, using more qualitative methods, depending more on grounded theory, and reintroducing discovery into the inquiry process.

In contrast with positivists, postpositivists adopt a "critical realist" ontology, also acknowledged as a philosophical movement that began with the writings of Roy

\textsuperscript{18} Emergent phenomena are discussed by Bhaskar (1993, 1998) in the context of Hegelian dialecticism.
Bhaskar (2008) in response to the shortcomings of Cartesian realism (Collier 1998:688; see also Guba 1990). In contrast with the realist ontology in positivism, critical realism asserts that objective reality can never be completely understood (Bhaskar and Lawson 1998:ix; Guba 1990:20). Epistemologically, postpositivists embrace interaction with research subjects, regarding that interaction as an integral part of the inquiry process. Furthermore, they eschew the positivist ideal of context-free reality, asserting instead that while reality exists, it can only be approximated through the research inquiry process (Guba 1990:21). Methods and data sources are often multiple and value is placed on triangulation. Postpositivists thoughtfully encounter the topic of (im)balance as part of an eclectic research design, including the balance between rigor and relevance, precision and richness, elegance and applicability, and discovery and verification (Guba 1990:21-23).

Methods

In the traditions of postpositivism and methodological relationism, I have elected a set of qualitative and quantitative techniques—a range of practices used to collect data known colloquially in the social sciences as “methods”—which were designed and informed by phenomenology and practice theory. As a result, the data provide a range of results as a means of validating and closely “approximating” (Guba 1990:22) ribeirinho place, identity, and sense of place.

The most structured and derived technique I employed was a factor analysis on an “attachment to place” questionnaire, described in Chapter 4 and found in Appendix B. The questionnaire, adapted from the aforementioned work by Williams et al. (1992), incorporated ribeirinho statements of place and identity collected during interviews and recorded narratives. Rather than test the ribeirinhos on statements of place in Western
studies of place attachment, I also tested them on their repeated statements of place, practice, and identity collected in interviews during my first field season. This took six months to achieve but I was pleased with the final result because it was informed by the specific theories and models presented in this chapter. Furthermore, the approach is one that I favored because it allows for inductive rather than deductive manipulation of qualitative and quantitative data (Benfer 1972; Rummel 1970:3), giving the researcher control over interpretation of the dimensions. My methodology is therefore well-aligned with postpositivism.

In addition, I utilized a thorough household questionnaire that was adapted from research conducted in extractive reserves in Acre, which contained structured and semi-structured sections (see Appendix A). The purpose of this questionnaire was to gather data on household consumption, practices, and participation in broader policies and processes. The results from this questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistical analyses and are primarily explored in Chapter 4.

To understand ribeirinho conception of place, I traveled with the ribeirinhos to places they identified as “places of importance”, “the boundaries of this place”, and “places where I am able to practice my profession”. I also accompanied them on informal trips to places where they socialized, ran an errand, or conducted business (e.g., trading goods or gifting manioc flour or game meat to neighbors and relatives). Often, the purposes of these informal trips were conflated. My intention was to understand, record, and communicate the ways in which locations “gather” for the ribeirinhos (sensu Heidegger 1977; see also Gray 2003), constituting ribeirinho place.
Representations of place took the form of “emic” (insider, or “folk”; Bernard 2002:430) maps that depict landscape as a network of related places (see Albert and Tourneau 2007 for an example). This method, sometimes referred to as “ethnocartography” (e.g., Chapin and Threlkeld 2001), has become an effective political tool on behalf of indigenous people in recent years due to enhanced technology (Chapin and Threlkeld 2001; Heckenberger 2004, 2009; see also the digital cartography of the Instituto Socioambiental in Brazil [http://www.socioambiental.org/map/index.shtm] and of the Instituto del Bién Común in Peru [http://www.ibcperu.org/mapas/]). Formal mapping was conducted using a handheld GPS unit\(^{19}\) and participatory mapping and in situ interviews constituted informal mapping exercises. The result was a series of “maps”. Some maps were technical, created by downloading the GPS coordinates onto a GIS in which geopolitical points of interest and deforestation were already inputted. Others were maps sketched in focus groups, during which participants were asked to sketch the land that pertains to their households, including rubber trails and Brazil nut groves. A final map was an organic exercise in “drawing this place”. This one took on a life of its own, with people coming and going for a period of a few weeks and making a contribution to what became a graphic, multilocal and multivocal illustration of place.

The maps I elected for this study are presented in Chapters 4 and 5. Other participatory exercises included the creation of a timeline of events and seasonal calendars of activities.

Finally, I conducted several hundred hours of participant observation and semi-structured interviews over the course of my fieldwork. Discourse forms an important part

\(^{19}\) The handheld device did not work well under forest cover, and I did not have an antenna to capture a signal in the forest. Points were therefore collected primarily along the river.
of this study of place. As Giddens (1984) demonstrates, agents possess discursive and non-discursive practical knowledge. In addition, Basso (1996) indicates that anthropologists are especially privy to notions of an ethnogeography or sense of place when it reaches the level of discursiveness; this is an anthropological adaptation necessary for the use of phenomenological perspectives. To understand the ribeirinhos' discursive knowledge of place, I conducted interviews about life histories and the rubber boom; places of interest; knowledge of the social movement or the broader civil society groups that represent traditional peoples in Brazil; their relationship to the forest and the river; and, particularly at the beginning of my work, about identity: being a ribeirinho, an extractivist, a rubber tapper, and their understanding of “caboclo”. These more discursive data are presented throughout the dissertation and intermingle the ribeirinhos’ voices with my own. Whenever possible, these data are presented in conjunction with observations of material interactions (i.e., practices) during the interview process.

Conclusion

This chapter has identified the strengths of the existing literatures on Amazonian peasants, provided a critique of their shortcomings for this particular study of place, and highlighted notable exceptions in the literatures for this study of place. Cultural ecologists have acknowledged the significance of caboclo societies; however, in cultural ecology work, space tends to be treated in terms of ecological systems, to which culture is the primary means of adaptation. With some exceptions, political ecology does not adequately emplace peasants in the landscape because of the primacy given to macroscale phenomena. Furthermore, political ecology discourse has been appropriated by state and social movements, blurring the lines between local agency,
scientific objectivism and political agendas. Brazil’s periods of development and conservation form an integral part of this body of academic literature. As this literature review has shown, recent policies often appear in dialogue with the literatures, demonstrating the fluidity between the academy and political agendas, and the power of strategic academic and political alliances with local people to effect policy change. The extractive reserve model is one example of the ways strategic alliances accommodate both nature and culture through the enforcement of identities and the creation of land use categories that incorporate but restrict human use and occupation of nature.

While effective, the consequences of relying exclusively upon economic, environmental, or political arguments for a study of peasants and place are numerous. The strategic posturing of human-environment agendas was made possible by the creation of environmentally friendly extractivist identities. These identities furthered a provocative, innovative, and timely agenda that sought to balance the critical, dual agendas of human rights and environmental conservation. The expectations generated at the outset for peasant livelihood improvement and conservation-compatible resource uses are, however, often untenable over the long term. They reinforce the idea of peasants as passive subjects of particular historic and economic processes, with a largely pejorative regional identity as caboclos.

Peasants’ historical movements and their “non-indigenous” status do not preclude meaningful engagement with the environment and the formation of a strong sense of place. Rather than assign identities to speak to broader social and political movements, an understanding of peasants’ meaningful engagement with the material world in relation to broader forces illuminates local identities and practices that have much to
offer to effective policy and natural resource management. To address these shortcomings in the literature and the repercussions of strategic posturing on Amazonian peasants, I have offered specific theories and models that pertain to a methodological relationist approach and a postpositivist research paradigm that, as Bender (2001) suggests, bring the existing cultural and political ecology literatures into closer rapport with phenomenology and practice theories. At the highest level of theoretical abstraction, methodological relationism and its corresponding ontologies and epistemologies enable me to use divergent theoretical perspectives—in particular, phenomenologically informed practice theories—as a way to understand, holistically, different aspects of my research problem. My methods reflect this undertaking.

A relationist approach provides relief from the reductionist economic and rational choice explanations for human behavior that are often applied to Amazonian peasants. It also provides an alternative to symbolic, myth- and ritual-based explanations typically reserved for indigenous societies. In my research design, this approach helped overcome the subject/object and macro/micro dichotomies upheld in dominant scientific perspectives.

Phenomenologically informed practice theories illuminate the referential relationship the ribeirinhos have with “place”, the multi-scalar phenomena that form a part of that relationship, and the sense of self and of place that emerge from it. As the following chapters illustrate, place (i.e., the “environment”) for the ribeirinhos is not only the natural and built surroundings of the forest, the homes, or the river; nor is it defined by policy. Rather, place is best understood through ribeirinho practices as they dwell.
In the following chapter (Chapter 3), I reexamine the wartime rubber boom period as an historical context from which my informants emerged. As I have demonstrated in this chapter, the dominant literatures on Amazonian peasants tend to preclude their experiences of movement and meaningful engagement with the materiality of place. I thus explore the wartime rubber boom period in Brazil through the lens of place, tracing the rubber tappers' journey from displacement in the northeast to the beginnings of emplacement in the Amazon. In doing so, I connect these migrants as agents of this history to the broader theoretical and political literatures reviewed in this chapter.
CHAPTER 3
RUBBER SOLDIERS

Introduction

Chapter 2 described the literatures and periods in which Amazonian identities and land designations were created for the purpose of developing national and international agendas related to development and conservation. I suggested that cultural ecology tends to relegate caboclos to an adaptive “outcome” of the material environment, depriving them of agency and history, while political ecology tends to privilege macroeconomic and political processes over local practices. As a result, Amazonian peasants, such as those with whom I conducted this study, are treated as a product of history and constrained by their surroundings, to which they “adapt” and “respond” (e.g. Moran 1974a, 1981). I indicated that history is critical to this study; people’s practices are a product of history because agents and structures are coimplicated in practices (Giddens 1984). Over time, these practices become secondhand, commonplace, and mundane (de Certeau 1984); they become embodied (Bourdieu 1977).

In this chapter, I contribute these latter, phenomenologically informed perspectives on practices, structure, and agency to more carefully examine the historical context of the rubber boom from which my study population emerged. I approach this task through the lens of place, regarding their arrival in the Amazon as a journey from displacement to emplacement. During this period, two distinct social and geographic regions and place-based identities were catapulted—suddenly and intensely—into international visibility: the northeast of Brazil and the Amazon. In framing the narrative of this history, I aim to link the theory- and policy-centered (intellectual, top-down) approach in the previous chapter (Chapter 2) to a people-centered (lived, contingent, bottom-up)
approach in subsequent chapters, exemplifying the connection between global and local scales of analysis.

Specifically, in this chapter, I highlight the journey from nordestino (northeasterner) or sertanejo (backlander; from the northeast) rooted in the semi-arid sertão (backlands) to seringueiro (rubber tapper) or soldado da borracha (rubber soldier) placed in the humid tropics. This journey marks the beginning of an ideological and material shift in both identity and place. While the decision to make this journey was motivated by macroeconomic, political, and environmental factors (e.g., Dean 1987; Schmink 1985; Weinstein 1983) scholars of place have long noted that human decisions concerning place are complex, and include symbolic, affective, and ideological factors (e.g., Bachelard 1969; Ingold 2000; Reynolds 1993; Stein and Lee 1995; Tuan 1976, 1977; Williams et al. 1992; Williams and Vaske 2003). In Chapter 2, I suggested that distinguishing between material and symbolic aspects of place and practice overlooks the complex ways in which they are interrelated. In this chapter, I address these perspectives as a mutually constituted whole that illuminates the rubber tappers’ decisions to leave the northeast, and the beginnings of emplacement, including the development of a sense of place and identity, that transpired after they were established in the Amazon. By incorporating the ribeirinhos' voices, memories, and opinions into this history, I identify the contradictions and assumptions in the mainstream literature about the rubber boom, and provide agency (or micro-history) to a history typically described through the lens of macroeconomic and political factors and environmental conditions.

The chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, “The Wartime Rubber Boom”, I provide background about the classic (1890-1910) and wartime (1940-1945)
rubber boom periods, including the social, economic, and ecological factors highlighted in the scholarly literature. These factors are credited as the leading explanations for how Brazil became the major supplier of natural rubber (*Hevea brasiliensis*) at two distinct moments in time. This section reviews economic and environmental factors that led Brazil to gain and then lose this position in the global economy.

The second section, “From Nordestino to Soldado”, explores the events in the northeast of the country prior to the rubber boom that brought about the northeasterners’ displacement from their places of origin, and that led to their geographic and ideological emplacement in the Amazon. The scholarly literatures on the rubber boom and rubber “bust” attribute the successful recruitment to structural impetuses, including economic hardship and environmental conditions in the northeast of Brazil. They also identify economic opportunity in the Amazon, provided by the rising price of rubber in the international market, as a driving force for migration. While structural conditions provide compelling explanations for the northeasterners’ (usually) voluntary relocation, I found that these explanations overlook local experiences of displacement and emplacement, which I highlight in this section. I also identify the government “strategies” (sensu de Certeau 1984) utilized during the recruitment campaign. These included effective gendered and cultural rhetoric and print media that equated the practice of rubber tapping with national defense, and “enlisting” as a rubber soldier a matter of patriotic duty.

The third section, “The Practice of Rubber Tapping and the Making of Place in the Amazon”, examines the ways in which the rubber soldiers’ newly acquired practices contributed to the early development of a sense of place in the Amazon. The wartime
rubber period is one that is internationally recognized for its abusive and dangerous working conditions and debt peonage system (da Cunha 1967:23; Dean 1987:41). Indeed, the literature on rubber tappers describes a lifestyle that is akin to slavery. The former rubber tappers from my field site, however, speak very favorably of this period, and also of the rubber barons. I explore this contradiction, linking it with the phenomenological literatures on building and dwelling (Heidegger 1977; Ingold 1993, 2000; and see Chapter 2). While economic, political, and environmental conditions and government strategies during the recruitment period initiated a sense of place among rubber tappers in the Amazon, I argue that over time, it was solidified by their practices, including rubber tapping.

The chapter concludes with a section titled “The Rubber ‘Bust’”, which describes the effects of the devalued price of rubber in the international market on the rubber soldiers in the forest. The rubber soldiers were abandoned by the structural forces and government programs responsible for their arrival. Ironically, these programs ensured the rubber tappers’ continued survival in the forest since they had equipped them with skills and practices that enabled continued survival in the forest. Among those who chose to remain, and their children and grandchildren, are today the ribeirinhos of the Iriri who were my informants for this project.

This chapter tells the story of the rubber soldiers within a largely chronological organization. Throughout, I incorporate the voices and opinions of the rubber tappers from my field site and secondary sources from media, fiction, and scholarly literature in Brazil, to supplement the standard scholarly literatures of North America and Europe. By doing so, I intend to highlight the complex forms of early place-making that occur in
the midst of macro-level constraints and conditions. Three principal, cross-cutting themes are addressed throughout the chapter: (1) displacement and nostalgia for place; (2) practices, including the often difficult and awkward adoption of new livelihood practices in a new place; and (3) the formation of place-based identity. These themes encompass an array of factors that played a role in the nordestinos’ decisions to leave their places of origin, and their subsequent adoption of a new place and place-based identity through new livelihood practices.

**The Wartime Rubber Boom**

The arrival of rubber tappers in the Amazon from 1850 to the 1910s, and again during WWII, formed part of a transnational migration of several hundred thousand individuals, mostly young single men from the northeast of Brazil. These individuals arrived primarily from the state of Ceará, but others came from Maranhão, Paraíba, Pernambuco, Rio Grande do Norte, and Bahia (Benchimol 1999:135-6) (Figure 3-1).

Demand for rubber surged in the United States and Europe in the 19th century during what is referred to as the classic rubber boom period (1890-1910). In 1839, Charles Goodyear perfected the vulcanization process (Weinstein 1983:8), which made rubber resistant to both heat and cold and useful in the manufacturing of a broad range of products. Demand for rubber surged again in the 1890s during the bicycle craze (Weinstein 1983:143).

Both the classic and WWII rubber boom periods were punctuated by catastrophic droughts and economic crises in the northeast of the country. Drought is considered a primary driver of northeastern out-migration, including to the Amazon during the classic and wartime rubber boom periods (Benchimol 1999:136; Sietz et al. 2006:134; Weinstein 1983:84). During the classic period, approximately 300,000 northeasterners
migrated to the Amazon (Benchimol 1999:136). During the wartime period, the U.S. and Brazilian governments attempted to recruit an additional 100,000 northeasterners (Dean 1987:93). However, poor planning led that number to be reduced approximately by half (Villa 2000:164) before recruitment was underway, and deaths en route to the Amazon ultimately led to only 34,000 recruits arriving in the Amazon (Dean 1987:96; Martinello 2004:228). The recruits travelled principally by extremely difficult navigation by river and road without any infrastructure, supplies, or places to dock. Lacking medical attention, many died during this journey.

In 1910, Brazil’s stronghold over rubber fell to the more successful and resilient rubber plantations in British colonial Malaya. Southeast Asian plantation rubber was not exposed to the Amazonian leaf blight (Dean 1987) and was more efficiently harvested because of high density monocultures with easy access, compared to low density, wild rubber populations within highly diverse native forests in remote regions. A swift decline in wild rubber production in the Amazonian interior followed the emergence of plantation rubber, and by 1913 no new investment in wild rubber occurred in the Brazilian Amazon (Dean 1987).

Rubber tapping nonetheless continued in Brazil between the decades of the 1920s and 1930s, although not at the same scale as before. This changed dramatically in the 1940s with the onset of World War II. In February of 1942, the Japanese occupation of Southeast Asia effectively disconnected the Allies from 92 percent of natural rubber.

---

1 There is lengthy dispute in the literature over the accurate number of recruits during the classic boom period. Estimates range from 300,000 to over 500,000. See the work of Santos (1980), Furtado (1982) and Benchimol (1999) for more information. I rely on the figure of 300,000 used by the Brazilian sociologist Benchimol (1999:136).

2 Present day Malaysia.
production. During WWII, rubber was a critically needed material used to supply military vehicles and wartime aircraft with tires, and it was the primary material used to make surgical gloves (Dean 1987). In the United States, insufficient rubber supply also posed a threat to the national economy as rubber was needed for tires for approximately 100,000 American automobiles and countless bicycles. The United States’ inability to access the Asian rubber supply thus posed an economic and, for wartime efforts, logistical and operative crisis that required immediate redress. In response, the U.S. government immediately looked to tropical regions of Africa and Latin America for supplementary sources of latex. Brazil was regarded as the most attractive supplier because of its estimated 200 million wild rubber trees available for harvest and its existing, trained rubber tapping population, which was presumed to continue to reside in rubber producing regions (Dean 1987; Martinello 2004).

On March 3, 1942, Brazil and the United States entered into an agreement for rubber production and export. Under these “Washington Accords”, Brazil agreed to undertake a massive rubber producing operation exclusively for the United States during a period of five years, shipping the surplus only after they satisfied their own demand. In turn, the United States would provide materials and money for recruitment and infrastructure (Dean 1987). An international organization called the Rubber Development Corporation (RDC), financed with capital from U.S. industries, was established as the primary benefactor of the Washington Accords (Martinello 2004). The RDC provided Brazil with the financing needed for infrastructure, recruitment, transportation, and supplies needed to expand the trade (Dean 1987:93).
Prior to recruitment, some investigation was conducted into the existing labor supply to determine whether there were sufficient, existing laborers who possessed rubber tapping skills to assist in the wartime effort. This experienced population, estimated at 34,000 people (Martinello 2004:209), could have represented an asset during the wartime recruitment period because of their history as rubber tappers. Nonetheless, representatives from Brazil, Europe, and the U.S. were unenthusiastic about the existing rubber tappers as a labor source for the wartime boom (Garfield 2006; Nugent 1993) because they were symbolic of the previous failure of rubber, which was inconsistent with the patriotic ideology of the wartime period. These former rubber tappers had undergone significant cultural transformation as they intermarried with the tapuio population (indigenous; referred to as “deculturated” or “detribalized” Indians; Schmink and Wood 1992:xxiv) creating a unique caboclo identity.

As discussed in Chapter 2, caboclos have been recognized in the Brazilian Amazon since the European use of African and indigenous slave labor after the conquest (Meggers 1950; Parker 1985b). The population experienced a surge in the post-rubber boom periods as a result of the influx of northeasterners to the Amazon who remained in the forest after the collapse of the rubber economy (Benchimol 1999; Wagley 1976; Weinstein 1983). Without resources or support, those seringueiros who did not perish or attempt to return to northeastern Brazil remained abandoned in the forest after the classic period ended (Benchimol 1999; Garfield 2006; Weinstein 1980). The social dynamics in the Amazon underwent a major shift because these caboclos gained autonomy from the rubber barons after the devaluation of rubber (Weinstein 1983). Although a few rubber barons continued to exert some power over various
rubber tapping regions, their influence weakened in the face of a diversified extractive economy (Weinstein 1983). Seringueiro livelihood practices expanded from rubber tapping to include swidden agriculture, hunting, fishing, and the extraction of some forest products, including some rubber.

Rather than recognize their abilities as capable forest dwellers and an asset for the wartime effort, Brazilian, European, and U.S. representatives from the government and rubber industry saw these transformed caboclos as a threat to the civilized campaign of the wartime recruitment and rubber production. This is evident from the following description by representatives of the British rubber industry (Woodroffe and Smith 1916:134-5) during the decline of rubber in the early twentieth century, which characterizes these former rubber tappers, who had become caboclos, as undependable laborers and backwoods, uncivilized people:

[They] are also recruited from the flotsam of such places as Manaus and Pará (Belém), where criminals, who are already practiced seringueiros, are wont to congregate at certain seasons in order to indulge in their natural lusts and wickedness...These men can be depended upon to do good work for a time...but they decamp, possibly after committing a murder or two...[and so on] (cited in Nugent 1993:24).

In 1940, President Getúlio Vargas lauded the northeastern pioneers who had arrived in the Amazon during the classic boom period, but denigrated the caboclos they had become in the interim (Garfield 2006:282). Representatives from the U.S. consul in Belém, capital of the state of Pará, had a similarly unfavorable, albeit less caustic, opinion of rubber tappers from the classic period as “individuals who perhaps have tapped rubber in the past and gave it up for farming, fishing, or just plain loafing” (Garfield 2006:283).
As these accounts suggest, the caboclos were perceived as lazy because they were accused of “choosing” to lead a subsistence lifestyle rather than contribute to the national economy after the classic boom period. It is more likely that their autonomy from the rubber barons and the emergence of their caboclo identity represented a threat to the viability of the wartime campaign. After all, these caboclos had already experienced coercion, low wages, and difficult working conditions, and had persisted and survived in isolation and “invisibility” (Nugent 1993), including relative social and economic independence since the classic boom period. Regardless, the rubber tappers who had remained in the Amazon after the classic rubber boom period were considered unsuitable, undesirable, lazy, and too “backwoods” for the efforts outlined in the Washington Accords and generated by the wartime rubber crisis (Garfield 2006; Nugent 1993).

To fill the urgent demand for laborers specified in the Washington Accords, a recruitment and training program called the “Special Service to Mobilize Workers to the Amazon” (Serviço Especial de Mobilização dos Trabalhadores para Amazônia – SEMTA) was approved by President Vargas on December 22, 1942. Based in the city of Fortaleza in the state of Ceará, recruiters from SEMTA filtered through the northeast of Brazil enlisting primarily young, single men\(^3\) to fill the labor demand needed in the Amazon (Garfield 2006).

Brazil’s state-sponsored recruitment effort was swift and sophisticated, although there is some variation between the secondary sources (e.g., Benchimol 1965; Martinello 2004; Oliveira 2004; Teixeira de Mello 1956) and my informants about the

---

\(^3\) Garfield (2006:284) reports that under SEMTA, 70% of the recruited men would be single, and 30% would be married but unaccompanied by their wives and children.
recruitment process. Some of the ribeirinhos of the Iriri report that their recruitment was
directly negotiated with rubber barons, and the process was less formal than the
accounts in the secondary literature. A resident of the Iriri described his recruitment as
follows:

I met Anfrísio⁴ by word of mouth. People were commenting that he had been going around, looking for people from the northeast to bring to the Iriri. I was in [a municipality] when he arrived to recruit. I was born there because my parents were recruited [during the classic boom period]. He asked me, “Where are you from? You know how to tap rubber, right?” I told him I come from northeasterners and I knew how to do what he was looking for. [He responded.] “Ah, okay, so I’m going to take you with me to the Iriri. It’s all set and done.” And so, I came.

In an acclaimed documentary released in 2004 by the Brazilian government called
Borracha para a Vitória (“Rubber for Victory”; Oliveira 2004), former rubber soldiers
describe how recruits would pick up young men from the street, giving them no chance
to say goodbye to their families. Others describe it as nearly being “snatched” from the
street. Some sources describe disingenuous strategies used by the recruiters, including
obligating them to choose between either working as a rubber tapper or enlisting in the
military for combat against the Italians or Germans. One rubber soldier who currently
lives in a shanty in Manaus stated, “I enlisted as a rubber soldier because my mother
cried a lot and didn’t want me to join the army” (New York Times 5/15/1991). This
indicates that some recruits “enlisted” because their families were worried they would
die in battle, not realizing that they were risking their lives going to the Amazon.

In Ceará, where recruitment was heaviest, northeasterners were sent to a training
camp in Fortaleza where they underwent weeks of extensive physical training and

---

⁴ Anfrísio Nunes, a famous rubber baron in the Terra do Meio region, and specifically the Iriri River, during the classic and wartime rubber boom. For more information, see Nunes (2003), Weinstein (1983:24), and below.
medical examinations. The camp was designed to accustom the future rubber soldier to
the demands of life in the forest, including the work schedule and physical labor.
Recruits were thus awakened before dawn and began rigorous physical activity for
several hours, punctuated by a brief and light breakfast. In the medical exams,
diagrams of preferred male “biotypes” were used to select those with a preferable
physique for rubber tapping (Oliveira 2004). If physical exams were passed, the recruits
were given vaccinations and a kit of supplies needed for the jungle, including a
hammock, plate, knife, backpack, and the standard uniform: blue pants, white cotton
shirt, straw hat, and rubber shoes.

Keeping with the nationalist and patriotic focus, the rubber soldiers were trained to
march in cadence while reciting rubber campaign songs (“Long live the Brazilian soldier!
Your product will be useful all over the world.”). Marching in cadence became a routine
public display during this period in the training centers of the northeast, such as
Fortaleza, as well as the port cities to which the rubber soldiers were subsequently
deployed, such as Manaus in the state of Amazonas and Belém in the state of Pará
(Martinello 2004; Oliveira 2004). The rubber tappers were thus given a national basis for
identity and pride as rubber soldiers, which stood in sharp contrast to the backlander
identity (sertanejo) that they possessed in the northeastern sertão. The documentary
Borracha para a Vitória shows footage of northeasterners in SEMTA training camps in
Fortaleza. Before departing in their uniforms with a pack of supplies on their backs, the
rubber soldiers, standing at attention in orderly rows, listened to instructions from
President Vargas and other political leaders broadcast from a megaphone mounted on
a tall pole in the center of the camp. In this announcement, the newly selected rubber
soldiers were saluted for their bravery, congratulated for their patriotism, and encouraged to reunite with their families when the war ended, just as the military soldiers would.

Nervous yet full of anticipation, the rubber soldiers were transported to the Amazon for work. The rubber recruitment campaign was a massive undertaking and received international attention, including from the German military, which dispatched submarines from the Atlantic Ocean up the Amazon River to survey the transport of rubber soldiers on troopships to Amazonian headwaters (New York Times 5/15/1991; Oliveira 2004). Upon arriving in the Amazon region, however, the recruitment plans seem to have fallen apart. Of the estimated 100,000 rubber soldiers recruited during this period, only 34,000 completed the four-month journey to their intended places of work in the Amazon region. Many died en route to the Amazon while others escaped during the voyage (New York Times 5/15/1991).

**From Nordestino to Soldado**

Economic and environmental factors are the primary reasons cited in the literature for a facile recruitment process from the northeast to the Amazon. These explanations for relocation are important to consider, given that this region has long been affected by severe drought and poverty. However, closer examination reveals that the decisions to leave were not only economic and environmental; they were more complex (Garfield 2006; Oliveira 2004; Teixeira de Melo 1956).

Weinstein (1983:84) calls drought the “single most important factor” responsible for the rush of nordestinos to the Amazon in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Schmink and Wood (1992:44) attribute migration to a “coincidence of two economic factors. One was the rising price of rubber; the other, a devastating drought.” The
drought destroyed the ranching and agricultural livelihood bases of the nordestinos (Schmink and Wood 1992:44), leaving them with few economic options. Rubber was an “available alternative to bare survival” (Weinstein 1983:31).

Schmink and Wood’s (1992) and Weinstein’s (1983) perspectives are informed by political economic theory and do not generally emphasize local experience; however, they acknowledge the significance of local livelihoods. Applying these literatures to the case of northeastern migration to the Amazon begs the question of what happens to the mutual constitution of people and place (Casey 1996) in the dwelling perspective (Ingold 2000) when existence becomes impossible. The northeasterners’ livelihood practices were made impossible by drought. Without livelihood practices, their very lives were at risk. They abandoned place as the price of survival. In the documentary *Borracha para a Vitória* (Oliveira 2004), one recruit from Ceará explained that in 1942, before his recruitment, he planted his entire field with cotton. He worked arduously for months but lost most of the crop due to drought. At the end of the season he harvested a meager six kilograms of the product, representing a complete economic loss. At that moment he proclaimed, “I will never plant anything in Ceará ever again.” When the recruiters arrived in his northeastern town, offering him the opportunity to travel to the Amazon to make money, he exclaimed “Let’s go!” (Oliveira 2004).

Indeed, Benchimol (1965, 1999) repeatedly refers to the northeasterners as a population “driven” to migrate because of drought. According to Benchimol (1999:136; my translation), the migration of Brazilian northeasterners is referred to as “migration by starvation; they were simply brought to the Amazon by a strong appetite for rubber, greed, fortune and adventure, or all of the above. Benchimol (1999:137; my translation)
refers to the northeastern migrant population in Brazil as one that is “easily seduced and captivated by the mystique of fortune and the tales of ‘getting rich quickly.’ The Amazon began to become ‘Brazilianized’ with the arrival of this kind of immigrant.” This explanation clearly references the economic motivation for migration, the naïveté of the northeastern chasing after riches, and an Amazon that is somehow otherwise devoid of its Brazilian essence. To Benchimol, to “Brazilianize” is therefore to attract northerners to a space lacking adequate Brazilian presence, a sentiment that was also embraced in the post-WWII period of development in the country (and see Chapter 2).

As these passages suggest, drought has become the default explanation to explain the northerners’ decision to leave their places of origin for the Amazon. Without any further understanding of the lives the northerners led before the recruitment or their experiences of displacement and relocation, the reader is left with the impression that the northerners were responding according to rational choice theory, greed, and naïveté. They appear to be motivated by the logic of escaping the environmental and economic constraints of the northeast for the opportunities in the Amazon, without regard to sense of place or identity that might be lost. These explanations, which consider the person as analytically isolable from the environment, can be supplemented by an experiential perspective and an analysis that situates the northerner “in place” in the northeast and Brazil more generally. This involves attention to the displacement of the rubber soldiers from their northeastern places of origin and the complex processes of their emplacement in the Amazon.
The recruitment campaign employed strategies informed by economic and political rationale (de Certeau 1984:xix; see also Chapter 2). Following the Washington Accords, the nordestinos were offered employment in the Amazon with paid relocation, medical care, uniforms, and supplies—an irresistible opportunity, particularly for young men who had yet to start a family and were told they would be returned to their homes after their period of service. The wartime employment was described as temporary and lucrative and the recruits were guaranteed that their needs would be tended to.

The recruitment campaign was built on northeastern cultural and gendered rhetoric and symbolism, instilling in the recruits a sense of responsibility to the family and patriotic duty to the country. Deliberate parallels between military soldiers and rubber soldiers authenticated the rubber campaign as a valuable component of Brazil's support of the Allies during World War II. The Brazilian government claimed to be building a rubber “army”. They worked closely with the Catholic Church to reach recruits in even the most remote parts of the sertão. Recruitment propaganda in the form of print media, radio, and film were widely distributed throughout the northeast, with particular effort aimed at the rural poor. One example is the print media designed by the Swiss artist Jean-Pierre Chabloz, who was hired by SEMTA in Fortaleza. Chabloz’s iconic recruitment posters and flyers captured idealized images of the nordestino and linked them with military slogans, doing so in the style of other socialist advertisements of the war period (Figure 3-2). According to Garfield (2006:287), the propaganda employed masculinist tropes, such as “the northeastern man exercising the traditional role of breadwinner and protector, the intrepid frontiersman whose independence ensured financial success and social prestige, and the worker whose newfound wartime
obligations were critical to national defense.” Garfield’s (2006) gendered analysis resonates with what the ribeirinhos described as their qualifications during the recruitment period. When I asked the eldest retired rubber tappers about the label of “soldier”, they referenced stereotypically “masculine” attributes of bravery, defending the nation and their families by fighting with Indians, and an exceptional ability to navigate the perilous forest.

However, fewer sources may be found that explore the northeastern experience and sense of place during this period. One account, written shortly after the wartime rubber boom period, captures the ways in which the nordestinos may have experienced place through livelihood practices, beginning in early childhood:

Before emigrating to the Amazon, the northeasterner practiced agriculture or ranching. Since he was a boy, he is accustomed to accompanying his parents to the fields to cultivate crops and grains. “Born” in the corral, his first sounds as a baby are confused with the moan of the cattle, the cry of the sheep, and the whinny of the colts (Teixeira de Mello 1956:23).

As this quotation indicates, the materiality of the northeastern landscape is not separated from the person. Place is practiced through agriculture and the relation of people to their farmland and livestock. The rubber campaign strategically harnessed nordestino identity and masculinity embedded in the place of the sertão, combined it with patriotism and national security, and characterized their period of service as “temporary” with ensured return to their families northeast. This combination proved to be extremely effective in the wartime rubber campaign.

In the next section, I shift from general history to a specific focus on the particular ways in which the rubber tappers in the Terra do Meio region negotiated the transition from nordestino in the sertão to soldado da borracha in the Amazon. I show that the transition to a new material context involves negotiating feelings of nostalgia for a way
of life left behind and adopting livelihood practices distinct from those used in their northeastern places of origin. Fundamentally, I describe the beginnings of emplacement in the Amazon experienced by the rubber tappers.

**The Practice of Rubber Tapping and the Making of Place in the Amazon**

A terrible battle it was, for which there is no comparison in the history of our nation nor perhaps in other nations, for unarmed soldiers were forced to confront invisible enemies that attacked them everywhere, rendering them useless, and mortally wounding them in many cases (Teixeira de Mello 1956:90).

In his overview of the rubber boom, Dean (1987:41) describes the living conditions of the rubber tapper as “miserable and dangerous”. According to Euclides da Cunha, an esteemed Brazilian journalist who covered the rubber boom period, the rubber tappers were subjected to slave-like conditions that amounted to ‘the most criminal labor organization that could be imagined by the most revolting egoism’” (da Cunha 1967:23). Yet recruitment campaigns continued to flourish and there was never a shortage of voluntary enlisting among the northeasterners, even when new recruits were sought to replace those who had perished or quit the trade and left the Amazon (Dean 1987:40).

This final point, concerning the ongoing replacement of rubber recruits despite known problems, remains largely unaddressed in the literature. Why did rubber tapping remain a practice for which the northeasterners arrived in droves, even as the working conditions were abhorred? Moreover, if rubber tapping were truly as difficult and the business as criminal as depicted in the literature, why do many of the ribeirinhos today long for this period with *saudade* (nostalgia) and wish it were still a viable practice? In this section, I address these questions through an analysis of the relationship between the rubber tappers and rubber barons and an examination of the daily practices that, over time, constituted a way of life for the rubber tappers, resulting in their emplacement
in the Amazon. I incorporate the voices of elders of the Iriri River, who are former rubber soldiers, to explore these contradictions between nostalgia for, and displacement from, the northeast, and the adoption of a new place and place-based identity through rubber tapping in the Amazon. The discrepancy between the reports of working conditions and the personal experiences recounted by former rubber soldiers constitute an historical paradox.

During the classic and wartime boom periods in the region now known as the Terra do Meio, the rubber business flourished with or without proper administration and management by the rubber barons. A saying existed among the barons of the region, which was that “the best business in the Amazon is a well-administered seringal; the second best, a poorly managed seringal; the third, a seringal with no management whatsoever” (Nunes 2003:191; my translation). The barons possessed a great deal of purchasing power as brokers between the regional rubber companies and the rubber tappers. Indeed, it was primarily the barons who controlled the price and flow of market goods and necessities, which were “purchased” by the rubber tapper at inflated prices using “credits” he received from his supply of rubber (Weinstein 1983). The baron meticulously recorded all transactions for each rubber tapper. These necessary exchanges were performed at small wood or bamboo and thatch kiosks (“stores”) in a central location between the rubber estates. The prices of the market goods for which the rubber was exchanged were elevated by the baron, and the purchasing power of the finished rubber product was extremely low compared with the price it obtained in the city. Thus, the rubber tapper rarely made a profit or accumulated sufficient credit to relieve him of his debt. A comparison of the network of exchange, from rubber tapper to
export, is analyzed in the context of the classic boom period by Weinstein (1983) and the wartime period by Dean (1987). Although the RDC attempted to streamline the exchange process during the wartime period, this proved impossible because of bottlenecks created at the regional level in the urban storage and trading centers in Belém and Manaus.5

Furthermore, rubber tapping was dangerous. Many rubber soldiers died in “battle” tapping rubber. One Brazilian account explains that “the rubber tappers affirm that there is a worker buried along every kilometer of every rubber trail in the Amazon, his grave marked by a small cross” (Teixeira de Mello 1956:93-4; my translation). During the classic boom period, Dean (1987:40) reports that mortality rates were extremely high and death was the principal cause of labor shortages. Infectious diseases were rampant and claimed the lives of many rubber tappers. The same appears to be true with the wartime rubber boom. With statistics obtained from local hospitals in Manaus and Belém in 1946, Teixeira de Melo (1956:103-4) found that of 2,160 rubber soldiers who worked near urban centers and managed to get to hospital, 80% were in the advanced stages of malaria. Anemia was also widely detected, as were parasites (Teixeira de Melo 1956:103-105).

5 The RDC initially sought to circumvent the existing exchange network by buying rubber at higher prices, closer to the source (Dean 1987:94). This existing network of exchange was one that was bottlenecked in the Amazon at the trading house, where the middleman who sold to the exporter would hoard rubber at times of low prices in the expectation of price increases (Dean 1987:94). The RDC thought they could bypass the exchange network by paying rubber tappers more money, but this strategy failed because they did not realize that the rubber barons were not just buying the rubber from the tappers, but exchanging rubber for supplies. As a result, the rubber barons increased the price of supplies for the rubber tappers. The RDC did not have sufficient boats and personnel to fulfill their proposed role as suppliers, and eventually withdrew in that capacity (Dean 1987:94). The system of exchange reverted back to what it was during the classic boom period, and these regional bottlenecks and inefficiencies persisted.
Furthermore, as I describe below, the work was also physically demanding and dangerous in other ways. Rubber tappers covered great distances with weight on their backs. They ate very little during the day and were malnourished. My informants also spoke of people who died from venomous snake bites, jaguar attacks, and surprise ambushes from neighboring Kayapó Indians who fought the rubber tappers in defense of their territory, upon which the rubber tappers were encroaching.

Nonetheless, a desirable aspect of being a rubber tapper was the autonomous and independent working conditions. A monopoly was held by the barons over the relations of exchange but not of production (Weinstein 1983:21). Despite the shared regimen over several months of training and transport, once the rubber tappers arrived in the forest they were largely autonomous. Work was done independently over large distances in dense forest with no means of communication. The primary point of interaction between baron and tapper was at the moment of exchange, but not during the work day. Furthermore, rubber tapping was a seasonal activity practiced during half of the year (Dean 1987); during the other months, the rubber tappers felled Brazil nuts, fished, and engaged in subsistence agriculture (see Chapter 5). In spite of the debt peonage system, it is clear that the rubber tappers enjoyed some autonomy.

During my interview with former rubber tapper Edilson, an elder of the Iriri River, the contradiction between the positive and negative aspects of the rubber boom was expressed as follows: “During the time of rubber, everyone lived well, thank God. Things were expensive. And the price of rubber was cheap...[the barons bought it from us] for a terrible price...but...what a pleasure it was, working as a rubber tapper.”
Thus, as the secondary sources suggest, tapping rubber was difficult, dangerous, and the rubber tappers were exploited and rarely relieved of the “debts” induced by the particular system of debt peonage practiced during the rubber booms. By contrast, however, the rubber tappers remember the period fondly as one in which tapping rubber was a “pleasure” that allowed all rubber tappers to “live well”, a dimension of this history that is not represented in the secondary literatures. As I stated at the beginning of this section, these discrepancies indicate a paradox in Brazilian Amazonian history.

Indeed, in spite of the dangerous and difficult working conditions and debt peonage system, the ribeirinhos with whom I spoke unanimously agree that their quality of life during this period was the best that they remember in history. Nailson said, “[Tapping rubber] has been the profession I have most enjoyed of everything I have done. If we had it again—if [the price] would go up again—that is the job for me.” To understand this nostalgic attitude requires understanding the earliest practices of the rubber recruits and social relations in the Amazon region, and the ways these contributed to early place attachment.

Rubber was collected during the “summer” (dry) season of May or June through December, when the rains were less likely to interfere with the collection of rubber.\(^6\) The rubber trees naturally grow dispersed throughout the forest, with an average of only two to three tappable trees found in any hectare (Dean 1987:10). Rubber trails were cut connecting these trees, which was an arduous task. The ribeirinhos describe how they each cleared two to three rubber estradas (“roads”; best understood as “trails” in English) per household, which contained anywhere from 100 to 250 trees each. The

\(^6\) Some former rubber tappers of the Iriri River explained to me that they tapped from May to September because the tree needed a “rest” as it put out new leaves and fruited.
trails were ovular rings that generally began from a main trail, on which a smokehouse (defumador) was constructed out of wooden beams and a thatch roof to enable the rubber tapper to smoke the collected latex into its finished product at the end of the workday. Figure 3-3 is an illustration of rubber trails and “huts” from the classic boom period found in Weinstein (1983:17), which is very similar to the layout of trails during the wartime period.

A typical day for a rubber tapper involved waking up well before sunrise and working until the afternoon. The rubber tapper gathered his headlamp, machete, tin cups (tijelas) for collection of the latex, and a special knife for making incisions in the tree. Coffee was prepared in advance by his wife and taken by him to the trails; sometimes a bit of farinha or meat would be packed as well, as the trails were sometimes found at some distance from the home and the work was constant until completion, usually leaving the rubber tapper no time to return to the home to eat.

The rubber tapper worked in three stages throughout the day. The first stage involved walking one’s trails and making incisions in the trees along that trail. This stage occurred in the early morning when the temperatures are coolest and the trees’ latex flow was heaviest (Dean 1987:37; Wagley 1976:85). The incisions made in the tree depended upon the technique employed. The most frequently reported technique is called bandeira (flag), whereby incisions are made along the trunk at a downward (diagonal) angle. The first cut was made high on the trunk, with subsequent cuts below and parallel to the one before it.\footnote{Fresh cuts were made during each round; “scarred” cuts could be retapped in future seasons after the tree has “rested”.} The tin cup was placed at the base of the cut and inserted into the bark approximately two inches deep, where it remained for several
hours to collect the *leite* ("milk"; liquid latex). The rubber tapper moved from tree to tree along the trail in this fashion for approximately three hours until finishing his round.

During the second stage, the rubber tapper returned to the trees to collect the full tin cups. He emptied the latex into a container and brought it to a holding area for processing. The third stage, processing the latex, involved different techniques that changed over time. In the Terra do Meio region, the ribeirinhos distinguish three rubber processing techniques, each with a slightly different end-product, which were employed according to international demands. In chronological order, they are (1) *sernambí*, a collection of rubber by-products; (2) *defumado* (smoked); and (3) *prensada* (pressed). *Sernambí* is a lower quality product of coagulated rubber strained and washed in water, and then pounded into the desired shape. *Defumado* is the most cited technique in the literature and was practiced extensively by the ribeirinhos. During this process the liquid latex is converted into its desired end-product, rubber, by smoking it slowly over a fire in a closed thatch structure called a *defumador* (smokehouse). During the wartime period, a wooden paddle was used, over which small quantities of latex were poured. The paddle was continuously rotated by the rubber tapper over the fire. As the rubber coagulated, more latex was poured upon the paddle and the process continued like this until the final product—an approximately 50 kilogram ball of rubber—was achieved.

The final technique, *prensada*, was the last utilized in the region.\(^8\) In this process, the latex is collected and brought back to the processing area. Once it is strained and rid of brush, twigs, and dirt from the collection process, it is combined with either a chemical coagulant (acetic acid), or a traditional coagulant (the latex from a strangler fig

---

\(^8\) The *prensada* technique is being tested in a pilot program by ISA and partners in the neighboring Anfrísio River, with expansion expected in 2010 in the Iriri.
tree called *gameleira*. The thickened liquid is then poured into rectangular containers and a weight is placed on top of it to “press” the rubber and expel remaining liquid that separated from the coagulating latex. The coagulated latex is then left to harden into tablets weighing up to 50 kilograms (Figure 3-4). Regardless of the technique used, the final product, rubber, was stored for collection by the baron in exchange for household goods or credit.

After recruitment and upon arrival in the backwater regions where they would work, the new recruits, called *brabos* (“wild”, in a derogatory fashion), were taught by the *mansos* (“domesticated” or “civilized”; experienced rubber tappers) how to subsist and tap rubber in the forest (Nunes 1993). The ribeirinhos’ current habitus navigating the forest and river make it difficult now to imagine them as awkward initiates; however, as recruits, the nordestinos possessed little or no knowledge about the Amazon and had no contacts beyond the recruiters and each other. They required instruction in basic subsistence skills and survival in the region, including how to tap a rubber tree, paddle a canoe, hunt with a Winchester gun, and fish (Nunes 1993). They were trained not only as rubber tappers, but also in other basic practices and skills appropriate for survival in the Amazon region. The following passage captures a comical element of their early days in the region:

With water up to their waists, and even with help, getting [the recruits] into their canoes was a huge feat. No less than 10 failed attempts occurred before they were able to finally sit in the canoe, all the while grasping the sides of it, attempting to calm the [vessel’s bucking, rocking and trembling]. It was an initiation, a race, a baptism…After the recruits stabilized the canoe…the second lesson, paddling, was easier but no less comical. The recruits paddled in circles, completely out of control and threatening to get swept into the current of the river, causing [the brabo to enter into a panic]. Finally, by the second or third day, all of this passed and he was able to paddle, stand up in the canoe to navigate and throw a net, and tip and
upright the canoe in the middle of the river without assistance from anyone and without losing his supplies (Nunes 1993:196; my translation).

As part of the recruitment and training program, the rubber tappers were initially trained in basic skills of navigating the river. Excellent navigation skills were required to survive in the region, and many rubber tappers had to cross the river daily to reach different rubber trails. In other words, as a result of government-sponsored programs and the strategies they entailed (sensu de Certeau 1984), such as the gendered and cultural rhetoric and print media employed during the recruitment campaign, the rubber tappers learned not only to tap rubber, but also to live as riverine people.

The rubber tappers were thus “building” a landscape of places and the movements and activities connecting them (Heidegger 1977; and see Chapter 2) in the Amazon. The practice of rubber tapping was clearly a central part of building, but other livelihood activities and the mundane practices that made it possible were also important, such as canoeing on the river and cutting trails to facilitate access to the rubber trees (see Chapter 5). In spite of their awkward beginnings navigating the Amazon, the rubber tappers who arrived in the vicinity of the Irirí River quickly learned the trade of rubber tapping, Brazil nut collection, and fishing to supplement the household income and diet.

Furthermore, for the rubber tappers the landscape began to become embodied. The kinesthetic skills, such as how to sit in and paddle a canoe, are part of a learned body hexis (following Bourdieu 1977) in which postures, gestures, and movements of the body with and through the material world are patterned and reflect broader social meanings and values (Bourdieu 1977:87). In this case, they reflect an emergent way of being as an Amazonian person that is becoming, to borrow Bourdieu’s (1977:78) phrase “durably installed”.
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Adjusting to life in the Amazon was difficult on a variety of levels. Mundane practices that are now embodied among the ribeirinhos in entirely non-discursive and unselfconscious ways were extremely difficult for the nordestinos upon arrival. Emplacement in the Amazon was a corporeal experience; navigating the materiality of the Amazon without the body hexis of an Amazonian person was disorienting. When one woman accompanied her family to the Amazon so that her father could tap rubber, she reported that her senses were overwhelmed with the abundance of noise coming from insects and animals that could not be seen in the dense forest. She exclaimed in consternation, “Daddy! What are you going to do? You don’t know a forest like this one!” (Oliveira 2004). Another rubber soldier explained how in the northeast, one can stand anywhere and see open, clear blue sky along the horizon, whereas in the Amazon it is rare to see any sunlight hit the forest floor due to the dense canopy (Oliveira 2004). My informants shared that it was not uncommon to use headlamps while tapping rubber until nine o’clock in the morning, the time at which the sunlight finally filters down to the forest floor to grant sufficient visibility for cutting the intricate lines necessary to extract the latex.

During my fieldwork, the elderly ribeirinhos and their children consistently commented on the presence of water in the forest in contrast to the arid northeast, and how they had to adjust to living with the presence of water all around them. In contrast to the droughts of the northeast, the Amazon rain forest was literally wet because of humidity, condensation, rains, and the fluvial landscape. Water also affected their movement and dictated their practices. Most of their livelihood practices, including tapping rubber, were seasonal; they were (and continue to be) performed in accordance
with “rainy” and “dry” seasons. Furthermore, their movement through the landscape was (and continues to be) heavily dependent upon the river as the major via of transportation, communication, and exchange (see Chapters 4-6).

With some exceptions, rubber tapping was an activity dominated by men. The men of the Iriri explained that their earliest memories are of tapping rubber with their fathers or another male family member. Adult men trained their sons or other male dependents from a very young age. While this was regarded as an economic handicap, since the young children were slower, clumsier, and lacked sufficient knowledge of the forest and the trade, the payoff occurred over the long run when the children became skilled laborers. Many explained that they began to accompany their fathers into the forest at the age of five or six to tap rubber. One resident stated, “My dad taught me to tap rubber as a small boy, when I was only this big”, and indicated approximately three feet high with his hand. By the time the boys were eight, they were contributing substantially and their families’ production levels rose as a result of their labor.

Women generally did not report that they tapped rubber. A few women reported that, as young girls, their fathers taught them to tap rubber alongside their brothers. As they grew older, however, they stayed closer to home with their mothers. One woman explained that “when I was a small girl, I sometimes hid behind a big tree near our yard. When my mother wasn’t looking, I ran behind my dad to follow him into the forest at dawn. He did not know I was following him, and by the time we got out there, he had no choice but to keep me with him and teach me a few things.” Similarly, most women

---

9 Also known as “winter” and “summer”, respectively.
reported that they accompanied their husbands on occasion into the forest, but after having children they generally remained at home.

However, women did not identify any less than men with the significance of the rubber boom in their lives. In fact, both men and women refer to the latex as “milk” (in reference to mothers’ milk) that enabled their survival as small children. Liliane explained, “My dad tapped rubber, but no, I never did. My dad raised me. I was sustained with the milk [from the rubber tree], which he sold to buy what we needed [to survive]”. Edma explained, “My dad raised me with the [credits] earned with rubber. He used it to buy medicine.” In households dominated by daughters instead of sons, the father often opted to train the eldest to tap rubber and collect other forest products to support the family. Rosalinda is an example of this.

Our situation was more difficult than others. My dad only had daughters—five of them. Generally, girls stayed home with their mothers [while their fathers tapped rubber in the forest], but in my house the eldest daughters tapped rubber. And we were not ‘brutish’ women—we were nice girls, respected, well-mannered and [sought after for marriage] even though [we knew men’s work].

Rosalinda hunted, harvested Brazil nut, and tapped rubber from the age of 13 to 38. She ceased working in these physically demanding and dangerous extractive activities because of an injury. When I inquired about female heads of household during the rubber boom, people said that they were rare but existed. Concrete examples were difficult to find, but people generally mentioned that they remember a widowed woman or a single mother who sustained the household through rubber and other laborious activities for periods of time before remarrying. Eventually, I met one woman who tapped rubber for years with her father and later with her sister; however, these women
lived outside of the reserve and so I did not have the opportunity to formally interview them.

Rubber tapping constituted the primary activity employed by the rubber tappers during the wartime period. Subsistence agriculture and the harvesting of Brazil nuts in the off-season were employed to diversify the household diet and accumulate “credits” with the rubber baron. Benchimol (1999:138) lists rice, beans, maize, and sugar cane as valuable supplements to the rubber soldiers’ diet of canned meats and farinha. However, my informants reported that they maintained very little in the way of subsistence agriculture during this time. Speaking of the rubber tappers’ diets and practices along the Iriri and Anfísio rivers, Nunes (1993:192; my translation) writes, “Manual labor [during the war period] was much more valuable when dedicated strictly to rubber tapping and Brazil nut harvesting—not wasted on lesser duties [such as agriculture]. [Those commodities were shipped in]. Apart from game meat and fish, what was consumed was from the city.” This description of the diet and practices of the rubber tappers most accurately reflects what my informants shared with me.

Most of the ribeirinhos report having individually worked for most of the rubber barons over several years’ period in the region spanning the Novo, Iriri, and Anfísio rivers. The most “famous” barons of the Iriri, Novo, Anfísio, and Curuá rivers were Anfísio Nunes, after whom the Anfísio River and extractive reserve are named, and Anfísio’s son, Frizan Nunes, son of Anfísio and Amélia, a Xipaia Indian from the region whom Anfísio married. Originally from Ceará, Anfísio arrived in the region during the classic boom period as a cook, became a rubber tapper, and eventually bought out his debts to his baron and became a baron himself (Weinstein 1983:24). He was able to do
so by avoiding accepting goods on credit, growing his own food, and buying his supplies
directly from Altamira. He evidently became so successful that he reportedly brought
200 families from the northeast to the Amazon to tap rubber.\textsuperscript{10} Anfrísio and Frizan have
the greatest legacy in the region but were not the only barons working there. Other
frequently named barons are Antônio Meirelles, Calixto Porto, and Seu Lauro; and
Sebastián Milico and Lorenço de Oliveira, brothers who reportedly transported 3,000
tons of latex per year during the war. When compared to estimates of the production
and export of Brazilian rubber during the wartime boom (Martinello 2004:150-152), this
figure represents anywhere from 10 to 13 percent of the rubber produced in Brazil and
13 to 30 percent of the total amount of Brazilian rubber exported, depending upon the
year.

Rather than remembered as abusive, the barons are described affectionately by
all of the ribeirinhos with whom I spoke as good men who “took care of” the rubber
tappers. According to Weinstein (1983:11), “the [barons] generally made a point of
developing personal and somewhat paternalistic relationships with their clients which
helped ensure a greater degree of loyalty, as well as a certain amount of fear.” In the
Iriri, the barons provided the rubber tappers with supplies, such as domestic goods and
construction materials for their homes, equipment for doing their trade, and food. Yet
their relationship did not only consist of debt-for-labor swap. They provided other key
services such as protection, health care, transportation, and communication with other
rubber tappers and the city. Ingold (1993) and Reynolds (1993) indicate that the social
and technical domains of dwelling cannot be separated. Social relationships, including

\textsuperscript{10} Most of my informants of the Iriri River report being from the wartime period, but several made
referenced the classic period as the time when their family first arrived in the region.
those between and among rubber tappers and barons, and between those who tap rubber and those who remain at home, are part of the practice of rubber tapping and the development of a sense of place.

Even the individuals who remained in the home while the rubber tapper worked the trails played integral roles in the family business by protecting the rubber product, keeping the home safe from Indian attacks, and maintaining the household. These individuals were generally women, children, and elders. Almost all of the ribeirinhos who tapped rubber or whose parents worked in rubber collection report being robbed on at least one occasion by Indians, sometimes through force or violence during which friends or family died or were seriously injured. These raids were likely conducted to assert territoriality because of the rubber industry’s encroachment upon Indian lands; however, they were also opportunistic attacks upon homes to obtain food and supplies. One resident of the Iriri shared that the rubber tappers’ homes were built very close to each other for security reasons to help protect against the attacks. The barons also provided protection for their laborers by maintaining a watchful eye on the river and providing valuable communication up and down the river to warn others of recent incidents. Additional support could come in the form of a barraqueiro, a senior citizen who no longer worked in the strenuous trade of tapping rubber and harvesting Brazil nuts. In exchange for food and shelter, this individual would help in the domestic sphere while also providing additional protection in the home for the wife and children while the rubber tapper worked in distant rubber groves.

11 The ribeirinhos cited the Kayapó Indians as the responsible group for such raids.
While all respondents reported positive sentiments about the rubber barons, some were keenly aware that less fortunate rubber tappers had a more challenging relationship with the barons. These rubber tappers were less productive due to health, age, family size, or a wavering commitment to the trade. Giovana, who was born and raised along the Anfrísio River but who currently resides along the Iriri River, commented on this: “The barons bought if the rubber tapper had products to sell. If he was sick and the baron came to his house, and he didn’t have a son to go to work for him, he couldn’t buy anything. And so he had nothing. And in the end he would die in this situation. It was unusual for a baron to help someone like that.” In this instance, this woman’s father was elderly and her mother had passed away, leaving her father to care for this informant and her three sisters. The household was therefore supported by an elderly, single male parent who had no other men in the household who could help with the most lucrative and physically demanding tasks of harvesting rubber and Brazil nuts.

By contrast, the most industrious and entrepreneurial rubber tappers in the region had an advantageous arrangement compared with their less productive neighbors. In these instances the rubber tapper usually had his own place of residence around which he tapped and prepared the latex. The independence of maintaining one’s own home and rubber trails placed him and his family in a position that was not as subservient to the barons. In other words, rather than living directly on the baron’s estate, these rubber tappers enjoyed more autonomy. In these instances, the barons would come to their seringal to collect the rubber in exchange for market goods. The self-proclaimed eldest resident of the Iriri Extractive Reserve explained this arrangement as follows:

I always worked for these men—always—from my home. They came to my port [and would say] “Seu César! What kind of price are you giving me
today?" If I am not at home—I am working my field, in the forest—[then they ask my wife] "Mrs! What does Seu César need these days?" [And she would say] "Here is the list of market goods we need." And they pick up the products [rubber, Brazil nuts] and take them down to the boat [in exchange for the market goods]. That is how my life was. If I am not there, my wife is there in my place. That is how it works. And regardless of which baron was there, [you can bet] that he was a good person.

This same individual described a situation in which his son, who was critically wounded while tapping rubber, was transported by plane to Altamira and then Belém, the capital city of the state, for treatment. All costs and logistics were assumed by the rubber baron. César’s experience clearly differs from that provided by Giovana about her father, which shows that (1) while the general sentiment among the ribeirinhos who remember the rubber boom is positive, there are some exceptions; and (2) the social status of particular rubber tappers varied, with several tappers acknowledged as particularly entrepreneurial, motivated, and productive, while others were less so because of personal circumstances.

**The Rubber “Bust”**

Despite the recruitment campaign, many of the same problems that plagued the classic boom period affected the wartime period. By the end of 1942 and beginning of 1943, Brazil’s rubber output was dramatically lower than expected. In response, Brazil’s President Vargas declared June “National Rubber Month” and coined the phrase *Mais borracha para a vitória* (more rubber for victory), which became a major campaign slogan. As part of National Rubber Month, the Brazilian government created financial incentives for rubber tappers who collected the most rubber possible (Martinello 2004:147). At the opening of the campaign, he delivered a speech that employed military rhetoric to foster a sense of pride and urgency among the rubber recruits who were tasked with uncovering all rubber sources available. He urged,
Brazilians, the armed Alliances need more rubber. Extract all the rubber you can, in accordance with the plans that we have developed and are being implemented by all of the Brazilian municipalities, with the sincere collaboration of the prefects. [I am certain] that this campaign will be victorious, and will provide us with more rubber for victory (*mais borracha para a Vitória*) (Martinello 2004:146; my translation).

Ultimately, however, Brazil’s wartime efforts failed. While the campaign was successful in recruitment, it was unsuccessful in economic and operative terms, leading most scholars to consider the entire rubber campaign a “colossal blunder”, a “colossal failure”, and a “great fiasco” (Dean 1987:95; New York Times 5/15/91). In a confidential report on Brazilian rubber to the rubber director, the umbrella organization for the RDC declared the operations “the worst example of bad planning, misinformed policies, lack of experienced administration and disorganization in 22 years of Latin American observations” (Dean 1987:95). The factors that impeded successful export of wild Brazilian rubber during this period were, in many respects, the same that were responsible for the classic period bust. They may be understood as a combination of socio-political, economic, and ecological factors that are interrelated.

Prior to signing the Washington Accords, the expectation was that 100,000 tons of Brazilian rubber would be extracted and produced by 100,000 recruited tappers each year, a calculation that was considered conservative based on the estimated 667,000 potential tons/year available from the estimated 200 million trees throughout the Brazilian Amazon (Dean 1987:93). However, as mentioned in the prior section, the annual output was much smaller and the number of northeastern recruits rose to only an estimated 33,000 individuals. Furthermore, the short-term demand and crisis overextended the abilities of Brazilian government agencies to successfully design and execute the rubber program and to address difficulties that arose along the way. Finally,
as mentioned in the first section of this chapter, the Amazon is a challenging environment to have a successful, basin-wide operation because of its remoteness, the distance between wild trees, and the distance to transport the product to ocean ports for export (Dean 1987; Weinstein 1983). These challenges were exacerbated by the overwrought government agencies pressed for time and resources, which hastily implemented inferior and convoluted transportation routes through remote regions. Although efforts were taken to improve efficiency by cultivating plantation rubber (Dean 1987; Grandin 2009), these trees were susceptible to the same leaf blight that overtook commercial operations established during and after the classic boom.

The most profitable period for tapping rubber and the legacy of the rubber boom, including the way of life that continues to be described by the ribeirinhos, ended shortly after the war. Unable to make a sufficient profit for transportation costs, the rubber barons left the region. The rubber tappers were forced to make decisions about remaining in the forest, attempting to return to the northeast, or finding other sources of employment in nearby towns and capital cities. All three options were pursued and many did leave, attempting to return to the northeast or seeking employment in towns and cities.

However, other rubber tappers remained. As indicated in Chapter 2, these individuals entered a period of “invisibility” during the post-WWII development period. Due in part to government training and their “apprenticeship”, they had acquired the appropriate skills to continue in the forest,\(^\text{12}\) and some continued tapping rubber and

\(^{12}\) The ribeirinhos report that a small demand for rubber persisted until the 1980s. In the interim period between rubber and the present, they also participated in an intense period of hunting for animal pelts (caça de pele or caça de gato) from the late 1960s to the mid-1970s. This market emerged in response to international demand for different furs and leathers used in clothing and decor, particularly jaguar. This
selling it directly to middlemen.\textsuperscript{13} Indeed, much like the story of Anfrísio Nunes, who moved from rubber tapper to rubber baron, it was at this point that the most industrious rubber tappers who remained in the region retained sufficient capital were able to purchase a boat. Over time, these individuals became middlemen in the region, and many remain middlemen today.\textsuperscript{14}

The ribeirinhos of the Iriri River today are not a random sample of the original rubber soldiers. They are the remnants and descendants of a subset of the original recruits. They are those who stayed when others left, perhaps because they tended to be the most committed and most industrious. It is perhaps because of their choices to stay that those who remain today and remember the rubber boom periods regard it with nostalgia. Together, and over time, they formed an emergent Amazonian identity as a river-dwelling people (\textit{ribeirinhos}), discussed in Chapter 6.

\textbf{Conclusion}

As I have indicated in this chapter, the dominant perspective among scholars of the Amazonian rubber boom is one that attributes nordestino migration to environmental, political, and economic forces. The nordestinos are often characterized as naïve laborers who, tempted by a more lucrative lifestyle and battered by a series of droughts, eagerly left their northeastern places of origin for the Amazon. Furthermore, the dominant perspective regarding caboclos is that they are passively buffeted about

\textsuperscript{13}Schmink and Wood (1992:46) reported this after the classic rubber boom period. My informants reported it during the post-WWII period.

\textsuperscript{14}For example, my informant César, mentioned in the preceding section above, became a key middleman in the region.
by larger institutional and ecological forces. Caboclos are frequently denigrated because they are reminiscent of Brazil’s historic, development-driven failures in the Amazon, including rubber. As I have indicated in this chapter, however, the northeastern experience of dislocation and relocation was more complex than these literatures suggest.

Many of the positive experiences of the rubber soldiers, relayed to me by my informants and through secondary sources, are often at odds with the negative accounts of the debt peonage system employed during the rubber boom in the scholarly literatures. Many rubber tappers appear to have had positive experiences during the wartime rubber boom. Furthermore, the government provided the recruits with initial “training” in subsistence activities, necessary skills, and provisions that allowed them to become proficient in a variety of practices (and corresponding livelihood identities) in the Amazon. Ironically, these skills allowed the rubber tappers to dwell (sensu Heidegger 1977) in the Amazon after their abandonment. Finally, although the rubber soldiers were abandoned in the forest after the rubber “bust” in spite of the promise of return, the people of the Iriri River are descendents of the rubber soldiers because they chose to remain in place. It is perhaps because of their choice to remain that my informants continue to feel nostalgia for the rubber boom, which is addressed further in Chapter 6.

These discrepancies suggest an historical paradox. They also indicate that the scholarly accounts alone are inadequate to understand this history; that the rubber tappers had a rich experience of early place-making in the region than is otherwise depicted; and that the intersections between macro and micro, structure and agency,
and economic and social are inextricably linked and best understood as an integrated whole. I have attempted to reconcile these historical discrepancies in this chapter by retracing the journey from nordestino in the sertão to rubber tapper in the Amazon during the wartime rubber boom period. I addressed three principal, cross-cutting themes to highlight the nordestinos’ journey from displacement to the beginnings of emplacement: (1) displacement and nostalgia for place; (2) practices, including the often difficult and awkward adoption of new livelihood practices in a new place; and (3) the formation of place-based identity. In doing so, I incorporated an experiential perspective into the history of the rubber boom and bust. This process involves the adoption of new skills, practices, and “building” (Heidegger 1977) through the materiality of a new landscape, and the beginning of a transformative shift in sense of place and identity.
Figure 3-1. Map of Brazil, with northeast highlighted in blue. Source: www.carnalloween.com/images/mapa_br.gif
Figure 3-2. Recruitment posters to encourage recruitment into the rubber “army”. (A) Northeasterners joyfully departing for the Amazon, encouraging other young males who remain at home to do the same. Poster designed by Chabloz. Above: “You should also go to the Amazon”. Below: “Protected by SEMTA”. (B) Military soldiers and rubber soldiers occupy the same national territory, with the Amazon River in the upper middle of the poster. Above: “Each one in [his] place!” Below: “For victory”. Note the emphasis on place and territorial identity. (C) A northeastern family enjoying a prosperous “new life in the Amazon” by engaging in rubber tapping and domestic activities. Note the SEMTA logo on the lower left of the image. http://diariodonordeste.globo.com/
Figure 3-3. Diagram of rubber trails, ca. 1900. Source: Weinstein (1983:17). This image is a reproduction from an illustration printed in *India Rubber World* in 1902. According to Weinstein (1983:17), “the tear-shaped loops are the trails, and the numbers show how many heveas make up each trail.” The huts depicted in this illustration housed several workers, each of whom was responsible for one to two trails. In the Iriri, households were generally responsible for individual trails. Forest-based huts were for smoking and storing rubber, and homes were generally located along the river.
Figure 3-4. The final product using the *borracha prensada* (pressed rubber) technique. Photo: Márcio Santos. Source: ISA 2009.
CHAPTER 4
THE RIBEIRINHOS OF THE TERRA DO MEIO IN THE PERIOD OF “CONSERVATION”

Introduction

Chapters 2 and 3 situate my study in three distinct periods of Brazil’s recent history: the rubber boom, development, and conservation. Chapter 2 provided an overview of cultural and political ecology, and the ways in which these literatures inform and intersect with conservation and development policies concerning Amazonian peasants. These literatures offer particular insights for this study of ribeirinhos and place, including attention to materiality, livelihood practices, and identity. However, they also perpetuate misperceptions of Amazonian peasants as passive, albeit rational, actors “on-the-move” (Bender 2001). I suggested that attention to an alternative perspective, informed by phenomenology and practice theories, more comprehensively emplaces the ribeirinhos historically, physically, and temporally in the landscape.

In Chapter 3, I incorporated an experiential perspective into the history of the rubber boom and bust, treating the nordestinos’ migration as a journey from displacement to the beginnings of emplacement. This approach highlighted an historical paradox, in which standard accounts of the rubber boom depict the period as horrific for the rubber tappers while my informants feel nostalgia for it and wish it would return. This paradox that was reconciled through a holistic approach to structure and agency in Chapter 3, in which I reexamined the history of the rubber boom and incorporated the rubber soldiers’ experience of displacement and the beginnings of emplacement in the Amazon. Ironically, revisiting this period in Brazil’s Amazonian history revealed the ways in which the government programs, responsible for the nordestinos’ displacement from
the northeast and abandonment in the Amazon following the rubber “bust”, played an integral role in their development of a sense of place and identity in the Amazon.

As Chapters 2 and 3 indicate, identities shift in response to livelihood practices and State policies. Chapter 2 introduced the notion that extractivist identities have been historically assigned to Amazonian peasants by outsiders. In Chapter 6, I explore the slippage between imposed and emic identities. Even as the ribeirinhos had not yet adopted the extractivist identity during my fieldwork, they did adopt the seringueiro identity, illustrating the ways in which identities, like places, are emergent. Chapter 3 documented their arrival as nordestinos to the region; their transformation, by training and by practice, into seringueiros; and their ultimate abandonment in the region by the same State entities responsible for their arrival. Those who remained in the forest are the ribeirinhos with whom I work, and their children and grandchildren.

In this chapter, I introduce the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River in relation to the current period, conservation, according to my periodization in Chapter 2. In the early 2000s, the ribeirinhos were once again propelled into visibility as part of another State intervention. This intervention—the strategic delineation and ratification of adjacent lands as a grouping of protected areas known as a protected area “mosaic”—was accomplished through the swift implementation of public policies to mitigate frontier violence, increase government presence in the region, and sustainably manage tropical forests. The Iriri Extractive Reserve constitutes one of the protected areas in the mosaic known as the Terra do Meio.

The creation of the Terra do Meio mosaic marked an end to the lawless frontier dynamics (Fearnside 2007a) that characterized the region in the post-boom invisibility
and development period and that escalated during the 1980s and 1990s, during which the ribeirinhos’ livelihoods and lands were at risk (CPT 2004, 2005; Greenpeace 2001a, 2001b, 2003; ISA 2003; Rocha et al. 2005; Sauer 2005; Schwartzman 2005; Schwartzman et al. 2010). The mosaic granted the ribeirinhos legal rights to lands on which they and others before them had been dwelling for a century.\(^1\) However, the mosaic also poses new challenges for the ribeirinhos and for my study on ribeirinho place-making. In some areas, particularly around the borders, the reserve created “negative spaces” (sensu Munn 1996) that limited use and occupation of their traditional lands. The swift implementation of protected areas by the government exemplified the contrast between the ways place is regarded and treated by the State, on the one hand, and by those who dwell in the landscape, on the other (sensu de Certeau 1984; Lefebvre 1991; Scott 1998). “Insider” and “outsider” perspectives are often referred to as “emic” and “etic”, respectively, in the social sciences. As I illustrate in this chapter, the ribeirinhos do not easily adhere to the “proper places” (following de Certeau 1984:121) created by the State upon the riverine landscape. This chapter documents the meeting point at which emic and etic perspectives and experiences are forced together in the context of the political delineation of lands that are home to the ribeirinhos.

In this chapter, I introduce the specific place and people of the Iriri River as I, the researcher, encountered them during this context of conservation. As discussed in Chapter 2, historical and political contexts explored in this study contribute to, but do not

---

\(^1\) Many of my informants report arriving as children of rubber soldiers in reference to the wartime period. Some are the descendents of nordestinos who arrived during the classic rubber boom period at the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century and beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century. The rubber economy thrived during the classic boom period in the region (ISA 2003).
define, ribeirinho sense of place and identity. Rather, I argue that place is shaped by what the ribeirinhos do in the context of their livelihood activities (see Chapter 5). In this chapter, I describe the ribeirinhos in the current context of conservation with full epistemological disclosure that as I conducted research in the region, I may have been sympathetic with certain perspectives and causes, and formed a part, albeit negligible, of these social dynamics. Furthermore, in the tradition of methodological relationism and critical multiplism (Guba 1990; Ritzer and Gindoff 1994; and see Chapter 2), I analyze and describe the rich dialectic between structure and agency that is not adequately represented by any singular body of literature introduced in the first part of Chapter 2. Rather, I attempt to bring these literatures to bear on the development of particular topics in this chapter, even as the literatures belong to incommensurate metatheories and paradigms.

Two sections are developed in this chapter: (1) the Terra do Meio region as Amazonian frontier, and (2) migration and emplacement. In my discussion of the Terra do Meio region as “frontier”, I explore the tension created by the juxtaposition of frontier boundaries and ribeirinho “places”. This provides a contemporary snapshot of the region and of the ribeirinho landscape, in particular. In the second section, “Migration and Emplacement”, I describe the study population, including demographic and migration data in conjunction with ethnographic field observations on ribeirinho movement into and out of the riverine landscape. This structure serves the chapter’s purpose of contextualizing and introducing the experience of the ribeirinhos who dwell along the Iriri River in contrast to preconceived notions of caboclo societies as out of place or “on-the-move” (sensu Bender 2001), discussed in Chapter 2. Thus, this chapter
bridges the broader theoretical and historical reviews provided in the preceding chapters to the highly specific taskscape analysis that follows in Chapter 5, and the ways in which tasks contribute to the creation of an emic identity and sense of place, discussed in Chapter 6.

To conclude this introductory section, I now provide an anecdote that captures the complexity of the transition period of the region—from invisible, dynamic, violent, and contested, to visible, legible and highly regulated—as I experienced it upon arrival in the region. In June of 2006, I possessed a research visa for Brazil. This visa was adequate for work in my proposed field site, but inadequate for strictly protected areas such as national parks. When I designed my research project, research permits were not required in extractive reserves. They were only required in indigenous lands, obtained through the National Indian Foundation (Fundação Nacional do Índio–FUNAI).

Furthermore, the proposed Iriri Extractive Reserve had not been created, nor was anyone expecting it to be created in the near future. I had arranged for transportation with a local family that ended up being my hosts: a man, woman, and their five year old daughter, who were in Altamira to pick up some supplies related to the woman’s job as the newly appointed Community Health Agent (Agente de Saúde Comunitário), a position that became available as a result of the creation of protected areas—further evidence of the increased visibility of the Iriri extractivists. Their boat was a small
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2 It is very common to hear that foreign researchers, and particularly American researchers in the Amazon, have a very difficult time obtaining visas and conducting research. Brazilian researchers tend not to undergo the same bureaucratic process for their work. This may be traced to Brazil's fears of losing part of their patrimony through bioprospecting (e.g., New York Times 5/7/2002) and rumors of Americans taking over the Amazon (see Jacobs 2007). However, there is also something to be said for the concerns the government had over the Terra do Meio region in particular, as the government scrambled to gain authority over this lawless frontier in the wake of escalating violence and the sudden creation of protected areas. Most recently, President Lula attacked "American gringos" for protests over the construction of the Belo Monte dam (Reuters 6/23/2010).
outboard canoe without a roof and a low horsepower motor. We expected it would take four to five days in the sweltering sun or pouring rain—and likely both—to arrive at their home. This boat trip consumed half of my allotted budget on fuel, oil, food, and equipment needed for our journey and my proposed, three month stay in the region.

On June 5, 2006, as we were stepping into the canoe and preparing for departure, an authority from the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment (Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente - IBAMA3) ran to the banks of the river yelling my name. The Reserva Extrativista Iriri (Iriri Extractive Reserve) had just been created where I planned to travel, she said, and I was no longer permitted to conduct research because it was now a federal protected area. I was also informed that if I attempted to go ahead, the federal police would find me, arrest me, and evict me from the country with an unlikely chance of reentry.

I was thrilled to hear the news of the reserve’s creation. The reserve would provide the ribeirinhos, a historically displaced people who have experienced decades of invisibility and violence in this frontier region, with legal rights to land and basic services. However, I was wary of the aggressive stance the government initially took on the protected areas, and the rhetoric some representatives employed that implied governmental ownership and strict bureaucratic rule. My prior experiences in protected areas have shown that rigid approaches to human communities in recently created protected areas prove detrimental to the people and undermine the objectives of the protected area. However, the creation of the reserve also meant my project was no longer legally permissible. As a result, a large portion of my budget already spent in

---

3 In 2007, the Brazilian government created the Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (ICMBio) to oversee all federal conservation units, including extractive reserves.
preparation for this trip was likely lost on the immobilized fuel, food, and supplies that would remain banked on the edge of the Xingu River, vulnerable to theft and ruin in the Amazonian elements.

The family with whom I was traveling was surprised and confused by the news, and was trying to understand the implications of the reserve for their return, and that of their kin, to the region. I immediately began contacting my local and regional non-governmental (NGO) partners and mentors, all of whom had experience doing research in extractive reserves, and indeed some of whom were key players in the design and implementation of Brazil’s extractive reserve concept. None of them had anticipated the federal government enforcing additional permits for extractive reserves, and all were flabbergasted. They began to make phone calls to Brazilian government authorities on my behalf. Meanwhile, my local partners, 4 whose organizations were members of the social movement in support of the creation of protected areas, told me they would try to dar um jeito with IBAMA officials in Altamira. Dar um jeito is a common Brazilian expression that implies “making a deal” or “informally negotiating” in accordance with Brazilian customs. It is often the most successful means of accomplishing tasks in Brazil, and was indeed what enabled me to conduct research that summer.

With the help of my mentors and in-country partners, I was able to negotiate a temporary field visa on the grounds that the reserve had not yet been signed into federal decree by President Lula. As the head of IBAMA joked with me a year later in Brasília, I was Brazil’s first foreign “guinea pig”. To his knowledge, I was the first foreign

4 My local partners were representatives from the Fundação Viver, Produzir e Preservar (Foundation to Live, Produce, and Preserve - FVPP), the Comissão Pastoral da Terra (Pastoral Land Commission – CPT), and the Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (Institute for Environmental Research in the Amazon - IPAM).
researcher for whom additional permits were required in extractive reserves. Thus began my field season in 2006. I was granted a temporary IBAMA permit for research, but only within the Iriri Extractive Reserve.

Once in the field, my provisional permit posed challenges for my fieldwork on ribeirinho sense of place, place-based practices, and identity. Because the Iriri Extractive Reserve is surrounded on all sides by other protected areas, and the ribeirinhos move through these boundaries fluidly yet I was not permitted to do so, I was faced with the near daily challenge of trying to adequately account for place without being able to collect data or experience many of the realities that comprise “place” for the ribeirinhos. I was not permitted to conduct research, including interviewing informants or even visiting them for lunch, on lands other than within the Iriri Extractive Reserve. Thus, if a ribeirinho was fishing in one place and then left to go to the other side of the river to rest on land, I could not accompany him because those lands did not belong to the Iriri Extractive Reserve.

I recall one occasion in which a woman with whom I was visiting wanted to take me to meet her parents and siblings on the Anfrísio River, just across the river from her home. Because that land was the Riozinho do Anfrísio Extractive Reserve, I had to decline. This was difficult to explain to the ribeirinhos, almost all of whom did not understand that protected areas had been created by the State, and indeed that the Iriri Extractive Reserve in which they resided had just been created days ago. In this sense, the extractive reserve had become a negative space that limited my presence in the region. It constrained my movement and use of space, similar to the “spatial interdictions” imposed for cultural reasons in Australia as explained by Munn (1996),
although in my case, negative space was idiosyncratic. The ribeirinhos remained largely unaware of the imposition of political boundaries in the region; they were simply navigating their landscape as they had been doing for nearly a century. Asking them to do differently was an interruption in the flow of the regular activities and could generate animosity between them and the State. Below, there are examples of the ways in which the extractive reserve does indeed become a negative space imposed by the government; in subsequent chapters, negative space is culturally enforced.\(^5\) In this instance, however, I adhered as closely as possible to the political boundaries of the newly created Iriri Extractive Reserve. I used the waterways as interstitial, in-between, neutral places in the same way that fisherfolk, middlemen, ribeirinhos, and indigenous people do.

**The Terra do Meio as Amazonian Frontier**

A general definition of frontiers as currently conceived is provided by Little (2001:1), as “sparsely populated geographical areas peripheral to political and economic centers of power that experience accelerated rates of demographic, agricultural, or technological change.” The frontier concept, both as it has been used generally and applied in the Amazon specifically, is a useful point of introduction to the region. The “Land of the Middle” is quite literally an in-between place located in the interstices of natural and manmade features that have been utilized and modified by various stakeholders in response to economic booms and busts. It is a forested expanse of land comprising 8.3 million hectares—approximately the size of Texas—between the Xingu and Iriri rivers, the municipalities of Altamira and São Félix do Xingu,

---

\(^5\) In other ways, however, the reserve became a celebrated space that granted the ribeirinhos access to government resources. This is discussed further below.
and surrounded by eight indigenous lands. It is also known as an expanse of forest nestled, albeit distantly, in the crook of two major highways: the Transamazon Highway (BR-230) on the north, which transects the entire Amazon basin, linking Brazil’s easternmost port to Peru and Bolivia on the west, and ultimately ending at Pacific ports on Peru’s coast; and the Cuiabá-Santarém highway (BR-163) on the west, which descends from the Transamazon Highway at the city of Santarém nearly 2,000 km south to the city of Cuiabá in the state of Mato Grosso (Figure 4-1).

The Terra do Meio forms part of what was, until recently, considered a lawless frontier (CPT 2004, 2005; Fearnside 2001a, 2007a; Greenpeace 2001a, 2001b, 2003; ISA 2003; Rocha et al. 2005; Sauer 2005; Schwartzman 2005; Schwartzman et al. 2010). Before the creation of protected areas, the area known as the Terra do Meio was considered terra devoluta—undeclared federal lands—that for decades were informally governed by those interest groups with the most power. Ill-conceived settlement projects and highway construction (see Chapter 2) provided land speculators—traffickers, and illegal loggers, ranchers, and miners—access to the interior, including along the Iriri and Anfrísio rivers. In the absence of government, the region was governed by the informal “politics” of the frontier, and, before the turn of the last century, had become famous as Brazil’s most chaotic (Schwartzman et al. 2010) and “contested” (Schmink and Wood 1992) frontier, and was characterized as an Amazonian “Wild West” in reference to the American frontier during the 19th century (Branford and Glock 1985; Reuters 12/22/2005).

At present, the Terra do Meio region is surrounded on all sides by several developments indicative of the frontier, including a controversial, major hydroelectric
dam project proposed in the 1980s called Belo Monte, which was approved in 2010; the expansion of soybean-based agro-business in the state of Mato Grosso to the south of Pará (Fearnside 2001b; Nepstad et al. 2002), and unprecedented deforestation related to illegal logging and ranching. The Xingu basin, in which the Terra do Meio is located, is adjacent to the “arc of deforestation” (Fearnside 2007b), an agricultural frontier of the southeastern Amazon⁶ where over 80% of deforestation occurs (IBGE 2004; ISA 2006).

As described above, the frontier concept is a modern one in which the frontier is delineated, physical space that emerged in response to an economic “boom”.⁷ However, Little (2001) and Schmink and Wood (1992) provide a more nuanced and multi-scalar approach to the frontier concept in the Amazon, which is useful to understand the Terra do Meio region. The creation of the protected areas in the Terra do Meio, and the ways people contest or comply with enforced boundaries and rules as they dwelled, became a fascinating lens through which to examine “place” in my research project. Amazonian frontiers are both a literal and a metaphorical “place”: “a multiplicity of simultaneous and overlapping contested frontiers, both palpable and abstract” (Schmink and Wood 1992:19). As Little (2001) discusses in his case studies in Amazonian political ecology, different social groups maintain distinct perceptions of territoriality in the Amazon. Amazonian frontiers are thus “perennial” (Little 2001:3): they open and close repeatedly in response to territorial struggles among different social groups. This perspective contrasts with the static view of the frontier critiqued by Raffles

---

⁶ The arc of deforestation includes parts of the states of Pará, Mato Grosso, Rondônia, and Acre (Fearnside 2007b).

⁷ See, for example, the emergence of the frontier concept in reference to the “Wild West” of 19th century United States history (e.g., Turner 1920).
as spatially linear, socially discrete, and overly simplified (sensu Turner 1920).

In the absence of clear land designation, governance, and acknowledgment of the ribeirinhos of the region, the Terra do Meio was under the control of drug traffickers, illegal loggers, and land grabbers (grileiros) who appropriated land through illicit and often violent means. Those who suffered the most immediate consequences of these invasions in the Terra do Meio were the ribeirinhos who considered those lands home (e.g. Schwartzman 2005; Schwartzman et al. 2010). The ribeirinhos who remained in the forest following the wartime rubber bust were “invisible” to the government. Without legal rights to land, identity documents, or government services—basic rights guaranteed to all Brazilian citizens—it was as though the ribeirinhos did not exist. One informant, who asked to remain anonymous, shared with me in 2005 that representatives from the regional secretariats of health and education did not provide services to the ribeirinhos because, in their words, there was no “proof” that they existed. They were left to defend their “place” themselves. In this context of lawlessness and invisibility, the protected areas proposal was generally welcomed by the ribeirinhos.

Frontier violence is also experienced at the urban-rural interface, where visibility is greatest: infrastructure, communication, and urban centers facilitate direct observation of people, their personal and professional business, and their social exchanges. As I reviewed in Chapter 2, organized movements against lawlessness and injustice that are associated with Amazonian frontiers tend to originate at this interface, and, as was seen in the assassinations of Chico Mendes and Wilson Pinheiro in Acre in the 1980s, the
location of movement leaders’ whereabouts, including their homes, is common knowledge.

The cities that surround and represent gateways into the Terra do Meio, such as Altamira and São Félix do Xingu, were frontier towns established during a period of intense development in the Brazilian Amazon in the 1970s, particularly highway development and settlement projects (Moran 1981; Schmink and Wood 1992; and see Chapter 2). In the years following this development, the surrounding lands and natural resources therein were illegally occupied and appropriated by ranchers, loggers, and land speculators, and land conflicts ensued (Alencar et al. 2004). Amazon social movements emerged and grew in response to the opening of the frontier. One movement in particular, the *Movimento pelo Desenvolvimento da Transamazônica e Xingu* (Movement for the Development of the Transamazon and Xingu – MDTX), represents 115 non-governmental organizations, workers' unions, and small family farmers, and their national and international NGO alliances (Campos and Nepstad 2006; Schwartzman and Zimmerman 2005). This movement began as a family farmers’ social movement in the 1970s in support of fair policies concerning the construction of the Transamazon highway and the distribution of lands for family farmers on both sides of the highway, as part of the country’s Amazonian National Integration Plan (PIN; see Chapter 2). Over time, the movement became a pro-poor, pro-environment movement, formed partnerships with the Indians and riberinhos in the interior, and was an integral, civil society entity that pressured the government to create the Terra do Meio mosaic (Campos and Nepstad 2006; Schwartzman and Zimmerman 2005; Schwartzman et al. 2010). As part of this process, representatives from the MDTX visited with the
ribeirinhos of the Iriri, Anfrísio, and Xingu rivers in the early 2000s. Over a period of several weeks on the river they surveyed the population, distributed medical supplies, and helped the ribeirinhos obtain identity documents (Tarcísio Feitosa, pers. comm., 8/12/2005).  

In 2005, one of my informants, Herculáno Costa da Silva, from the neighboring and then-proposed Middle Xingu Extractive Reserve, began receiving death threats from hired gunmen involved in illegal logging because of his work in favor of creating the Middle Xingu Extractive Reserve. In February 2005, 18 gunmen removed him from his home on the Xingu, and 67 homes of other ribeirinhos were burned. In 2007, an American PhD student received a death threat for her work in the then-proposed Middle Xingu Extractive Reserve. She suspended her work there, altered her research plan, and did not return to the reserve, which represented one of her case studies.

In the Terra do Meio region and its gateway cities, MDTX social movement leaders are recipients of frequent death threats because of their work in defense of these lands and the people living therein. The statistics related to land-related homicides in Pará broadly, and the Terra do Meio region specifically, are astonishing. Pará is a largely forested state that, at 3% of the national population, has a very low population density. In the last 40 years, however, 534 land-related deaths occurred in the region (CPT 2004, 2005; Greenpeace 2001, 2003; Sauer 2005). Between 1996 and 2001 alone, 90 homicides were registered. Between 1994 and 2004, assassinations due to land-related
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8 This informant asked to be named.
9 This was an unsettling occurrence since we were the only two American students in the region at the time, of the same age group, height, and some similar physical features, and most people confused us. I was encouraged to consider leaving my field site by my American mentors after her death threat, but was assured by my Brazilian partners who have a long history of dealing with lawlessness in this frontier, including grileiros, that I would be safe if I was accompanied while in the city and kept indoors after dark.
conflicts represent 40% of the national total. Most of these assassinations were against local leaders in defense of land and rural workers who defend their rights to land. They are often implemented by hired gunmen (*pistoleiros*) who are contracted by loggers, ranchers, or independent but powerful individuals who take advantage of the lack of land designation and government presence in the region (Alencar et al. 2004; Fearnside 2007a; Schwartzman 2005; Schwartzman et al. 2010).

Ademir “Dema” Alfeu Federicci is one example of a local leader and activist who was shot by suspected hired gunmen. Dema, who was characterized as “the region’s most outspoken labor, peasant and environmental leader” (New York Times 10/12/01), opposed the construction of the Belo Monte dam (see above). For his activism, he was shot by two hired gunmen on August 25, 2001 in his bed in Altamira in front of his wife and children. Nearly one year later, in July 2002, Bartolomeu “Brasilia” Morais da Silva was tortured and killed for his role with the *Federação de Trabalhadores Agrícolos do Pará* (Federation of Agricultural Workers of Pará - Fetagri-PA), where he was working in defense of lands and smallholders.

Yet it was the assassination of the American-born nun Dorothy Stang on February 12, 2005 that garnered intense international scrutiny and was perhaps the most defining moment for the creation of the Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic. Stang was a missionary who had been working in the region since 1966 through the *Comissão Pastoral da Terra* (Pastoral Land Commission-CPT), a national organization linked with the Catholic Church. Called the “Angel of the Transamazon” by local people, Stang was popular among the region’s poor for her commitment to securing land rights and establishing sound farming and resource management practices for those
disenfranchised by land grabbing and illegal logging. She is often compared with Chico Mendes, the rubber tapper from Acre who, with the help of strategic alliances, created the Extractive Reserve concept.

Ironically, it was Stang’s highly publicized assassination that propelled this region into visibility and the government into action. Dorothy Stang’s death is often equated with the completion of the Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic.¹⁰ Brazil’s President Lula proclaimed Stang’s assassination a reaction by land grabbers and ranchers against the implementation of the federal government’s program to regularize land and support environmental conservation in the region. He immediately sent 2,000 troops to the region. Within five days of Stang’s assassination, 4.5 million hectares of the proposed Terra do Meio mosaic were approved by IBAMA. Finally, Lula organized a provisional federal government cabinet for the region, and placed 8.2 million hectares of forest on the west of the BR-163 as federal lands in interdiction.

The government’s response clearly demonstrates the ways in which protected areas are more than a conservation strategy; they are used to replace the informal frontier dynamics with governance. The transition from lawless, terras devolutas to protected areas was one that was facilitated by the MDTX, strategic alliances, and the tragic assassination of Dorothy Stang. While the region remained “invisible” for decades to the government, the creation of protected areas launched the physical space of the Terra do Meio and its inhabitants into visibility. The multivocality and multilocality of competing interest groups—the State, social movements, ribeirinhos, land speculators
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¹⁰ This is not unlike what happened in the aftermath of Chico Mendes’ assassination in the state of Acre in 1988. As discussed, Mendes was shot outside of his home by hired gunmen for his work defending the rights of rubber tappers and developing the extractive reserve concept in Brazil. Shortly after his death, his dream became reality and the first extractive reserves were created.
(grileiros), ranchers (fazendeiros), and indigenous people (índios)—shape what is called the Amazonian “frontier”. Competing interests clash within the frontier as territories are perceived as threatened, violated, or at risk. Next, I discuss the role of boundaries in the frontier region, with particular attention to the creation of protected areas in the ribeirinho landscape.

**Boundaries**

When the Iriri Extractive Reserve was created, the responses elicited by disparate stakeholders in reaction to the news depended upon their experience of the region. Their responses were linked to their perception of “territoriality”, not just in the literal sense of inhabiting and developing lands, as indicated in the development of the frontier concept in the United States (e.g., Turner 1920), but also in the figurative sense of authority over a region. Similar to the concepts of Amazonian frontiers and territories provided by Little (2001) and Schmink and Wood (1992), I consider boundaries to be the literal and symbolic delineation of territories in the Amazonian frontier. They are multilocal and often juxtaposed, representing the multiple, competing claims to land and resources.

In this section, I explore the ways in which the creation of political borders throughout the Terra do Meio region makes it difficult to situate a study of place in place. I sought to understand place as the ribeirinhos understood it—what I call the ribeirinho taskscape, defined in Chapter 5 as a network of related places, tasks, and times (Casey 1996; Ingold 1993, 2000) —and to accompany them in their everyday activities so as best to understand their sense of place. Yet the protected areas, most of which were recently created and enforced by the State upon this landscape, made this a challenging task, as this chapter’s opening anecdote reveals.
The creation of protected areas and the follow-through provided by several NGOs that form part of the social movement has brought the desperately needed assistance and respite from the violent conflict and invisibility endured for years. Overall, the ribeirinhos have benefited from increased government presence. As a result of the social movement, the ribeirinhos, previously invisible to the State, now have identity documents and are officially recognized as a result of the creation of the protected areas. This visibility also entitles them to their basic rights as citizens, including medical care and education, as outlined in the Brazilian Constitution of 1988:

Article 208 (I): With regard to education, the State guarantees basic, free, obligatory education for those between the ages of four (4) to seventeen (17) years.

Article 227. It is the responsibility of the family, society, and the State to ensure, with utmost priority, that all children have rights to life, health, food, and education, culture, dignity, respect, and liberty, and to have these rights while living with their family and community. They should be protected from all forms of negligence, discrimination, violence, cruelty, and oppression (Constituição de 1988 do Brasil; my translation).

The creation of the reserves marked a welcome respite from the violence, insecurity, and displacement the ribeirinhos faced at the hands of the grileiros. With the prodding of the social movement, the required government services of education and health care are beginning to reach the region in some fashion, including some primary education and routine medical expeditions. Both of these were implemented after my fieldwork had concluded, and so I am unable to provide firsthand account of these interventions and the positive or negative ways in which they might be affecting the ribeirinhos. Nonetheless, a brief update of education and health care is provided in Chapter 7.

The creation of protected areas also provides a new dimension of place to this study: the State’s ordering and administration of a region that is understood, at times
differentially, by the ribeirinhos. As one ribeirinho, Zeca, shared with me, “If we had accepted the [terms and proposal of] reserve, the reserve would have been created. If we hadn’t accepted them, the reserve would have been created” (June 6, 2007). While environmental advocates hope the ribeirinhos will become stewards of the reserve, the sense of propriety and pride toward the physical “space” of the reserve, as the government defines it, is not the same as the ribeirinho landscape. I now describe the boundaries of the Terra do Meio mosaic, including a definition of an extractive reserve. As part of this description I explore the ways in which the ribeirinhos move through these recently created territories, at times clashing with them, as they conduct their daily lives within their landscape.

**The Boundaries of the Terra do Meio Mosaic**

The ribeirinhos of the Iriri River are surrounded on all sides by a series of protected areas, most of which were created immediately following Stang’s death. Most of the ribeirinhos with whom I work now reside in the Iriri Extractive Reserve. Other protected areas include three *Terras Indígenas* (TIs) occupied by Indians from the Tupí linguistic branch, another extractive reserve, and a strict protected area called an *Estação Ecológica* (Ecological Station). The objective of an Ecological Station is to preserve nature and conduct scientific research with authorization (ICMBio; [http://www.icmbio.gov.br/menu/instituicao](http://www.icmbio.gov.br/menu/instituicao)), but it prohibits settlement and occupation. Extractive reserves, on the other hand, provide long term use and occupation of federal lands. The reserve concept is an innovative public policy option designed in the 1980s by a rubber tappers’ movement allied with national and international human rights and environmental activists, researchers, and policymakers. According to Brazilian federal law,
A Reserva Extrativista (Extractive Reserve) is an area designated for the use of traditional extractivist populations whose livelihoods rely primarily on extracting from the area’s natural resources. They may complementarily practice subsistence agriculture and possess small, domesticated animals, both for household consumption. The principal objective of an extractive reserve is to protect the ways of life and culture of these human populations, and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources in the reserve (ICMBio, my translation; http://www.icmbio.gov.br/menu/instituicao).

As a concept, extractive reserves were acclaimed as a promising option that balanced environmental conservation and economic development for landless traditional peoples (Fearnside 1989; Nepstad and Schwartzman 1992) who would serve as environmental stewards. The idea, modeled after the TI legislation in Brazil,\(^\text{11}\) was to provide traditional peoples with use rights to federal lands they occupied (Allegretti 1990; Schwartzman 1992). Whereas Brazilian Indians have permanent rights to land and autonomous decision-making regarding natural resources, in extractive reserves landholders are granted 30 year land use concessions, after which they may be removed or the concession renewed. Furthermore, land use is limited to specific, environmentally sustainable activities that are overseen by the Chico Mendes Institute (Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade – ICMBio). ICMBio is the unit within IBAMA that creates and administers inhabited protected areas. Thus, the extractive reserve concept is an innovative public policy that addresses the dual objectives of land reform and environmental conservation (Ehringhaus 2006; Fearnside 1989; Geisler and Silberling 1992).

\(^\text{11}\) Brazil’s 1988 Constitution recognizes Indians as the first and natural owners of Brazilian lands. A Terra Indígena is a federal land “inhabited by [Indians] permanently, those used for their productive activities, those indispensable to the preservation of the environmental resources necessary for their well-being and those necessary for their physical and cultural reproduction, in accordance to their habits, customs and traditions” (Constituição de 1988 do Brasil). Indigenous lands undergo a federal demarcation and designation process, overseen by the National Indian Foundation (Fundação Nacional do Índio - FUNAI).
The Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic was the final area of land needed to complete the Xingu Protected Areas Corridor (XPAC), a forest corridor comprised of indigenous territories, extractive reserves, strict protected areas and a national forest that is home to 11,000 people—most of whom are members of 24 indigenous tribes and ribeirinho families. The XPAC covers a vast amount of territory, extending from dense and humid lowland forests in the central part of the state of Pará, south to the forest-savanna transition area in the state of Mato Grosso. At 26 million hectares, the XPAC covers half of the Xingu River Basin, and is considered the largest protected areas corridor in the world.

As seen in Figure 4-1, several protected areas and indigenous lands are found in the Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic. The entire eastern border of the reserve is flanked by the Estação Ecológica Terra do Meio (Terra do Meio Ecological Station), created on February 17, 2005. At 3,373,111 hectares (ha), the Terra do Meio Ecological Station is a very large, strictly protected area in which, as noted above, people are not allowed to reside. Three TIs are adjacent to the Iriri on the north (Cachoeira Seca do Iriri) and south (Xipaya and Kuruaya). The Riozinho do Anfásio Extractive Reserve (736,340 ha) is west of the reserve. Table 4-1 provides information on each protected area (including indigenous lands) in the Terra do Meio.

**Living on the “Wrong Side” of the Protected Area Boundary**

While the majority of my informants resided in the newly created Iriri Extractive Reserve, 24 households (36%)—20 in indigenous lands and four in the Ecological
Station—are outside of the reserve in close proximity to it. These individuals feared for their futures since they were now regarded as illegal occupants of the landscape they had considered home for generations. The extractive reserve had in this scenario become a powerful negative space: a space of “deletions” (Munn 1996:448) that constrained the ribeirinhos’ use and occupation of their familiar and historically dwelt landscape.

Although the extractive reserve concept was developed in defense of traditional people’s culture and land use practices, this was not the case for those individuals who fell on the “wrong” side of the protected area line. Their entire lives were spent in a particular landscape that they were suddenly “illegally” occupying because of the creation of the protected areas. As a result of this oversight, ICMBio initiated a relocation process for those families on the “wrong” side of the protected areas lines to move over to the recently delineated Iriri Extractive Reserve. At the time of my last visit in 2008, the process had been implemented with mixed results. Figure 4-2 is a georeferenced map created with the help of one of my regional partners, which indicates the location of all ribeirinho households, and juxtaposes the households on the boundaries of the geopolitical landscape, including the protected areas. I recorded the points during my fieldwork using a Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) unit at all households within the reserve. I located households outside of the reserve through interviews and a modified snowball sample. When across from the TIs, I asked if anyone in the home had kinship or other social ties with ribeirinhos living on the other
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12 It is also estimated that several families live in the Serra do Pardo National Park (Schwartzman et al. 2010), but my informants did not indicate any links with these families, most likely because of distance and lack of kinship ties.
side of the river, or far away from the home of the da Silvas—the name of the family I knew was legitimately located inside the reserve, just at the reserve’s boundary. If they did not have social ties, they indicated neighbors who did. This process eventually led me to several families who lived outside of the reserve who considered themselves part of the reserve population. I verified the information with these families and, if they had social and kinship ties with families in the Extractive Reserve, I took the GPS point. The list is by no means exhaustive; over 20 families have been reported in the TIs and several more in the strict protected areas (Schwartzman et al. 2010).

Furthermore, a portion of a household questionnaire was implemented to determine place of origin (Appendix A). Of the 66 responding individuals to the questionnaire—consisting of 52% men and 48% women—82% identified themselves as “from here”. “Here” was probed further and traced to three rivers: the Novo, Anfrísio, Iriri, and Curuá. In other words, “here” was not necessarily the Iriri Extractive Reserve but the rivers in and out of the reserve that they consider part of their landscape from birth. The technique is simply illustrative of the complexities associated with the imposition of boundaries on local perceptions of place, and was employed to broadly identify compatible and incompatible perceptions of space and place in the ribeirinho landscape.

As the map demonstrates, several households are outside of the Iriri Extractive Reserve, located in the TIs and in the Ecological Station. Those within the Ecological Station are easy to identify on the map depicted in Figure 4-2; they are isolated households to the south of the reserve, clearly outside of the extractive reserve boundary and within the ecological station boundary. The households in the TI
Cachoeira Seca do Iriri are not as easily distinguished on the map from households in the Iriri Extractive Reserve because of their proximity, but close inspection reveals their location. During my fieldwork, these families expressed frustration, confusion, sadness, or anger about being asked to relocate. A woman shared with me that “here [in the indigenous land] we apparently don’t have rights, but we don’t have a place over there [in the reserve] either. So, they tell me I am at risk of being thrown off of this side, but I also do not have rights on that side. What confusion!” (June 6, 2007). Some ribeirinhos decided against relocating because they weighed their current location against the perceived benefits of living in the reserve. In a worst case scenario in which the government would remove them from their land, they felt they could find another place in which to live that was not in the reserve. One household headed by a man and woman in their sixties that also included two of their children, those children’s spouses, and their grandchildren, explained their perspective to me. My fieldnotes describe this situation as follows:

When asked why they would not undergo the relocation process, they explained that the reserve was simply a concept that was not showing tangible results. Why, they argued, would they give up their swidden agricultural fields, home, and Brazil nut grove on the indigenous side, when the Indians have asked them to stay and, in fact, invited them to settle there in the first place? When I asked what they would do if FUNAI asked them to leave, they felt they could pursue other options in the region. I am not sure if they are aware of the extent of protected areas created in the region now. They would have to go very far to be outside of the purview of federally protected lands in this region (June 10, 2007).

Another woman expressed outrage that she or her children could be evicted because they were born and raised there, while the president of the reserve was an
outsider and recent arrival.\textsuperscript{13} Most families were angry about the fact that they had been asked to leave their lands and relocate to the new reserve. One woman passionately described her perspective through her and her children’s history, rooted in place: “The worst crisis that I have experienced in my life is this one. I was born and raised here. I had a terrible miscarriage and almost died here. I raised 11 children here! But, in the end, the worst crisis I have experienced was this: that the people [from the government] come and take me from my place” (June 15, 2007).

This sentiment was shared by one of the eldest ribeirinhas, Socorro, an 80-year-old woman on the indigenous side who refuses to leave her home and land. Socorro is physically incapacitated but mentally astute. She has not left her hammock in a decade. Her daughter and grandchildren bathe her in her hammock. Her body is twisted and gnarled from what I imagine is osteoporosis and arthritis. Yet she articulately explained to me that she has resided on the indigenous land her entire life, tapped rubber on the indigenous side, intermarried with the Indians, and considers herself part Indian. As a result, she prefers to die on the indigenous side. “I have not arrived at this age to die without grace”, she commented. “I am not going to the other side. If they take me, they will have to take me when I’m dead” (June 10, 2007).

All of the ribeirinhos with whom I spoke who reside in a TI report amicable relations with the Indians and many reported having indigenous blood. For over a century, they had dwelled in the landscape. Just like their family and friends in the Iriri

\textsuperscript{13} The President of the time was appointed hastily through heavy government assistance, since a reserve cannot be created without an intact Associação de Moradores (Resident’s Association) that is headed by an elected president and includes a treasurer and secretary. This is a foreign concept to the ribeirinhos, and so they were encouraged by a team of IBAMA representatives and NGO advocates to vote for the president of the time because he had completed primary school education and was more familiar with such organizational constructs.
Extractive Reserve across the river, these ribeirinhos’ rubber trails, Brazil nut groves, swidden agricultural fields, and homes comprise their landscape. Yet they were keenly aware that the creation of the protected areas and the uncertain but potential enforcement of TI boundaries—a possibility they considered in light of the increased attention paid to the region by government officials—would render them homeless, placeless, and without access to the resources that had enabled them to dwell for several generations. In a private conversation with Socorro’s daughter Raimunda, I learned that although Socorro was committed to staying on the lands, Raimunda and her husband Zeca were nervous about the future if they did not relocate. Raimunda recognized that her family needed to stay with her mother to care for her and maintain those lands. She felt overwhelmed by the prospect of having to make a decision that went against her mother’s strong desire to remain in place, but felt that eventually they would be forced to relocate by FUNAI or they would be evicted. In both circumstances, Raimunda felt they were at risk of losing everything they consider “home” in the TI.

Zeca described the recent creation and enforcement of legal boundaries as one of “sudden paralysis”: for decades they were forgotten by the government, and now they are being told they are in the wrong place. Zeca expressed that in both scenarios his family would be removed from the landscape since they would become disconnected from their livelihood practices. In reference to this he angrily proclaimed, “Here we don’t have rights and over there we don’t, either” (June 6, 2007). Weighing these two options, he opted not to participate in the government’s relocation assistance program, choosing to remain on the TI where he and his family would continue to dwell as they had for
generations. He did so aware that he was risking complete eviction from the region, should the government also enforce TI boundaries.

By contrast, several families reported agreeing to undergo government-assisted relocation to the reserve. Although they agreed to undergo this process, they did so with trepidation and with a sense that it was the only way to ensure their long-term security. The phrase, “What else can we do?” was repeated by these families, and anxiety characterized the tone of their discussion with me on the subject. According to these individuals, the government had negotiated the use of land, including Brazil nut groves, to ensure a continuation of their livelihood. In fact, in August 2007 one informant reported that one year before, an IBAMA representative had spent months canvassing the ribeirinhos’ homes and forests on both sides of the protected area “line” to count Brazil nut trees and link them to their owners.

For those who found themselves on the “wrong” side of the line considering relocation, they were clear that the use of land in the reserve constituted a favor or a lease with their “owners” until a better agreement could be made. These individuals were most concerned with the loss of the resources associated with their livelihood practices. The role of these practices in the ribeirinho landscape is described in detail in Chapter 5; for the purposes of this chapter, the role of the Brazil nut tree specifically in the definition of place and boundaries is important. The phrase, *os castanhais já têm dono* (the Brazil nut trees already have owners), was anxiously repeated to me by ribeirinhos on the “wrong” side of the boundary. Brazil nut collection is a significant livelihood practice for the ribeirinhos, reaching several kilometers into the forest on both sides of the river. During these interviews, the extent of the Brazil nut grove was the
most defining feature of the ribeirinho landscape. Houses can be rebuilt and crops can be replanted. Brazil nut trees, however, cannot be relocated. One informant told me, “I don’t want to go to the other side because here I will lose rights to my Brazil nuts. But we must move. The government told us that if we stayed, we will eventually be evicted [by FUNAI]. And so we agreed to move. But all the Brazil nut trees over there already have owners” (June 6, 2007). A sense of not having other options except moving was expressed by these families, who appeared resigned to relocation rather than understanding or accepting of it.

As this section has demonstrated, there is considerable variation between the State and ribeirinhos with regard to place. While the creation of the Terra do Meio mosaic has succeeded in assuaging the frontier violence of the region, the juxtaposition of protected area boundaries created considerable tension among the ribeirinhos of the Iriri. Some of the ribeirinhos had been dwelling for over a century in the riverine landscape. In particular, perceptions of territory—where one’s “place” begins and ends, and what comprises “place” for the ribeirinhos—clashes with the legal framework of extractive reserves. Many of the rifts between the two are the incompatibility of the two perspectives of the riverine landscape. On the one hand, the State delineated lands as if they were stable, bounded, and fixed locations in geographic space. The ribeirinhos, by contrast, perceive place as “process”; it is experienced through their tasks in relation to other places and times. Thus, it is not temporally or spatially fixed; it is constantly becoming. Chapters 5 and 6 explore the ribeirinho taskscape and sense of place in greater detail.
Migration and Emplacement

As discussed in Chapter 3, the ribeirinhos are primarily descendents of northeasterners who came to the region during the rubber boom, and particularly during WWII, to extract the latex of the wild rubber tree (*Hevea brasiliensis*) in the Brazilian Amazon. The ribeirinhos are thus a population that has experienced displacement and short-term migration through the landscape as a result of government initiatives that may be traced back to the 19th and 20th centuries. After the rubber boom, these populations considering themselves seringueiros and soldados de borracha were left in the forest to fend for themselves for generations. Many remained in the forest, leading a subsistence lifestyle, intermarrying with Indians, and developing a distinct cultural identity as caboclos (Wagley 1976; Weinstein 1983; and see Chapters 2 and 3).

At present, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River live in dispersed settlements on both banks of the river, but primarily on the east side. In June 2006, 35 households and 191 individuals were surveyed inside of the reserve; by July 2007 the number of households had increased to 42. The increase was due to a variety of reasons: adolescents marrying and building a home of their own near their parents, families declaring separate residence when previously they were counted as one residence, and families relocating as part of the process described above, from one of the indigenous lands to the reserve.\(^{14}\) The distribution of the population by 10 year age increments and gender

\(^{14}\) A rapid inventory was completed by a team of consultants contracted by IBAMA between November 21 and December 22, 2006. During this period, they counted 51 families and a total of 206 residents in 23 “localities”. The population is comparable between the two sources; the discrepancy in households is likely due to the difference between “families” and “households”. I asked residents who lived in the home. I did not differentiate by last name, but rather recorded names and relationships according to who they reported lived in the home.
is fairly typical for the developing world, with an inverse “J” shaped curve from children through the elderly (Figure 4-3).

As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, a general sense of “placelessness” is presumed to accompany populations on-the-move in modern times (Augé 1995; c.f. Bender 2001). This is the case in the Amazon, where smallholders are held responsible by environmentalists for deforestation (e.g., Myers 1984) and caboclo populations are depicted as opportunistic, economically motivated, and somehow detached or displaced from the environment (e.g., Browder 1992; Redford and Sanderson 2000).\textsuperscript{15} The ribeirinhos of the Iriri, however, have a deep sense of place that has developed in spite of the economic and political fluctuations they have experienced over decades. Indeed, in many cases, their sense of place was heightened through these intervals.

My research indicates that even as families expanded or contracted in response to fluctuating economic periods, and even as extractive practices shifted from rubber (as the price was devalued) to other activities over time, individuals tended to stay in place or to move only within short distances. Data collected on place of origin, length of residence, and migration in a household questionnaire reveal that ribeirinho movement within or even outside of the region is not indicative of a lack of attachment to place. Even with the constant flux in the region, 35% of respondents said that they remain on the land on which they were born and raised and 20% report residing on the same piece of land for over 20 years.\textsuperscript{16} Indeed, more than half of the residents have remained in the

\textsuperscript{15} See Ehringhaus (2006) for a thorough review of the literatures on extractive reserves. According to her analysis, extractivists are unfairly grouped as either environmental heroes or villains by the conservation community, leading to unrealistic expectations for reserves and extractivists therein.

\textsuperscript{16} This questionnaire was administered to adult heads of household in the 35 households surveyed in 2006.
place they reside now for 15 years or more (Table 4-2). These data suggest that this is a stable population.

Almost all of the ribeirinhos consider themselves “of” the Iriri River (see Chapter 6). Above, I referenced the results of a household questionnaire on place of origin, in which 82% of the surveyed population (N=66)—53% men and 49% women—identified themselves as “born and raised in the region”. Furthermore, a cross-tabulation of place of origin and family members reveals that of all respondents—those who have consistently occupied the region since birth and those who have not—over 80% (87% and 81%, respectively) reported that they have family in the area. After leaving the region, reasons for returning were almost always attributed to being near family and to enjoy a higher quality of life that the region affords; likely these two are related.

In one case, a 24-year-old woman explained that although she was born and raised along Kilometer 80 of the Transamazon Highway, where her father worked in highway construction, her mother was a long-term resident from the Anfrísio River. Her father, originally from the northeast, had arrived in the region as a young man to work in construction along the Transamazon Highway. He met her mother along the Anfrísio River where, on several occasions, he hunted jaguars to sell their skins in the city and supplement his wages in construction. They married, moved to the Transamazon, and began raising a family there. The respondent’s decision to return to the region was based on having family in the region where her mother originated, resources to rely on, and fond memories of spending time there as a child. Another informant, Carlos, said that he was born in Altamira on a small plot of land outside of the city. His father, who is from a small tributary of the Iriri, worked difficult jobs doing heavy labor under slave-like
conditions, which he “could not stand”. His father left his mother and brought all of the children back to the region he was from. Luis and his siblings grew up on the banks of the river and now have children they are raising there. In other words, even when people are not born in the region, when they have only seasonally occupied the region, or when they leave the region for occasional employment elsewhere, I found that they often return.17

Of those who live in the Iriri Extractive Reserve, marriage18 was a primary cause of migration into and out of the region. Twenty percent of the population reported that a member of their household had moved to or left the region because of marriage. In other words, individuals from outside of the reserve moved to the reserve to marry a person from the region, and individuals from the region also leave it to marry an outsider. The following fieldnote excerpt provides an example of the role of marriage in ribeirinho migration.

Sebastián, a 20-year old, single male, was born and raised in Altamira with his mother, Dona Selene. Selene married Seu Antônio, a ribeirinho from the Iriri, five years ago. Sebastián thus maintains two residences: one with his father in the city, [not previously mentioned] and one with his mother and stepfather in the Iriri. A seasonal member of his mother’s household in the Iriri, he spends two or three months, twice per year in the region engaging in seasonal extractive activities: fishing in the dry season and collecting Brazil nuts in the rainy season. He told me that he would like to live permanently in the Iriri, where he felt he had better quality of life and was close to his mother and little sister, but that it “depends on the woman”. When I asked him to explain, he said that ideally he would find someone in

17 Two exceptions to this were for those unusual individuals who have family in Altamira and chose to move their parents as they became elderly so that they could be close to health care, or to move their school aged children there to receive some amount of education (usually a year or two).

18 The ribeirinhos do not legally marry through the court or a religious contract; they cohabit and raise families together. However, for consistency I use the term “marriage” to indicate a pairing of two people who live together, usually because they are romantically involved and intend to have children or, in most cases, the woman is already pregnant. This tends to occur shortly after the onset of the woman’s puberty, but several middle-aged people reported marrying a second or third time after their first relationships ended in death of a spouse or “divorce”.
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the reserve because it was difficult finding a city girl willing to live in the forest.

Sebastián has selected a plot of land behind his mother’s and stepfather’s home on which he intends to build his (and his future wife’s) house, with his mother’s and stepfather’s support and assistance. He showed me the land, and it is ample with room for manioc gardens and other small crops, and easy access to the river. He said he has been invited to participate in his stepfather’s and step-grandfathers’ Brazil nut harvest, so there would be no shortage of work. He expressed interest in some of Antônio and Selene’s neighbors’ daughters, one 12 and one 13 years old. He is currently trying to romance them and get their parents to warm up to him. Selene is very keen on her son staying in the region permanently, so she is actively trying to arrange Sebastián’s partnership with either girl. (8/4/2006)

When I returned the following May, I learned that the girls (or their parents) were not supportive of the proposed unions. Rejected, Sebastián returned to the city and soon after formed a relationship with a girl from the city. She became pregnant and he brought her back to the reserve. A few months later she said she could not tolerate the forest and missed her family, and she moved back to Altamira, where the baby was born. Sebastián’s home remains incomplete behind his mother’s and stepfather’s home. He currently works processing charcoal on boats near the city and continues to travel frequently for seasonal work in the Iriri. He does not like this arrangement, but as he was aware, a lot depends “on the woman”.

In spite of the placelessness and mobility that is assumed of populations that are “in between”—and particularly of peasants, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri are a stable population that identifies itself as “of” the region, and that clearly expresses a desire to remain in the region. As Basso (1996:55) says, people and place “interanimate” each other. Some factors, such as marriage and forceful evictions from place, described in this chapter, inevitably introduce a dimension of “movement” in the region, but do not
indicate that the ribeirinhos’ are any less attached to or “part of” the places in which they dwell, as I explore in the next section.

**Quantifying Place Attachment with Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis is a straightforward but compelling multivariate statistical technique used to simplify complex sets of data. The technique simplifies a matrix of correlations so that the data may be explained by a few underlying concepts, or “factors” (Kline 1994). Factor analysis provides correlations of variables to factors to help the interpreter answer the question of what underlying factors account for the relationship between different variables of the study subject.

Unlike other statistical analyses, factor analysis is an inductive technique; the results of a factor analysis present a number of factors, the meanings of which are derived by the researcher, although they must be externally validated. Thus, while the factor analysis represents the most derived and structured technique in a suite of techniques that I incorporated into this study, it reflected my commitment to methodological relationism and a postpositivist inquiry paradigm and provided another avenue through which to examine the conclusions drawn from ethnographic observations and qualitative data collection.

**Study Design**

The quantitative component of this study occurred in three phases. The first phase occurred during fieldwork in 2006 when I entered my fieldsite to pursue a research question about protected area management and community participation in public policy. This experience demonstrated the salience of place in ribeirinho identity and resource valuation. My interview protocol probed local perceptions of place, extractive and subsistence practices, and ribeirinho identity. These interviews were recorded.
The second phase, spent in the United States, involved transcribing interviews (N=53) and identifying recurrent themes in the data. The themes that emerged were the universal use of the term “ribeirinho” as a place-based identity, subsistence practices from the past and present as a source of pride, and the relevance of history in their current perceptions of place. The third phase, during the summer of 2007, involved designing the attachment to place questionnaire and re-entering the field to implement it. Data analysis of the questionnaire occurred in 2008.

The 61-item questionnaire was developed from the second phase of the study and contained a set of questions adapted from natural resource management and recreation studies conducted by Williams et al. (1992), and Williams and Vaske (2003), who examined the functional and symbolic attachments visitors had to wilderness and recreation areas in North America. Their work emerged in response to increasing demand by U.S. government agencies for improved land use planning and management using a variety of indicators, including affective attachments that guide people’s relationship with place. Kruger and Jakes (2003:820) describe this emergent trend in a special issue on place in the journal Forest Science: “Managers are seeking ways to incorporate [nonempirical] knowledge of place into resource planning and management, and social scientists have called for tools and conceptual frameworks that allow managers to access, assess, inventory and monitor sociocultural meanings of places in order to incorporate socially relevant meanings into social inquiry and planning processes.” These meanings are spiritual, symbolic, and historical, and are generally not included in empirical, economic, and knowledge-based measures of success in natural resource and recreation areas.
Williams et al. (1992) and Vaske and Kobrin (2001) included items that had previously loaded high along the dimensions of place identity and place dependence. The concept of place identity originated with environmental psychologists, who deduced that human-environment interactions lead to a cognitive development model that includes memories, ideas, feelings, and attitudes (Proshansky et al. 1983). As described in Chapter 2, they define place identity as an emotional attachment that includes identity and belonging, and tends to develop over time (Williams and Vaske 2003:831). Williams and Vaske (2003:831) define place dependence as a functional attachment, whereby the place of interest provides particular characteristics that help the user attain goals or engage in desired activities. The 61-item questionnaire included both identity and dependence items (Appendix B).

Because of the language, cultural, and biophysical differences between the North American and Brazilian sites and respondents, I modified the original questionnaire items used by Williams et al. for use in the Brazilian study site. Thirty-eight applicable items from the original questionnaire were retained and translated into Portuguese for implementation in the questionnaire. The remaining 23 items were adapted to reflect the local culture and biophysical environment. These included, for example, the desirability of where one lives, natural resource valuation, and social relationships.

The selection of adapted items was determined from the 2006 field season, in which extensive interviews on perceptions of place were recorded and transcribed. Thus, the 23 adapted statements were taken directly from 2006 interviews and, therefore, incorporate slang and other common expressions from the ribeirinho study population. These proved very effective while administering the questionnaire, since
they are verbatim, ribeirinho statements about place. Thus, the way in which the
questionnaire was designed was to test the ribeirinhos on place-related concepts, using
reliable statements used in prior studies in addition to their original statements collected
during the first phase of fieldwork.

A census was attempted to obtain the maximum number of respondents possible.
Because of the often extreme distance between houses and the strength of the
outboard motor used on the boat, houses were interviewed in logical geographic
groups. Four weeks were spent on the upper portion of the reserve, two weeks in the
middle part of the reserve, and four weeks on the lower part of the reserve. Three
attempts were made to contact each adult resident of each house during each time
period allotted for that portion of the reserve and upon exit from the reserve. A total of
68 questionnaires were completed.

Residents 18 and over participated in the study. With each respondent, I or a
community research assistant who is sufficiently literate recorded the respondent’s
name, age, gender, place of residence in the reserve, place of origin, and frequency of
and reason for travel to the city of Altamira. Respondents to the questionnaire rated the
61 statements on a Likert-like scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree),
with a neutral point of 3. Either I or the research assistant read the questions to the
respondents and recorded their answers. Where respondents faltered, basic probing
statements were used for clarification. If a respondent could not answer the question, it
was left blank. Each questionnaire took between 10 and 15 minutes to complete.

Data Analysis

A principal components analysis was performed to reduce and classify variables
using SPSS for Windows (Version 16.0). Extracted principal components were rotated
using an orthogonal variance maximizing rotation (Varimax) to maximize the variability of the factors while minimizing the variance around the factors.

Determination of the number of factors can occur though two methods: 1) Kaiser's criterion or 2) Cattell's scree plot test. Kaiser's methodology retains factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. First proposed by Kaiser (1960), this criterion states that unless a factor extracts as much as the equivalent of an original variable, it must be dropped. Although it is the most widely used criterion, it is often critiqued for retaining too many factors (Hakstian, Rogers and Cattell 1982). Another method used is Cattell's Scree test, first proposed by Cattell (1966) and now widely used by factor analysts as the best solution to select the correct number of factors (Kline 1994). This test graphically plots eigenvalues and principal components in a simple line plot. The number of factors to choose is determined by the point at which the line changes slope.

A total of 14 factors emerged from the Varimax rotation, yet most eigenvalues fell below the cutoff point of 1. Most of the 14 factors had extremely low factor loadings, suggesting that Kaiser’s criterion was not the most appropriate for this data reduction technique. Because too many factors were selected using Kaiser’s criterion, a Cattell’s Scree test was performed on the principal components to select the correct number of factors. Cattell’s scree test proved much more appropriate than Kaiser’s criterion. The slope line proved exemplary for the scree test, as three factors clearly emerge from the shape of the curve at which the line changes direction and begins to even out. The first factor accounts for 37% of the variance, the second 10%, and the third 8%.

19 Eigenvalues represent the variance explained by each factor. Variance is the sum of the squares of the factor loadings for each factor. The larger the eigenvalue, the more variance explained by the factor.
Factor reliability was confirmed by computing Cronbach’s alphas for each factor. In addition, means and percentages were reported for each item in each factor, and overall means were averaged for each factor. These were used to assess which items were the most and least important to respondents.

Results

Three factors emerged from the Cattell’s scree test. Two of them—place identity and place dependence—were found in prior studies on place attachment to protected areas in the United States (Vaske and Kobrin 2001; Williams et al. 1992; Williams and Vaske 2003). Factor loadings—correlations between factors and the items that are included in the factors (Bernard 2002:643)—were compared with corresponding items on the questionnaire. Next, each factor was named according to the themes of the corresponding items. Following the aforementioned studies by Vaske and Kobrin (2001), Williams et al. (1992), and Williams and Vaske (2003), the dimensions of place identity and place dependence also emerged in these data. Following the aforementioned studies on place attachment, Factor 1 was named “Place Identity” because high factor loadings occurred for items that probed a sense of belonging (“I form part of this place”), place and identity (“This place forms part of my personal identity”), and interpersonal connection with place (“I feel that my friends and family enjoy this place”). Factor 2, “Place Dependence”, included such items as “I depend upon this place for my survival” and “This place is important for my profession”.

The third factor that emerged was unique to this study. Named “Place Comparison”, it grouped together those items that probed respondents on their preference of place. For example, the items “I would have preferred to have lived in any other place” and “If I were from another place, my life would have been the same as it is
“here” loaded under Factor 3. A list of the three factors and corresponding items is found in Table 4-3.

**Means and percentages**

In addition, means were calculated for each factor, and means and percents were calculated for each item (Table 4-4). Place dependence had the highest mean (4.8), with place identity in close second (4.6). Place comparison had the lowest mean (2.2). This is to be expected because the items were negative items, such as “This place is boring/dumb (chato)”, and “This place is the same as any other place”. Residents thus responded with an average of 2 (“disagree”), which is consistent with a positive opinion of place.

Percentages were calculated to see the relative amount of respondents by answer on the Likert-like scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It is clear that the respondents strongly agree with the positive statements and strongly disagree with the negative statements. In fact, Factors 1 and 2 have the majority of respondents strongly agree with the statements. Factor 3 represents a slight deviation from this trend, with half or nearly half or more of respondents in strong disagreement with the negative statements, with the rest primarily accounted in the “disagree” category.

**Reliability**

I examined the internal consistency of the three factors—place identity, place dependence, and place comparison—using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients test how well items group together under a factor. 0.80 is generally regarded as the minimum acceptable coefficient (Bernard 2002). All three factors have very high reliability. Factor 1, Place Identity, has an alpha coefficient of .96,
and Factor 2 (Place Dependence) and Factor 3 (Place Comparison) have alpha coefficients of .90 (see Tables 4-3 and 4-4).

**Discussion**

This technique demonstrates that place attachment can be measured effectively in non-Western societies. The technique can be implemented successfully among non-literate societies if the researcher administers the questionnaire orally. The Likert-like scale was easily comprehended by the peasants of this population, in spite of little- to no experience of Westerners, and no prior experience with researchers, research tools, or interviews. When adequately adapted to reflect the culture and language, this technique demonstrates that a factor analysis can illuminate the complex relationship that people have to place.

The findings of this technique reflect and confirm the findings of ethnography and qualitative data: place is multifaceted for the ribeirinhos. For this peasant population, there is not a distinction between that which is material, or economic, and that which is symbolically or ideologically meaningful. While affective and material attachments to place include a variety of functions, such as quality of life, work, identity, social relationships, and belonging, this study indicates that three primary domains explain the majority of the variance in people’s multiple attachments to place: Place Identity, Place Dependence, and Place Comparison. All three factors have high alpha coefficients, indicating that they are reliable. The strength of the three factors was calculated using means. These scores indicate that Place Dependence is the strongest of the three factors, with Place Identity in close second, and Place Comparison in distant third.

These data indicate that there is not a polarization between economic and affective activities, what Ingold (2000:195) refers to as an erroneous division between
“technical” and “social” activities. Thus, the ribeirinhos may derive a living from natural resources that is inextricably linked with affective, experiential aspects of daily life and personal identity. It is also clear that the ribeirinho taskscape is not divided between technical and social realms of life, but rather that their daily activities are concurrently affective and utilitarian. The various dimensions of their attachment to place derive from their unique history in the region and their pride in having a livelihood from forest resources.

In spite of existing literature that suggests otherwise, this statistical technique supports the ethnographic findings that ribeirinhos have a complex and historic relationship to place. Peasants are generally depicted in the literatures as rational choice actors struggling to provide for their families (see Chapter 2). As a result, they are often viewed through the lens of threat: a threat to, or a strain upon, existing natural resources and ecosystem services. However, as this study suggests, the affective significance of peasant livelihoods is an overlooked but important dimension of ribeirinho attachment to place. Factor analysis captures the multiple dimensions of this relationship in a few powerful, underlying factors that could be utilized by policymakers to assess the designation of federal public lands and the people who reside therein.

**Conclusion**

In prior chapters and above, I have described the trajectory of the ribeirinhos from visibility during the rubber boom, to “invisibility” during a period of place-making and identity formation, and subsequently to conservation, the current period in which I conducted this study and during which they have again been thrust into visibility. The ribeirinhos perceive the present in relation to the past, particularly through the activities that have enabled them to dwell over time. As a result, I have developed this trajectory
as more than background; as I discuss in Chapters 5 and 6, this trajectory and the referential ways in which it is invoked is foundational to their sense of place and self in the present.

The Terra do Meio may be considered a “frontier” region that is comprised of multiple and often competing ideas of “place” that have changed over time. The multivocality and multilocality of place in the frontier becomes apparent with the juxtaposition of boundaries and borders. The ways in which the ribeirinhos consider place is distinct from other stakeholders in the region, such as grileiros, indigenous people, and the government. As was seen in the state of Acre in the 1980s, the result of these competing claims to land and resources in Pará is often uncomfortable and even violent, as evidenced by the deaths of members of the MDTX and death threats toward individuals with potential to uncover the frontier violence that had been unfolding for decades.

Like many Amazonian peasants, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River have survived in the forest for decades as an “invisible” people. To provide for their families, they lived a subsistence lifestyle in the forest, occasionally seeking employment along the frontier to make ends meet, only to return, in most cases, to the Iriri. During this period, they developed what I describe in Chapter 6 as an emic identity as ribeirinhos. In spite of the literatures that suggest that populations on-the-move, and particularly Amazonian peasants, cannot develop attachments to place, closer examination of this study population reveals the complex relationship they have with the riverine landscape.

The various statistical and ethnographic techniques described in this chapter provide a holistic picture of the ribeirinhos and place in the current period of
“conservation” in the Terra do Meio. Together, the emic mapping, descriptive statistics, and factor analysis indicate that the ribeirinho experience is one that is rooted in place and that this experience is simultaneously affective and materialist and cannot be understood as one or the other. This approach reflects the methodological relationist approach embraced in this study, which includes providing a place for phenomenology in studies of conservation that are otherwise dominated by ecology and political ecology.

In Chapter 5, I discuss how places accessed on a regular basis by the ribeirinhos, acquire their meaning and material form in relation to each other and in reference to different time periods in which they have played a role in support of the ribeirinho household. These places, created from the ribeirinhos’ livelihood practices or “tasks” (Ingold 1993), form a network. This network of places, tasks, and time periods comprises the ribeirinho taskscape, the material expression of practice-in-place, or more succinctly, an “embodied landscape” (Ingold 1993:162).
Figure 4-1. Map of the Xingu Protected Areas Corridor, with the Terra do Meio mosaic, extractive reserves, and highways indicated. Source: Environmental Defense.
Table 4-1. Protected areas in the Terra do Meio mosaic (proximate to the Iriri)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (hectares)</th>
<th>Date created</th>
<th>Occupants</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extractive Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriri Extractive Reserve</td>
<td>398,938</td>
<td>June 5, 2006</td>
<td>191 ribeirinhos</td>
<td>Extensive kinship ties with ribeirinhos in the Anfrisio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riozinho do Anfrisio Extractive Reserve</td>
<td>736,340</td>
<td>November 8, 2004</td>
<td>267 ribeirinhos(^{20})</td>
<td>Extensive kinship ties with ribeirinhos in the Iriri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Xingu Extractive Reserve</td>
<td>303,841</td>
<td>June 5, 2008</td>
<td>~320 ribeirinhos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Lands(^,2,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Cachoeira Seca do Iriri</td>
<td>274,010</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>199 Arara Indians; ~20 ribeirinho families(^{22})</td>
<td>Karib linguistic family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Xipaya</td>
<td>178,624</td>
<td>2006(^{23})</td>
<td>48 Xipaya Indians</td>
<td>Juruna linguistic family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Kuruaya</td>
<td>166,784</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>129 Kuruaya Indians</td>
<td>Munduruku linguistic family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict protected areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra do Meio Ecological Station</td>
<td>3,373,111</td>
<td>February 17, 2005</td>
<td>Illegal occupation of ranchers, loggers, miners. 4 ribeirinho families(^{24})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra do Pardo National Park</td>
<td>445,392</td>
<td>February 17, 2005</td>
<td>Several ribeirinho families reported(^{25})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{21}\) All information about indigenous lands was taken from the Instituto Socioambiental database (http://pib.socioambiental.org/pt).

\(^{22}\) I only spoke with 10 ribeirinho families living in Ti Cacheira Seca do Iriri; Schwartzman et al. 2010 estimate 20 families.

\(^{23}\) The creation of TIs involves a complex federal demarcation and designation process overseen by FUNAI. The process includes many steps. The formal designation of a TI usually takes years to accomplish; many never achieve formal designation because of bureaucratic complications. The date recorded here represents the final step of formalizing a TI, even though initial creation may have occurred many years before. As may be noted by the date, the push to finalize these TIs is related to the creation of the Terra do Meio mosaic.

\(^{24}\) Schwartzman et al. 2010.

\(^{25}\) Schwartzman et al. 2010.
Figure 4-2. Geo-referenced map of ribeirinho households (in green), collected during fieldwork in 2007 inside and outside of the Iriri Extractive Reserve, with adjacent protected areas identified by name. Map created with the assistance of Ane Alencar of IPAM.
Table 4-2. Length of residence (N=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Population pyramid of the Iriri Extractive Reserve.](image)

Figure 4-3. Population pyramid of the Iriri Extractive Reserve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Place Identity</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This place means a lot to me</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is where I belong</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I form part of this place</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place forms part of my personal identity</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very attached to this place</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that this place is part of who I am</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my life depends upon this place</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is the best for my lifestyle</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that this place defines who I am as a person</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my friends and family enjoy this place</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like living here more than in any other place</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is very special too me</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place interests me</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a lot of stories about this place</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live here because I am “of” this place (literally, “a child of this place”)</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of family here</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am lucky living here</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am going to achieve my dreams in this place</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a pleasure living here</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to live here my whole life</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha 0.96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2: Place Dependence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I depend upon this place for my survival</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I depend upon this place for my work</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave here, it's always important for me to return</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is important for my profession</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is great for spending holidays and free time</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a lot of satisfaction living and working here</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel important responsibilities in this place</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with my neighbors from here to improve this place for ourselves</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha 0.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3: Place Comparison</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I were from another place, my life would have been the same as it is here</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, it's the same living here as anywhere else</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could live anywhere</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is boring/dumb (chato)</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have preferred to have lived in any other place</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is the same as any other place</td>
<td>0.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alpha 0.9
Table 4-4. Means and percentages by domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Place Identity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This place is where I belong</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like living here more than in any other place</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very attached to this place</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place forms part of my personal identity</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that this place is part of who I am</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is the best for my lifestyle</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that this place defines who I am as a person</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live here because I am &quot;of&quot; this place (literally, &quot;a child of this place&quot;)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to live here my whole life</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place means a lot to me</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a lot of stories about this place</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of family here</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is very special to me</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I form part of this place</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am going to achieve my dreams in this place</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place interests me</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place forms part of my life</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my friends and family enjoy this place</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my life depends upon this place</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am lucky living here</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a pleasure living here</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha  0.96

N  68

Mean  4.6
Table 4-4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2: Place Dependence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I depend upon this place for my survival</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the quality of life in this place more than in the city</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is good here (literally, &quot;too good&quot;)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel important responsibilities in this place</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is important for my profession</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I depend upon this place for my work</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is great for spending holidays and free time</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I leave here, it's always important for me to return</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with my neighbors from here to improve this place for ourselves</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a lot of satisfaction living and working here</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.9 |
| N | 68 |
| Mean | 4.8 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3: Place Comparison</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I were from another place, my life would have been the same as it is here</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is boring/dumb (chato)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place is the same as any other place</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, it's the same living here as anywhere</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have preferred to have lived in any other place</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could live anywhere</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.9 |
| N | 62 |
| Mean | 2.2 |
CHAPTER 5
THE RIBEIRINHO TASKSCAPE

Introduction

In Chapter 1, I introduced two theses that guide this project. The first is that everyday activities in the material landscape are integral to place-making and identity formation. The second is that the past, including historical practice and memory, permeates the present-day landscape. In Chapter 2, I reviewed the theoretical underpinnings of this project, focusing on the complementarity of emplaced, emic experience and practice with cultural and political ecology. This approach acknowledges the important role of social, political, and economic forces in place-making. In subsequent chapters, I incorporated an experiential and practice-based perspective into the history of the wartime rubber boom in Chapter 3, and into the local experience of place in the context of policy interventions, emphasized in Chapter 4.

My intent in this chapter is to demonstrate how a network of interrelated places, practices (tasks), and times constitute the ribeirinho taskscape. I argue that the extractive activities that materially sustain the ribeirinho household are simultaneously acts of dwelling. Through these activities, and the referential and recursive relationships they share with other places, the taskscape emerges. The “gathering power of place” (Casey 1996:44) is such that through their engagement with the taskscape, the ribeirinhos develop a sense of place and identity. For the purposes of this chapter, I focus on specific, essential tasks and places gathered into the emergent taskscape. In Chapter 6, I identify the ways in which the emergent taskscape contributes to the ribeirinhos’ sense of place and identity.
Revisiting Definitions

In this chapter, I rely upon definitions of landscape and taskscape provided by scholars who, influenced by phenomenology, have demonstrated that humans are not separated from the material world. Rather, through their experiences and practices over time—their dwelling—humans and the “environment” are mutually constituted (e.g., Casey 1996; Gray 2003; Hirsch 1995; Ingold 1993, 2000; Miller 2005). Two points discussed in Chapter 2 merit revisiting. The first concerns the intersubjective perspective adopted in some relationist approaches, especially phenomenology and certain practice theories. Intersubjectivity is a phenomenological concept that refers to the ways in which, as a person is engaged in practices, those practices shape back upon the person (Munn 1986:14). Subject and object become coimplicated as one engages with the material world (Miller 2005:8). This approach contrasts with the notion of landscape as nature, the “environment”, or blank space separated from humans (e.g., Daniels and Cosgrove 1988:1), a perspective of landscape that originates in the post-Renaissance Western distinction between subject and object and the alienation of people from land. Furthermore, the positivist or essentialized ontology of the landscape as a stable phenomenon amenable to manipulation, engineering, or observation by distanced subjects contrasts with an emergent ontology, which assumes that the landscape is always in process.

Borrowing from Ingold (2000:189) I adopt the term “taskscape” as a refinement of landscape to highlight dwelling over time through tasks; in this sense, “landscape is constituted as an enduring record of—and testimony to—the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it.” Ingold (2000:195) defines task as “any practical
operation, carried out by a skilled agent in an environment, as part of his or her normal business of life. In other words, tasks are the constitutive acts of dwelling.”

Through the tasks and the experience of the tasks (i.e., being “at one’s task”; Ingold 2000:197) and the role of time in the landscape (Bender 2002; Hirsch 1995)—and specifically “temporality” (Ingold 2000:198)—the taskscape becomes an “embodied” landscape that reaches the level of the habitus (see Chapter 2). However, the taskscape as briefly defined by Ingold (1993) is methodologically underdeveloped for research applications. I thus incorporate the work of other anthropologists into my application of the concept in this study (e.g. Bender 2002; Casey 1996; Gray 2003; Hirsch 1995; Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998). These scholars have applied the concepts of practice, time, materiality, and landscape from a variety of angles in their fieldwork, particularly as they apply to place formation. From these scholars and in reference to the theoretical foundations of phenomenological philosophy and practice theory (e.g., Bourdieu 1977; de Certeau 1984; Giddens 1984; Heidegger 1977), I adapt Ingold’s definition of taskscape as the process by which people, places, times, and tasks are “gathered” into a network. Furthermore, the people, places, times, and tasks to which I refer are mutually constituted and therefore simultaneously materialist and symbolic, technical and social (Ingold 1993; Reynolds 1993).

I also employ the concept of “temporality” as used by Ingold (2000), who develops it as a key component of the taskscape. Temporality is a phenomenological term that is a constant feature of human dwelling. Thus, it is not chronological time or history (Ingold 2000:194; see Chapter 2). Rather, temporality allows for multiple moments in time to be experienced in the present; it is evoked through reflection and memory in the context of
current tasks. Temporality may also be evoked through seasonality, as different tasks occur in the same place during different seasons. In Ingold’s usage, temporality is a constant feature of human experience. When I use the term it is in this sense, which is both general and fundamental. To describe more specific occurrences of the temporal gathering of experiences in the taskscape, I employ the vocabulary of Hirsch (1995), who identifies two “poles” of experience: foreground and background. The foreground is most often constituted by immediate experience of the present, but the background of past, potential, or even idealized experience is never absent, and the foregrounding of background punctuates our immediacy. For Hirsch (1995), the landscape is the dynamic, processual relationship between these two “poles” of experience that are proximate and distant, and real and imagined; hence “landscape as process” rather than an objectified phenomenon. When I use these terms I am adopting Hirsch’s usage which, though as fundamental as Ingold’s temporality, is specific rather than general.

Thus, the taskscape is emergent; it is always in a state of becoming and therefore cannot be completely understood through its essential, "place-like" qualities (Ingold 1993, 2000). Three dynamic, recurrent operations identified in this study facilitate the conceptualization of the taskscape as process: (1) matter and materiality; (2) movement; and (3) inscribing. As the ribeirinhos engage in their practices, they incorporate the material world into their activities. “Matter”—wood, a fruit—is transformed through skilled technological practice into the products that provide for the ribeirinho household. In addition, I occasionally reference “materiality”, which is distinguished from matter because it entails the dialectic between object (matter) and
agent from which a sense of place and identity emerge.\(^1\) That is, as the ribeirinhos incorporate the material world into their activities, that world of objects (sensu Bourdieu 1977) and those activities shape them as ribeirinhos. In this study, “matter” and materiality are an important recurrent operation in the context of the ribeirinhos’ tasks, the products of which sustain the ribeirinho household and enable them to dwell.

Movement refers to the distance traveled and the orientation of people and products as they move through the riverine landscape. As the ribeirinhos move through the landscape with the transformed products of their harvest, they are inscribing and building places. Rather than refer to ribeirinho “inscriptions” on the landscape, which imply a stable end-product of human action, I focus on the processes of inscribing, as a human activity. For Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga (2003:13), inscribing refers to the ways in which the landscape is enduringly “written” with the experience of people. In this study, the recursive movements involved in ribeirinho tasks become acts of inscribing. The creation of footpaths and trails to facilitate the tasks is an inscriptive act. When identified in reference to temporality, the recurrent operations inherent in the taskscape are what give it its processual and emergent quality.

The Taskscape as Model

While messy and difficult to separate analytically, the use of the taskscape as a model offers an alternative and complementary approach to standard cultural ecological and political ecological literatures, which treat caboclo culture as an adaptation buffeted by external forces and landscape as a mere “setting” (e.g. Moran 1974a, 1981; Parker

---

\(^1\) Bourdieu (1977) refers to this as the “dialectic of objectification and embodiment”. Miller (2005) describes it as an ongoing process of “objectification”. See Chapter 6 for more on identity and sense of place as emergent from the taskscape.
When applied to caboclo societies, the taskscape—as model and as process—shows the ways in which people, the material world, and tasks are mutually constituted and emergent. Similar to what anthropologists have noted among indigenous societies (e.g., Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), the riverine landscape was created over time. Yet rather than based on myths and rituals that are at risk because of external forces, the aspects of ribeirinho life of interest to this study are the economic activities that sustain the household and that are mostly a result of policy interventions. In particular, this study indicates the salience of “backgrounded” memories of the past activity of rubber tapping, which resulted from the “external” force of the wartime rubber boom.

If I were to provide a standard, cultural ecological description of places in the riverine landscape, I might begin with the house and move outward, spatially, into each proximate area, sequentially encompassing the yard, swidden agricultural fields, the river, and into the forest, in a thematic progression from domestic to wild. But that etic (“outsider”) description of places would not adequately represent the act of “gathering” that I aspire to express, in which the taskscape emerges from extractive activities that are shifting, dynamic, and cannot be easily bounded on a map, and by which social ties and relations are created, reiterated, and tested. I wish to highlight the significance of mundane activities in the creation of places and identities.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the idea of places “gathering” referentially originates with Heidegger. According to Heidegger (1977:330), building, as an aspect of dwelling, constructs locations, and thus is a “founding and joining of spaces”; a gathering or assembly (Heidegger 1977:331, 336). Casey (1996), Hirsch (1995) and Ingold (1993,
2000) incorporate a temporal dimension into gathering, such that past activities and memories may also be gathered. In this chapter, I attempt a literary “gathering” of the places, practices, and temporalities into the taskscape that reflects the dwelling perspective, outlined by Heidegger (1977) and developed by Casey (1996), Ingold (2000), and Gray (2003). Casey (1996:25) describes this as “placewise” gathering.

By “gathering” I do not mean merely amassing. To gather placewise is to have a peculiar hold on what is presented (as well as represented) in a given place. Not just the contents but the very mode of containment is held by a place. The holding at issue in the gathering of a place reflects the layout of the local landscape, its continuous contour, even as the outlines and inlines of the things held in that place are respected. What is kept in place primarily are experiencing bodies. Places also keep such unbodylike entities as thoughts and memories.

The ribeirinhos at their tasks, engaged in their practices, exemplify Casey’s (1996:25) “experiencing bodies”. Ribeirinho practices have temporal and social dimensions; they are not merely subsistence or economic activities, but are rather subsistence and economic activities that have enabled them to dwell and develop a sense of place and self within the riverine landscape. Incorporating phenomenology and practice theory into standard approaches provides an opportunity to understand the ribeirinhos in relation to the State and historical periods and in place over time, through their practices and their experiences. Thus, when I say places gather, the gathering to which I refer is not only the “setting” or the “environment” of places. Rather, I attempt to gather the experiences of ribeirinhos in the context of their mundane tasks and, through the relationships between and among places, illustrate the ways in which the taskscape is the mutual constitution of people, places, tasks, and temporalities. Therefore, I am also gathering other times, places, and tasks into the description of the taskscape. By way of contrast with Casey (1996), I treat thoughts and memories as “bodylike” entities because mind
and body are not separate, and thoughts and memories emerge from experience and the “mutualism” (Ingold 1992:40) of people and the material world.

**The Challenge of “Writing” the Taskscape**

While there are various ways to approach an analysis of the taskcape, I have elected to highlight the connections between and among places to demonstrate the emergent aspects of the taskcape—the recurrent operations, visible through ribeirinho tasks, and the temporality of the riverine landscape—that connect and gather places into the taskcape. In doing so, I have chosen to develop emically elicited places in the taskcape—forest, river, and home—to demonstrate their linkages through an analysis of the materiality, movement, and inscribing that gathers them, “placewise” (Casey 1996:25), into the taskcape. This chapter thus operationalizes and develops the model of the taskcape on the tail of the chronological and historical analyses provided in Chapters 3 and 4, and is foundational to understanding the ways in which identity and sense of place are emergent, as discussed in Chapter 6.

**Scale and “the” taskcape**

In “writing” the taskcape, I am presented with two challenges related to scale. First, although the ribeirinhos name and distinguish places in the taskcape in discourse, their practices demonstrate that named places contain within them other, more ephemeral or individually experienced places they have inscribed to facilitate livelihood practices (e.g., trails within the forest). These places may be considered Heideggerian buildings in their own right. As Gray (2003:233) also indicates with respect to his study of shepherds in the Scottish borderlands, it is significant that any practice in which the ribeirinhos engage can be considered a type of “round” that begins and ends at the house. Through my analysis, I expand traditional, house-centric
approaches used in phenomenology (e.g., Bachelard 1969; Bourdieu 1973, 1977; Heidegger 1977) to demonstrate that through the ribeirinhos’ practices, memory and identity may be engrained and habituated from infancy in places beyond the house. These less obvious places become “buildings” through the recurrent operations of movement, materiality, and acts of inscription.

To aid the reader in understanding this point, I rely upon a sketch of place provided in Figure 5-1. This figure was created by several ribeirinhos from multiple families over a period of two weeks, as they passed through the house in which I resided during my fieldwork. The exercise was not my intention; it unfolded organically as I waited for any boat headed to Altamira to pass by the house and take me on as a passenger for the four to seven day journey back to town. I needed to stay near the river with my items packed, and these days were tedious. Using the crayons, colored pencils, and paper I had brought to the home as gifts, I began to sketch with the five-year-old daughter of my hosts. One afternoon, the male head of household sat down to show her how to draw a boat. A neighbor boy who arrived with some salted fish for trade began to poke fun at his artistic abilities. In response, he was challenged to try, and so he picked up a pencil and began to draw a tree.

I quietly removed myself as a participant in the sketching and watched a picture emerge over the next several days as people came and went from the house. One sheet of construction paper quickly became three that I taped together. They would have kept going as far as their collective imagination allowed, but eventually a boat of gold miners passed, responded to my waving arms and white sheet, circled back to retrieve me, and agreed to take me to the city. This sketch remains an incomplete and
imperfect illustration of the taskscape at that moment in time. But, in many ways it is an appropriate metaphor for the taskscape because like the taskscape, it is multiply authored and remains “in process”. Furthermore, it provides a vibrant depiction of the ribeirinho taskscape and serves as a heuristic device for navigating through it.

Second, although the social, spatial, and temporal experiences of individuals vary, I am seeking generalizations about the ribeirinhos of the Iriri as a population rather than internal factions or idiosyncratic experiences. There are limits to individual knowledge and experience when attempting to understand a landscape as process. I am thus attentive to tasks and knowledge that extend beyond the purview of individual experiences of the riverine landscape. For example, the ribeirinhos often rely upon each other and middlemen for knowledge, transportation, trade, communication, and products that extend beyond an individual’s experience of the taskscape. While beyond the scope of this project, a study of individual experiences of the taskscape is possible and would result in multiple tasksapes.

In addition, individual experiences of place may vary according to the historical contingencies and trajectory of outcomes of cumulative events. An individual’s particular decision to remain in the riverine landscape, or to leave and return to it at a later date, often occurs in relation to historical periodization recognized in the standard literatures of the Amazon (e.g., the rubber boom and bust, “development”, and “conservation”, periods adopted in this study). These decisions lead to different experiences of boundaries, use, and occupation of places in the taskscape, and may play a role in different perceptions of time.
Next, I include an anecdotal section that chronicles the deaths, search parties, and funerary arrangements of four children who died in 2006. This section is testament to the issues of scale in the taskscape, and thus of the difficulty I am faced in “writing” the taskscape as part of this project. It reveals the multiplicity of “places” as experienced and the role played individuals in recognizing positive and “negative” spaces (see Munn 1996), familiar and unfamiliar places, sacred and mundane places, places that nurture and support as well as places that threaten and frighten.

**Movement in life and in death: The riverine landscape as a palimpsest of multiple tasksapes**

Bodies move through the taskscape in life and death, gathering matter, boundaries, other places, people, and times. The tragic drowning of four children that occurred during my fieldwork exemplifies this passage through the taskscape, and the ways in which the knowledge garnered from individual, familial, or proximate experiences in the landscape are insufficient for some tasks. I now recount the circumstances leading to the children’s deaths, the search that unfolded to locate the bodies, and the funerary stages involved in the burial. The mother of the children and her extended family asked that I share the story of the drownings widely to communicate their experience of the riverine landscape. With their permission, I develop it here.

The children lived alone with their mother, Andresa, for extended periods of time while their father worked odd jobs ranging from gold mining to coal production near Altamira. According to my host family, he drank away his money, and nearby households, including neighbors and family members, supported Andresa and the children in any way they could. I interviewed Andresa three days before the drowning in
the course of conducting the household interviews. I was shocked by the conditions in which she and her six children lived. Although all the ribeirinhos I met live in what would be considered poverty by outsiders, most are vibrant and cheerful people, deeply embracing of and attuned to their social relationships, even in the face of adversity and isolation. In contrast, Andresa and her children did not appear to be dwelling as part of the riverine landscape. Andresa seemed withdrawn, depressed, and unresponsive. Her children were barely clothed. Domestic animals invaded the home; like the people, they were desperately hungry and searching for any overlooked morsel. A chicken jumped inside an empty pot on the floor amidst garbage, and the tinny sound of its beak pecking the metal was one of the few sounds of life in a house that was slowly falling apart.

There was no indication of any activities or practices that sustained the home. Andresa did not remember the names of her six children, did not know how old they were, and was unable to sustain much of a conversation with me. My hosts asked, as they said they always did, if they could “borrow” a few of her children to raise them. Andresa persistently declined.

Three days later, Andresa and her children were starving. She loaded herself and her six children into their small canoe and set out across the river toward her sister’s home, one of several ribeirinho households that persisted within the Cachoeira Seca do Iriri TI. She was looking for manioc flour (farinha), the staple carbohydrate in the ribeirinho’s diet (see “The Home”, below).

Midway across the river, where the current is strongest, Andresa could not control the canoe. The overloaded canoe turned sideways against the current. Water quickly spilled over its sloping sides and the boat submerged. Andresa and her eldest children,
whose ages I estimated at six and seven, began to swim diagonally with the current, gradually guiding their bodies toward the opposite bank of the river where the current eventually delivered them. The mother and her eldest child arrived first. The second eldest was swept further downriver. Her head was bobbing under when a ribeirinho from the Anfrísio River, who was fishing, spotted her and pulled her by her arm into his canoe.

A search team was formed in the hopes of locating additional survivors. Several residents paddled upriver to the home where I was staying to ask if I could do anything. I traveled to the nearest radio, about a 30 minute trip using an outboard motor mounted on the back of the canoe, and called into the city to ask for help from any governmental or nongovernmental entity. They reported that, sadly, there was nothing they could do from the city because of the distance. I donated the rest of my gasoline to the rescue effort, resolving to paddle to the rest of my interviews and stay in the reserve longer to complete my work. The ribeirinhos from the Iriri River searched during the rest of the day in the hopes of finding survivors.

The next afternoon, the families and neighbors determined that the younger children were unlikely to have survived. The families close to Andresa tried to estimate where the bodies might be found based on the locations of the survivors. They surmised that motionless bodies would have been swept much further downriver from where the last survivor was found. They were unfamiliar with that portion of the Iriri River where it meets the Anfrísio River—it lay beyond their own taskscape—so they sought help from the ribeirinhos of the Anfrísio River and anyone who had an outboard motor or gasoline.
The search for survivors had become a search for bodies. The importance of retrieving the bodies so that they could be buried in the ground grew clearer as ribeirinhos from the Iriri, Anfírio, and Novo rivers joined and persisted in the search, made possible by numerous donations of the precious commodity of gasoline, until three of the four bodies were found far downriver. They were ultimately discovered by the most skilled fishermen and middlemen who had traveled longer distances than others, whose task-scape thereby extended beyond the realm of their standard activities.

The following morning, families from the Iriri, Anfírio, and Novo rivers made the long journey to Andresa’s sister-in-law’s home for the burial. The bodies were dressed in clean clothes, provided by other households, and laid out on a table in the house. People filed in to pay their respects to the family. Having been submerged under water for several days, the children’s noses, ears, and mouths weeped fluid. Andresa wiped the children’s faces every time she passed them, as if she were simply attending to a cold.

The afternoon was spent paying respects to the bodies of the children and the family in the house and awaiting the burial, while one team of men made the caskets and dug the graves in the forest, and the search team continued to traverse the river in search of the still missing body of the youngest child. Making a casket is a time-consuming task that begins with felling a hardwood tree from the forest and cutting it into logs using an ax. The logs are transported to the yard and slowly fashioned into boards (tabuas) using a hand ax. The boards are assembled, using a manufactured hammer and nails, into a simple wooden casket. After the caskets were assembled in the yard, one of the men entered the house to inform the family that they were ready for
the burial. The fourth body was still missing and the family was distraught that the
children would not be buried together. They pleaded for more time, but the three bodies
in the home were beginning to smell badly. At the urging of family and friends, the family
agreed to proceed without the missing child.

The caskets were brought into the house, laid on the floor, the children were
simply placed inside and, with no additional ceremony, the caskets were sealed. The
men picked up the caskets and carried them out of the house with the funerary party
following. We walked for approximately half a kilometer, moving slowly from the place of
the house, through the yard, through the kitchen garden, and into the forest. When the
funerary party stopped we gathered around the burial place, a Brazil nut tree, under
which three graves had been prepared. After the caskets were lowered into the ground,
the men shoveled dirt over the caskets. No marker of their graves was provided apart
from the majestic tree. We retraced our steps out of the forest and, since the sun was
setting and people needed to return home before dark, everyone said goodbye to the
family, boarded their canoes, and paddled home. The body of the youngest child, an
infant, was found the next day by a fisherman from the Anfrisio River and was buried,
without ceremony, under the same tree.

The next morning, back at my host family's home, I asked why the Brazil nut tree
was selected as a place of burial for the children, and if that was typical practice. They
indicated that most bodies are buried in Brazil nut groves, and usually underneath a
mature Brazil nut tree because it is a beautiful and important tree that will be visited by
the ribeirinhos. I asked if it was always that way. They explained that bodies used to be
buried in the seringais during the rubber boom, when the rubber trees were tapped as
an economically important species. This was also documented by Teixeira de Mello, who identified that the burials occurred more specifically along the rubber trails (1956:93-94). This demonstrates the ways in which places that are economically valued may also be sacred, clearly illustrating the ways in social and technical aspects of life are inseparable (Ingold 1993, 2000; Reynolds 1993; see also Williams et al. 1992; Williams and Vaske 2003).

Afterward I set out to go for a walk behind the homes, but was told by my host family to avoid the swidden agricultural fields because I was at the burial. Confused, I asked them to explain. They told me that after attending a burial, people are forbidden from entering the swidden agricultural fields for a period of three days because the crops would die. Heavy with grief and saturated by my questioning, I resisted probing them further and went on my way, avoiding the fields as I walked.

This sad narrative is exemplary of the ways in which places gather through the movement of bodies, living and dead, through the riverine landscape. Andresa’s quest for food began at the home and ended in demise in the river. After the river carried the bodies far outside the purview of the family’s taskscape, a search party was organized, incorporating the knowledge and experience of people from various parts of the riverine landscape to locate the bodies. This highlights the importance of “places as experienced” emerging within proper named places (e.g., “forest” and “river”; see below), and the differential skills and knowledge associated with multiple tasksapes that overlap, intersect, and blur state-imposed boundaries. The city in this anecdote is the most distant place; because of my role as researcher from outside, I was called
upon because of my perceived familiarity with the city and access to resources they felt they did not possess.

From Andresa’s ill-fated journey across the river to the search party that extended beyond their familiar landscape, it becomes apparent that the riverine landscape is really a palimpsest of multiple taskscapes difficult to separate by tasks, particular people, or by “place”. Nonetheless, for heuristic reasons I begin with explanations of three named places, starting with the forest and river and ending with the home because it is a hub formed from its linkages with other places.

**The Forest (A Mata)**

Rubber (*Hevea brasiliensis*) and Brazil nut (*Bertholletia excelsa*), historically the two most economically valuable resources to ribeirinho livelihoods, are dispersed throughout the forest. Game meat, medicinals, and construction materials are also found in the forest. To convert the species’ economic potential into products that have use or exchange value for the ribeirinho household, the ribeirinhos must transform what they harvest into an economic good. In Chapter 3, I described the harvest of rubber during the wartime boom. Rubber is frequently summoned in discourse by the ribeirinhos, particularly in the context of current tasks and conversation about current tasks, and as part of an historical identity (see Chapter 6). In this section, I explain how the ribeirinho experience of rubber has been gathered, non-discursively, into the taskscape and forms part of the current task of the Brazil nut harvest.

For the ribeirinhos, the forest is a composite of many different places that are shifting, contested, and take form in relation to other places in the ribeirinho taskscape, such as the location of the house. The ribeirinho forest is a dynamic place whose limits

---

2 I use the term “home” to refer to the house, yard, and kitchen garden (*casa e quintal*).
and potentialities are understood differently by those who dwell within it. Longevity and duration of occupation appear to play important roles in perceptions of boundaries and ownership. The rubber tappers who stayed after the rubber boom, and who persisted in the region throughout the period of development and grilagem, have a different perception of the passage of time and ownership of places than do those who decided to leave during these periods.

**From Trail Tenure to Tree Tenure: The Forest as Shifting Property Limit**

Unlike the rubber trees dispersed throughout the forest, requiring the trail system described in Chapter 3 (see Figure 3-3), Brazil nut trees are found in concentrated groves (*castanhais*) of 50-100 individuals in the Amazon, with each grove separated by a distance of approximately one kilometer (Mori and Prance 1990).³ In the Terra do Meio region, a family castanhal may be found at distances ranging from 200 meters to three kilometers from the house.

The historical seringais and the extant castanhais often overlap. This overlap is not merely physical; it constitutes a temporal coinciding of extractive tasks, times, memories, and political and economic processes. As described in Chapter 4, the ribeirinhos do not own land; rather, they have a land use concession within the political boundaries of the extractive reserve. Prior to the creation of the reserve, informal tenure systems emerged and shifted based on the location of Brazil nut trees and the rubber trails. During the rubber boom, customary rights to land were bounded by the trails connecting rubber trees. Depending on the productivity of particular trees, portions of

---

³ See Cronkleton et al. (2010) for georeferenced illustrations of Brazil nut groves in the Western Amazon.
old trails closed and new trails were opened in their place to incorporate more productive trees into the round of the rubber tapper.

Just as the boundaries of the family forest shifted through the opening and closing of rubber trails during the rubber boom, the current boundaries of the family forest are determined through the distribution of Brazil nut trees. The “tree tenure” system, both of rubber and of Brazil nut,\(^4\) has been previously recorded in the region (ISA 2003) and elsewhere in the Amazon (e.g., Ankerson and Barnes 2004; Cronkleton et al. 2010). These boundaries are not fixed; rather, they shift over time in response to social and political dynamics and to changes in tree productivity.

During the period I refer to as “development”, many family forests were expropriated by grileiros (see Chapter 4), interrupting the informal tree tenure system. Some of those ribeirinhos who were pushed out by the grileiros returned to find their traditional castanhais assumed by another occupant. Most recently, in the current period of conservation, new political boundaries have been created in the form of an extractive reserve that is in places incongruous with the existing, traditional tree tenure. These exogenous changes have shifted the internal boundaries of the forest as a place within the taskscape.

Traditionally, the castanhais are passed down by kin from previous generations. Following the creation of the reserve, many who temporarily left the Iriri because of the violence and economic hardship of the previous decade have returned, anticipating a more peaceful and lucrative livelihood that accompanies increased government

---

\(^4\) A discrete natural grove is a distinct place from the trail inscribed by the ribeirinhos. Nonetheless, the literatures give precedence to the trees, rather than the trails connecting the trees. In this chapter, I distinguish the place of the trails, when appropriate, as important to the taskscape.
presence. However, they have returned to find a different pattern of land use and occupation that does not recognize their rights to familial Brazil nut groves that others, who remained in the region, have since occupied. Of the 33 households I interviewed in 2006, five reported “owning” no Brazil nut trees because, as briefly explained in Chapter 4, “os castanhais já têm dono” (“the Brazil nut groves already have an owner”). These households often harvest Brazil nuts trees belonging to a family member; the groves may be far from their own houses. In one instance, a man who had moved back to the Novo River after working in the city for 11 years complained that he had moved his family back to the region under the assumption that he would own his own castanhais. Instead, he helps his sister’s family with her Brazil nut harvest, keeping a portion of their profits for his family. This arrangement is amenable to established families in instances where there are more Brazil nut trees, or more trees fruiting in any particular season, than the nuclear family can harvest alone. Other families are not as fortunate, and in choosing to leave, forfeit their rights to Brazil nuts indefinitely.

**Brazil Nuts**

Brazil nut trees are admired by the ribeirinhos for their impressive size. A mature Brazil nut tree can reach 50 meters in height (Mori and Prance 1990), three meters in diameter, and live up to 500 years. Some individuals are estimated to have lived to nearly 1000 years (Vieira et al. 2005). For their value in the regional economy they are legally protected by Brazil’s forestry code, making it illegal to fell any individual, even in pastureland (Fearnside 2001a).

---

5 According to my data, most families claim ownership over 200 to 300 Brazil nut trees; two households claimed 500 trees.
The harvesting of Brazil nuts and rubber are seasonal tasks that may be attributed to the particular phenology, or life cycle events, of each species. Whereas rubber was harvested during the dry season (April to November), Brazil nuts are harvested during the rainy season (December to April). The seasonality of each task, and the ways in which the forest was inscribed to facilitate these practices, made rubber and Brazil nut complementary activities that, in the past, provided for the household year-round.

During the rainy season, the large, woody fruits (ouriços) of the Brazil nut tree, roughly the shape, size, and weight of a small coconut,\(^6\) become saturated with water and fall to the ground. Each fruit contains between 10 and 25 of the desired seeds (Mori 1992), or “nuts” (castanhas) that have economic value and are collected by the ribeirinhos for trade and household consumption. The ribeirinhos must arrive to collect the nuts before the agouti (*Dasyprocta* spp.), a rodent and one of the few forest animals with teeth capable of gnawing through the fruit, arrive first to consume and bury them. Indeed, the concentrated arrangement of the Brazil nut trees in the forest is often attributed to the instrumental role the agoutis play in seed dispersal (Mori and Prance 1990) and in the germination of new individuals in relative proximity to the parent trees (Peres and Baider 1997). In this context, there is little difference between the life activities of the agouti and the ribeirinho (see also Ingold 2000:174). Both are dwelling and building as they dwell: the agouti through the role it plays in the distribution of the Brazil nut trees as they forage, and the ribeirinho through the inscribing that occurs as he removes and collects the nuts from the fallen fruits.

The differences between the trails of the rubber harvest versus the Brazil nut harvest are related to the distance, the orientation of movement, and the configuration

\(^6\) The shape of the fruit can vary somewhat; the weight ranges from .5 to 2.5 kilograms (Mori 1992).
of the places through which one travels. Their movements during the rubber boom were characterized by sustained speed and effort on ovular trails over large distances. The ribeirinhos’ movements during the Brazil nut harvest are less fluid, more spontaneous, and less methodical than during the rubber harvest. As was discussed in Chapter 3, the rubber tree was tapped during the dry season and the latex flowed over a period of several hours, requiring the rubber tapper to make two, long rounds of the rubber trail on the same day. By contrast, the fruits of the Brazil nut, battered by rainfall, break from the stem and fall a distance of up to 50 meters before abruptly slamming into the forest floor. Because of falling debris, and most notably falling Brazil nut fruits, the rainy season is the most dangerous time in the forest because of the potential for accidents and fatalities related to the fruits hitting the ribeirinhos on the head or body during collection. For these reasons, and in contrast with the task of rubber tapping, the ribeirinhos accomplish the task of Brazil nut collection opportunistically and efficiently in response to fruiting trees; to arrive before agoutis reach the nuts on the forest floor; before the nuts rot on the ground as a result of the rainwater, moisture, and humidity; and to avoid injury or fatality.

The Brazil nut harvest, illustrated in Figure 5-2, incorporates movement and acts of inscription through the collection, extraction, transport, treatment and storage of Brazil nuts. As a result, the Brazil nut harvest is also a gathering of other places than the forest into the ribeirinho taskscape. When the ribeirinhos arrive at a Brazil nut tree

---

7 The task of harvesting Brazil nut varies by household. Some ribeirinhos are able to begin the task of harvesting Brazil nuts from just behind the home. However, some castanhais are far away from the home or on the other side of the river, requiring some ribeirinhos to travel extended distances by foot or canoe. In the latter instance, many of these must paddle one of the larger rivers and several smaller streams before arriving at a trail that leads to the castanhal.
or, as is more likely the case, a grouping of trees, they quickly amass (*amontoar*) the large fruits into a pile a safe distance from the trees. This is done with the assistance of two products made at the home: a palm fiber basket (*paneiro*) tied onto the ribeirinho’s back like a backpack, and a *pé-de-bode* (literally, a “goat’s foot”), a tool made from a palm stem that is “forked” at the end, using a machete. With minimal pressure, the pé-de-bode envelops the fruit and holds it until the ribeirinho lifts it over his head and makes an abrupt thrusting motion with it in his hands, releasing the fruit into the basket. The ribeirinho moves quickly during this process, filling the basket, emptying the fruits into the pile, and repeating this process until all fruits have been collected. He then moves onto the next tree to repeat these steps.

Extracting the nuts from the fruits is accomplished by splitting the hard shell of the fruit open on the forest floor using a machete. The nuts are removed by hand and deposited either directly into the paneiro or into a 60 kilogram rice sack from the city. To transport the nuts, the ribeirinhos retrace their steps, traveling the same trails, streams, and rivers from which they arrived to return to the home. Depending on the distance to the house and the number of people harvesting the nuts, the process of extracting and transporting the Brazil nuts can be completed in one or several days. If a castanhal is located far from the home and there is not enough light in the forest to extract and transport the nuts, they may choose to leave the fruits intact in the pile, go home for the night, and return the next day to extract the nuts from the fruits and transport them back to the home. If the castanhal is close to the home, the ribeirinhos can extract the nuts and transport them back to the home in one day.

---

8 In instances where the ribeirinhos have to go home before extracting the nuts, they leave the fruits intact so other animals do not consume them overnight.
When they arrive at the home, they walk down to the river to wash the nuts using the basket as a sieve. The nuts that float are discarded since they are rotten. The nuts that are suitable for consumption may be directly bagged and stored in the house until the middleman arrives, or are stored on a platform (paiol) in the yard built in anticipation of the harvest from palm thatch and wood so that they are protected from animals while they dry.

Both the Brazil nut and rubber harvest are acts of inscription, evident in the cutting and walking of trails to access the trees. Materiality is embodied in the dialectic between matter—the raw materials and tools used in collection and transformation of the product into an economic good—and agent. Recurrent operations thus provide a dynamic and emergent quality to the taskscape in which the boundaries of places and identities shift over time, as discussed in Chapter 4 and above through the concept of tree tenure. Temporality, discussed next, contributes an additional, critical dimension that gathers the people, materiality, and tasks of other time periods into the place of the forest in the present.

**Temporality and the Harvest**

The ribeirinhos access the Brazil nut trees through the creation, maintenance, and use of paths, some of which coincide with the former rubber trails, giving a distinct temporal dimension to the material landscape. During the rubber boom, the seringueiro created and maintained two to three rubber estradas (trails) per household to facilitate movement from tree to tree. These trails were created in lengths, groupings, and in the distinct teardrop or ovular shape discussed in Chapter 3 (and see Figure 3-3) to calibrate the seringueiro’s movements in relation to the time required for the latex flow into the collection cups after making the morning cut into the tree. Similar to the rubber
trails described in Chapter 3, the ribeirinho clears the main *caminhos* (paths) of
overgrowth in December before the Brazil nut *safra* (harvest) for the same purposes.
However, the concentration of Brazil nut trees in a grove result in the creation of a
somewhat haphazard, multilinear trail system. This trail system contrasts with the
rubber trails walked during the rubber boom. Nonetheless, as mentioned previously, the
rubber trails of past generations often coincide with the Brazil nut trails of the present
(Figure 5-3), demonstrating the temporality of the taskscape.

Although the Brazil nut harvest is a rainy season activity, it is important to note that
during the summer months, the ribeirinhos walk the trails and assess the condition of
their Brazil nuts, beginning to plan what their movements will be like during the harvest.
In the neighboring Riozinho do Anfrísio Extractive Reserve, a researcher reported that
when the ribeirinhos are extracting resins from other tree species for medicinal and
economic potential, they are also making the rounds on their Brazil nut trails, visiting the
trees to predict their potential during the upcoming harvest (Vivian Zeidemann pers.
comm., July 6, 2010). In other words, the “background” of future plans is foregrounded
in activities of the moment.

During the summer, Ailton showed me his Brazil nut trees, predicted a decent
*safra* that winter, and brought me to see the empty and discarded fruits left over from
the previous season. As we walked through the castanhal, I was excited to see rubber
trees with the characteristic hatch marks, clearly inactive but remnants from the rubber
boom. He indicated that these rubber trees were tapped by his father during the rubber
boom, and the same ones he had begun to tap as a young man before the rubber bust.
After seeing my interest, he began to deviate somewhat from the Brazil nut trail, told me
to wait, and began cutting a trail with his machete, hacking away the woody plants and
vines to take me to more trees. This required some manual labor, as he was reopening
a rubber trail. I was shocked to hear that the “trail” we were walking was a rubber trail.
To me it was all vines, woody plants, and debris; to him it was a family rubber trail
committed to memory and traversed over a few generations. He located the rubber
trees immediately. He traced the outline of the hatch marks with his fingers and
explained how they used to tap rubber. He made a gash in an old hatch mark and
showed me the milky latex that began to seep out before we moved on to the next tree.

As we walked, Ailton shared his family’s story of rubber with me, and reiterated
what many ribeirinhos had told me during my fieldwork (discussed in Chapter 3): “If only
rubber would return.” As we retraced our steps and walked back through the forest, he
stopped to examine the milky latex from the tree he had cut, now dripping onto the
forest floor, perhaps to assess it for its productivity. He turned to me, smiled, and
shrugged as if to say “oh, well”, and we moved on. In these acts of teaching, he brought
the past and the future into the present. He did so not only in discourse but in the
acknowledgement of the material refuse (the fruits) from the previous Brazil nut season,
and in the incorporation of the rubber trees and trails, last used decades before, into
that day’s lesson on the task of collecting Brazil nuts. This anecdote illustrates the
dialectic of materiality. For Ailton, memories of people and past activities are gathered
into the forest. The rubber trails and scars on trees are his souvenirs and his family’s
mementos. The forest—and more specifically, the trails that represent “buildings”
inscribed over the years in the context of tasks—is part of who he is.
Thus, when the ribeirinhos go into the forest for their extractive activities, past and present, they do so in reference to other places, activities, and time periods. As Antônio stated, “When we see the forest, we see all the years we have lived here, and all the years our parents lived here.” As discussed in Chapter 4, the bodies of loved ones are buried in the castanhais, and often under a Brazil nut tree. In the past, bodies were also buried in the forest, but in the area designated as the seringais. Although during my fieldwork I did not see a ribeirinho stopping to remember a deceased loved one in the context of walking through the forest, Schwartzman et al. (2010) found that the time of grilagem was particularly traumatic for some ribeirinhos because they did not want to leave the castanhais where loved ones were buried.

Furthermore, when the ribeirinhos spend time in the forest to engage in extractive activities, past and present, they always bring their gun (espingarda). This is a practice learned over time in relation to the presence of animals in the forest. It may also be a residual habit acquired during the rubber boom, when Indians attacked the invading rubber tappers in territorial disputes (see Chapter 3). In the present, however, the ribeirinhos report doing so for protection from jaguar (onça) attacks, and, most importantly, to hunt for game meat. Although fish is the primary source of protein in the ribeirinho diet and is consumed daily (see “The River”, below), the ribeirinhos rarely miss an opportunity to kill peccary, deer, tortoise, and smaller mammals and birds for consumption. Thus, when the ribeirinhos move through the forest in the simple acts of

---

9 Schwartzman et al. (2005) found the same in the Medio Xingu Extractive Reserve, and I observed this directly in my fieldsite.

10 Opportunistic hunts do not usually yield game meat. In response to the question, “During the past seven days, how many times did you eat game meat?” on the household questionnaire discussed in Chapter 4, 10 out of 21 households responded “never”, and ten households responded “one- to-five times”. One family, whose household head had just returned from a successful hunt, replied “every day”.
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travelling to the castanhais and harvesting Brazil nuts, they are also gathering the people, places, and activities from the past, present, and future into place. These examples are indicative of “background” being brought into the “foreground” (sensu Hirsch 1995).

Extractive activities have a distinct temporal dimension. Despite their seasonal incongruence, the paths traversed during the rubber boom have some overlap with the castanhais, and in the act of walking the trails, the ribeirinhos remember. Memories associated with the rubber boom—even those that are not explicitly linked with the task of rubber tapping, such as Indian attacks—are referenced by the gun carried by the in the present context of the Brazil nut collection. Future potentialities, such as the anticipated quality of the Brazil nut harvest, are also brought into the foreground. The simple act of harvesting Brazil nuts is also a gathering of places and times, and is indicative of building. The gathering of interest includes a gathering of other places in the taskscape and places within the forest, such as trails, as well as memories and seasons. As I discuss in Chapter 6, this gathering is fundamental to the development of a sense of place and identity as ribeirinhos.

The River (O Rio)

In this section, I “emplace” the river for the reader within the ribeirinho taskscape by illustrating the ways in which it is incorporated into their daily lives. I accomplish this primarily through an exploration of the central extractive activity of fishing, which is crucial to the ribeirinho diet, household economy, and ribeirinho sense of place and of self (this last topic discussed in Chapter 6). Their self-identification as “river people”
(ribeirinhos), is itself compelling evidence of the importance of the river to their livelihood and identity.

The river is the primary water source used in all aspects of ribeirinho daily life, from its most important and basic use as source of drinking water to bathing and washing of all kinds. Historically, it has served as the only passage for the people and products that sustain the ribeirinho economy and household. The ways in which the ribeirinhos engage with the river demonstrate that it is a somewhat paradoxical place because it contains positive, neutral, and negative values (Munn 1986), and links and separates places within and outside of the ribeirinho taskscape.

Like other places in the ribeirinho taskscape, the river is not a stable entity; rather, it is a composite of various places that shift in accordance with the seasons. The middle of the river, and the two banks of the river—that which is opposite of the home and that which is in front of the home—may be regarded as distinct. These places hold different meanings, provide different cues for behavior, and are used differently depending upon the context, the season, and the individual. Similarly, the opposite bank of the river poses restrictions for some ribeirinhos, because of newly created political boundaries and relations with Indians in the TIs (see Chapter 4). The juncture at which the river meets the yard near the home is an important place where the ribeirinhos socialize, swim, collect drinking water, clean fish and game meat, bathe, and wash. It is also a place that poses danger because of the presence of freshwater stingrays (*raias*) in the shallow waters where the river meets the yard. The ribeirinhos also have an ongoing fear of small children being eaten by carnivorous fish and other river-dwelling animals that pose a threat to humans. This part of the river is simultaneously positive and
negative space (sensu Munn 1996). The physical limits of these places change in accordance with the seasons, because of the dramatic transformation in the volume and appearance of the river between the rainy and dry seasons.

**Passage and Boundary**

The river provides a neutral passage in the midst of the borders and boundaries that characterize this frontier region. The Terra do Meio, or “Land of the Middle”, is known as such in part because of its location between the Xingu and Iriri rivers. Within the Terra do Meio, the Iriri River is itself an interstitial place. When the ribeirinhos are on the river and pass territories they perceive as hostile, including certain TIs and lands illegally occupied and claimed by speculators, they made clear that as long as they remained on the river, their travels would be undisturbed. As described in Chapter 4, I too remained in the neutral, central part of the river to adhere as closely as possible to the terrestrial protected area boundaries that I was prohibited from entering, such as the adjacent indigenous lands, the Riozinho do Anfrísio Extractive Reserve, and the Terra do Meio Ecological Station.

At the same time, the river represents a boundary within the ribeirinho taskscape. Boundaries between protected areas, including TIs, are more strictly enforced since the creation of the protected areas mosaic. However, boundaries are perceived differently by different households, depending upon the relationship with neighbors on the other side of the river. For example, the ribeirinhos on the northern portion of the reserve report having positive relations with the indigenous people of the TI Cachoeira Seca do Iriri. They frequently access the health post in cases of medical emergency, and reported that they are rarely turned away by the indigenous people. The presence of ribeirinho homes on both sides of the river, and of the significance of the health post,
may be noted in Figure 5-1. As discussed in Chapter 4, many ribeirinhos on this portion of the river live on the indigenous side and are in process of being relocated to the Iriri Extractive Reserve. Those who are further south, across from the Kuruaya and Xipaya TIs, reported less amicable relations with the indigenous neighbors across the river. In these instances, the river is often the outer limit of the taskscape because families there do not have access to the lands or resources within the TI. In cases of medical emergency the ribeirinhos in this portion of the river reported crossing the river to access the health post in the TI, although they said they were often denied treatment.\footnote{Reasons cited for this were spite (e.g, “just because they can” or “because we have nothing and they have government services”. I would imagine that the reasons are more likely availability of medical supplies. If the indigenous people began serving the basic medical needs of all the ribeirinhos in the region, they would have insufficient supplies for themselves. They do appear to provide medical services for ribeirinhos on an emergency basis, such as providing antibiotics, antimalarials, and stitches, and have occasionally assisted in the evacuation of gravely ill ribeirinhos through the use of the FUNAI speedboat.}

In all cases, riverine boundaries are difficult to define by their geography because these boundaries shift seasonally. These seasonal changes play an important role in ribeirinho tasks and movement through the riverine landscape. The river dramatically expands and contracts during the two distinct seasons of the Amazon. During the dry season, the river’s edge may be 15 to 30 meters from the ribeirinho house, depending on the household. During the rainy season, the river rises several meters and the water may reach the door of the house, forcing the ribeirinhos to board a canoe in order to exit their house. Some houses are built on platforms, allowing the river to flood underneath (Figure 5-4).

**Fishing**

Beginning in early childhood, ribeirinho children accompany their parents and older siblings to the river. Children are capable anglers, and from a very young age they are able to identify dozens of fish varieties. This is an example of habitus (Bourdieu
embodied and incorporated by children from an early age. The ribeirinhos tend to classify fish according to the fishes' physical characteristics and habits. For example, they distinguish between fish that have scales or smooth skin, prefer streams, lakes, or rivers, clear waters or black waters, and swim and live at different depths.

The practice of fishing is conducted for usually one of two objectives: for subsistence and for market. Depending upon the objective of the task and the desired fish to be caught, the technologies employed, tools used, and tasks may vary.

**Subsistence fishing**

Fishing for household consumption is a daily activity. The ribeirinho diet consists primarily of fish and manioc flour, their main protein and carbohydrate sources. In the household questionnaire implemented in 2006 (see Chapter 4), one hundred percent of household respondents fished on a daily basis (N=33), whereas only about half claimed to have hunted at least once during the prior month. Of the 21 households responding to the question, “During the past seven days, how many times did you eat fish?”, 18 households responded “every day”, and three households responded “one to five times”. In the latter case, these households indicated that they were fortunate to have game meat in the home, explaining their temporary break from the fish.

Fishing for household consumption is a task performed by men, women, and children, using traditional fishing methods. Fishing for consumption can be done

12 Sometimes the two are not easily distinguished. Not all fishing destined for market occurs in organized expeditions. To maximize their potential, a proportion of fish caught by individuals for household consumption may be prepared for trade rather than household consumption. Similarly, not all fish harvested during organized expeditions is for market purposes. Some fish are consumed by the anglers in situ or, if returning to the household shortly, brought home for household consumption.

13 The river is also the source of other delicacies consumed less frequently than fish. The meat of the tracajá (the Yellow-spotted Amazon River turtle; *Podocnemis unifilis*) is also a delicacy, as are the eggs laid by the female along the sandy beaches in the summer, which are collected at night by the ribeirinhos.
successfully at almost any time of day, but it is most productive if done at dawn and
dusk when the fish are feeding. The kinds of tools and technology used depend upon
the type of fish one wants to catch. Some fish, such as the pacu and curimatã, can be
cought in clear, shallow waters in the dry season using a bow and arrow (cana e
flecha),\(^{14}\) or in moderately deep waters using a small cast net (tarrata); others are
cought in deep water using a manufactured nylon line (línea or tela) and metal hook
(anzol). With the exception of the bow and arrow, which are handmade, these tools are
acquired through trade with a middleman.

When the ribeirinho\(^{15}\) goes fishing, he boards his canoe and paddle from the
river’s edge in front of the home. The canoe is a dugout made from one of many
possible hardwood trees from the forest, which has been felled and hollowed for this
purpose by the male head of household. The canoe is thus a direct index of the forest,
and the forest facilitates the task of fishing on the river; it is thus gathered into the place
of the river. Thus, the distinctions between places named and, upon first glance,
differentiated by use, fade as the relationships between them become apparent. The
ribeirinho paddles to the desired location, which is usually a shady part of the river or a
small stream (igarapé), at a distance of a few meters to several kilometers from the
house. Grubs, palm fruits, or bits of fish or other animal guts are used as bait. Before he
leaves the home, the ribeirinho considers the type of bait he must bring, or where he
might find bait along the way, to catch his preferred fish. Types of bait include grubs
from rotten logs in the forest, leftover scraps of fish or animal from the yard or from

\(^{14}\) I did not witness this firsthand, nor did I see any bows and arrows, but several ribeirinhos say they use
this technology.

\(^{15}\) Fishing for subsistence purposes is conducted by men and women. For clarity, I refer to the masculine
form here so as not to confuse the reader.
smaller bait fish caught during his outing, or fruits from palms near the river’s edge. For example, the carnivorous piranha responds best to meaty bait, while the pirarara catfish prefers palm fruits.

While he is out on the river, the ribeirinho may be fishing in response to explicit requests from his family for a type of fish that they would prefer to eat that evening, and so he calculates his locations and bait accordingly. As he paddles through the riverine landscape, he may stop to receive or deliver a message to a neighbor, or to gift a tasty fish to an elderly friend, an ailing neighbor, or a family with a new baby. In the absence of roads, the river is the only means of transportation in the region and, with the exception of the middlemen, of intra-household communication. Rather than walk from house to house, the ribeirinhos board their canoe and paddle to visit with family and friends. Thus, socializing often occurs on the way home from fishing. When the ribeirinho returns to his home, he, his children, and/or his wife gut and clean the fish at the river’s edge on rocks or a small pier made from wood from the forest, which bridges the yard to the river (Figure 5-5; see also “The Home”, below).

The selection of bait and the way in which fish are caught, using tools from the city and a canoe made from wood in the forest, demonstrate the gathering of places that occurs during a quotidian activity. The ribeirinho’s efforts may be guided by backgrounded, future potentialities, as illustrated in the selection of bait and in the requests for particular kinds of fish, yet uncaught, to prepared into the desired evening meal.

Fishing for market

Until the 1990s, fishing was primarily for household consumption. After the rubber bust and the sanctions placed on the hunting of animal skins (see Chapter 4), the
ribeirinhos turned to fishing for economic gain to supplement the household economy during the dry season. This activity complements their rainy season activity of harvesting Brazil nuts.

The ribeirinhos often partner with a local middleman or small-scale commercial fisherman who maintains a residence in the region (henceforth referred to as “middleman”). The relationship of dependence between the ribeirinho and middleman, which is discussed in Chapter 4, may be historically traced to the relationship between rubber patrão and seringueiro, discussed in Chapter 3. The middleman provides the fishing supplies, such as hooks and nets, so that the ribeirinho may fish. In return, the ribeirinho sells his fish directly and sometimes exclusively to that middleman at a relatively low price. On any given week, a household sells between 150 and 250 kilograms of salted fish.\(^{16}\) After collecting all the fish he can on a monthly basis, the middleman travels to the city to sell the fish for up to four times the price “paid” in the interior. The trade value obtained for the fish in the reserve depends upon the kind of fish sold. Mostly, the ribeirinhos receive between R$1.00 and R$1.50 per kilogram of salted fish. Popular market fish are colloquially known as tucunáre, surubim, pescada, pacu, and pirarara. Prices fluctuate depending upon regional demand and availability.

Often, these partnerships involve expeditions to remote places less frequently fished by commercial fishermen and ribeirinhos to maximize their harvest. On one occasion, I was interviewing a family when their young adult son suddenly jumped up and began excitedly packing a sack of belongings, including his fishing supplies. He had

\(^{16}\) This is the range reported by 14 households that participated in the household questionnaire in 2006. ISA (2003:231) estimated that ribeirinho households in the region (including the Iriri) sell approximately 100 kilograms per week.
heard a boat was taking ribeirinho men on a fishing expedition, and he had spread the word that he wanted a spot on that expedition. The boat driver, a man acknowledged by my hosts as a regional middleman who works in small-scale commercial fishing during the summer months, stopped at the home and picked up the young man. The men traveled by sliding their canoes and paddles sideways onto the larger boats (Figure 5-6). The young man left with nothing but a change of clothes, salt, a cast net, hook, and line in his hand, but he returned with what he estimated to be over 200 kilograms of fish one week later. Incidentally, I was visiting with the household when he returned, and all members of the household immediately rushed out to greet him, unloaded his canoe and belongings, and immediately went to work washing, cutting, salting, and setting the fish out to dry on drying lines in the yard (see “The House”, below). The young man reported that they went far upriver, into the Curuá River, and to a place where only a few people had ever fished before.

In contrast with the excitement in this young man, fishing is a somewhat sensitive subject among most ribeirinhos. Fishing for market is a sensitive topic that seems to threaten their sense of place and identity as ribeirinhos. Most of the families with whom I spoke said that they are skilled fisher people, but that fishing destined for market was an activity for which they “settled” in the absence of other income-generating activities during the dry season. They spoke nostalgically about rubber as an example of a more noble profession. Although they feel sentimental about rubber tapping, a defunct practice in the region, they regard an income-generating practice—fishing for market—as a poor substitute. The reasons for this appear complex, and include a sense of belonging or ownership as people “of” the region (see Chapter 6), historic use of the
resources versus contemporary use, the perceived impact overfishing has on their ability to provide for their family’s diet, and the fact that overexploitation of fish in the river is requiring them to venture beyond the reach of their familiar taskscape.

During my research, all but four households participated in fishing for market, although many did so with little enthusiasm and the four households that did not were outspoken against it.

We used to have more [to do economically] here. Now there are just these large boats, grabbing all the fish up in their nets, running us dry. It’s not worth it to a ribeirinho to try to compete with this. It’s against what we should stand for! It’s humiliating that a ribeirinho, once a seringueiro, should have to do this. And it doesn’t even pay enough to live. Every day along this river I see women wearing men’s clothing because they cannot afford women’s clothing with the fish they sell. I think people do not like me because I am against fishing of this nature. And I eat fish every day. Boy, I do love to eat my fish, and to fish myself, but only because fish is food!

This ribeirinho is expressing the inadequacy of fishing as a replacement for rubber tapping. He was opposed to fishing for market in part because of the low prices obtained for fish, as opposed to rubber (“it’s humiliating”), but his opposition is also because “fish is food”, and is thus a subsistence activity that is threatened by over-fishing associated with commercial operations.

The discomfort felt by some ribeirinhos about commercial fishing for market may also be attributed to its susceptibility to exploitation by commercial fishermen from the city who overharvest the fish using large nets (malhadeiras) that are submerged and span nearly the length of the river. The net is held in place for several hours before being pulled up by a dozen or more men (see Figure 5-1 for an illustration of this occurrence). This practice captures and kills indiscriminately and was a chief complaint
and concern among all ribeirinhos during my fieldwork. João relayed this sentiment in an interview.

Here we have fishing by malhadeira [a commercial practice that comes] from the city. The people from there have no right to come here because they are taking our income, our money from us! And besides, their kind of fishing is predatory, with the malhadeira, right? Here we don't accept that kind of practice. Because we ribeirinhos from here, we only fish what we can use for food and for sale, and we only fish with a line and hook or very small nets. And apart from them coming here with a huge boat full of people to take what we should be earning, they bring the large nets that extinguish all the fish in the river. (6/19/2006).

Large-scale commercial fishing leaves fewer fish for ribeirinho consumption and sale, reduces prices for direct purchase from the ribeirinhos, and disrupts the riverine ecosystem. At the time of my research the harvesting of fish by outsiders was prohibited by law but not enforced in practice. The ribeirinhos were upset and angry about this growing problem. Competition and overexploitation between ribeirinhos and outsiders have placed this important ribeirinho task at risk. As the anecdote provided about the young man illustrates, the ribeirinhos are being forced out of their familiar taskscape to areas that are infrequently traveled but provide more fish for market. This disrupts their routine; threatens their livelihood, and renders them more dependent upon outsiders to sustain the household economy.

**Hunting on the River**

Just as the ribeirinhos traverse the river to access resources of their taskscape, such as Brazil nut groves in the forest and manioc flour in a relative’s home, they also pursue game animals that, like them, are at their most vulnerable when they are in the water. This process is dramatically illustrated by opportunistic hunts for the *porcão* (white-lipped peccary; *Tayassu pecari*) when it is swimming across the river from one forest to another. This peccary is a wild boar that travels in large herds of up to several
hundred individuals. In the forest, a herd of these peccaries poses a serious threat to humans. However, when the herd crosses the river it is almost totally defenseless. If the ribeirinhos encounter a herd of peccaries on the river, they have been known to harvest as many animals as they can carry in their canoe. They drown the animals by grabbing their hind legs and pushing their heads underwater next to the boat. The peccaries do not flee but persist in circling the boat and gnashing their teeth at the ribeirinhos, trying to protect the herd and making themselves, as individuals, easier prey. The dead peccaries are quickly hoisted into the boat and the ribeirinho grabs the next animal within reach. The scene resembles a massacre. Because several peccaries provide more game meat than any household can consume, the meat is traditionally gifted to family and friends.\footnote{Game meat is not usually exchanged among ribeirinhos, but is sometimes exchanged for money or goods with gold miners who spend months prospecting on the Curuá River, a blackwater tributary of the Iriri River.}

I witnessed this hunt in 2007 when a herd of about 100 peccaries crossed from the eastern to the western bank of the river. We were far from the familiar taskscape of my travel companions, and so only a few individual peccaries were killed during this encounter so that the meat would not perish. We stopped at a home, the owners of which my travel companions had infrequent contact, to ask if the heads of household could help skin, gut, and remove the meat from the bodies. They did so happily—they reported not having game meat or visitors in over a month—and we spent the evening eating the meat and telling the story of the “hunt” over and over again. In the morning the ribeirinhos left some of the meat with our overnight hosts. One of my travel
companions salted the remaining portion, wrapped it in a cloth, and gifted portions of it to friends further downriver in the following days (Figure 5-7).

**The Home (A Casa e Quintal)**

While the river is regarded as an “in between” place, the home is the site at which products from other places in the taskscape are processed, transformed, and consumed or sold to middlemen. Nowhere are the recurrent operations of movement, materiality, and inscribing more salient than at the home. Every day begins and ends in the house. Tasks extend from the house, yard, and kitchen garden. Tools, technologies, and matter are gathered into the home as tasks are completed. The home as building is a concentrated gathering (and storage) place of people, products, and tools used and created over time. Socializing and storytelling occurs during meals and before bedtime in the home. Each story—for example, of a hunt, a harvest, a family member—gathers past practices into the present and links them to the future. The transformed matter that comprises the home—the roof, walls, and plants in the yard—also offers cues and causal inferences, what Gell (1998) refers to as “indexes”. The home is thus an ideal place from which to understand the role of temporality in place making.

In this section, I again focus on tasks that exemplify movement, materiality, and acts of inscription. Infrastructural investments are a particularly useful medium through which to identify these recurrent operations and the gathering of other places into the home. Infrastructural investments made in the vicinity of the home aid in the transportation, processing, consumption, and storage of products from other places in the taskscape. Small and large structures in the home act as bridges on and through which tasks are performed, while simultaneously enabling the movement of people and their products from other places in the taskscape into the home. In the act of creating
and using these investments, the ribeirinhos are thus inscribing the riverine landscape and linking places together. Three infrastructural investments in the place of the home are illustrative of these points: (1) the pier, found where the yard and river meet; (2) the casa de farinha in the yard, where manioc flour is prepared for consumption; and (3) the house itself, which facilitates countless tasks, from trivial to vital, that sustain the members of the household.

**The Geography of the Home**

I treat the “home” in this section as a combination of the house, yard, and kitchen garden (casa e quintal) because of the physical proximity and continuity between these three areas in practice and in discourse. In speech, the ribeirinhos infrequently distinguish between the areas of the home. For example, the windows, doors, and even walls to the house may be open to the yard to promote air circulation and to facilitate the movement, disposal, and storage of products, waste, and food items (Figure 5-8). When the ribeirinhos refer to the movement of matter between the house and the yard, they more often distinguish between “inside/outside” rather than “house/yard”. I identify the following subsections based on these distinctions.

**Outside: The Yard and Kitchen Garden**

The **quintal**, a term that may refer to the yard and kitchen garden (the latter of which is occasionally specified as *jardim*), is the terrestrial area surrounding the house. During the dry season, the front yard is a neatly maintained area in front of the house that tends to be free of vegetation (Figure 5-9). The yard slopes downward from the house to the point at which it meets the river.

Small, domesticated animals, such as chickens, ducks, dogs, and cats, live and are tended in the yard. Most yards include a chicken coop (*galinheiro*), a structure made
from palm thatch. At night, dogs sleep in the yard under the overhang of the roof next to the house. Most yards also have drying lines and platforms on which to dry and store salted fish for future retrieval by the middleman (Figure 5-10).

The yard transitions into a kitchen garden that contains several varieties of edible cultivars that are maintained close to the house to facilitate their use in cooking, snacking, and treating ailments. The ribeirinhos may also cultivate palms near the quintal that are useful as edibles, as bait for fishing (see above), and for the construction and the transportation of products. For example, some palms, such as the Babaçu (*Attalea speciosa*), are cultivated and managed in the area of the home. This palm made into thatch for roofs and walls of the house; into brooms for cleaning the house; and, importantly, into baskets (*paneiros*) used to haul Brazil nuts from the forest to the home and yucca from the swidden fields to the river and, subsequently, to the casa de farinha (see below). The native açaí palm (*Euterpe oleracea*) is cultivated near the house to facilitate seasonal consumption of its deep purple fruit, which, after being processed, is consumed as a type of porridge.

The yard may also contain species of historical significance, such as rubber trees that are deliberately cultivated (Figure 5-11). I first discovered this while walking through a yard one day during my first field season. A singular, tidy tree in front of a window caught my eye. I asked, “What’s that?” To my embarrassment, my host immediately responded, “That’s the rubber tree”. I was unaccustomed to rubber trees without the characteristic hatch-markings. Stunned, I asked him why he maintained the tree in his yard if it does not have economic value. He replied, “It’s a memento” (*é uma lembrança*). He explained that he had “raised” the tree in his yard, the purpose for which
he described as “to remember”. During our discussion, he also added, as many of the ribeirinhos do, that maybe one day it would return as an economically valuable species. Then, he joked, he could tap it from the convenience of his home. As this anecdote illustrates, rubber—a product that is no longer commercially viable—is an index of the past, around which a sense of place continues to coalesce.

The presence of rubber trees in the yard and kitchen gardens was subsequently noted in several ribeirinho homes, although it was discovered in the context of conversations and household interviews. The topic of the rubber boom always emerged in discourse. As we discussed it, many would ask me, excitedly, “Do you want to see a rubber tree? I have one here in my yard”. Like the informant cited above, subsequent conversations with ribeirinhos about the rubber trees in the yard summoned nostalgia for the past and economic expectations for the future.

In one instance, after I had spoken with one ribeirinho about the rubber tree cultivated in his family’s yard, his brother-in-law appeared at the house the next day carrying a satchel with receipts and identity documents from the rubber boom. Over the course of my fieldwork, many ribeirinhos came out of their way to show me similar documents and to bring me the tools and materials they used to tap rubber (Figure 5-12). I did not request this; in fact, at one point their fixation upon the past seemed to overwhelm my original objectives in the reserve. Over time, however, it became clear to me that this was one way in which backgrounded memories and practices are brought into the foreground. In addition to its future potentiality, the rubber tree thus acts as an index of the past: it marks the historical era of the rubber boom and the people, places, and practice of rubber tapping that enabled the seringueiros to dwell and develop a
sense of place in the Amazon (see also Chapter 3). Furthermore, other cultivars of the yard, such as the edible plants and useful palms, are maintained in anticipation of use, an example of a future potentiality (Hirsch 1995) from the background that is foregrounded in the present.

Two particular structures associated with the home space exemplify the ways in which places gather. These structures are in close proximity to the house but in most cases, detached from it.¹⁸ The first is the pier, located where the yard meets the river. The ribeirinhos use the piers to engage in a variety of activities related to the place of the home. The second is the casa de farinha, a wood and thatch structure in which the ribeirinhos prepare manioc flour.

The pier is built between the water’s edge and the front yard. This small, wooden platform is made from the wood harvested from any variety of hardwood trees from the forest. The pier extends from the yard to the river (or the river to the yard, depending upon the perspective), and it is from this pier that the ribeirinhos may engage in any number of activities. The pier provides a dry platform on which to place pots as they are being washed, an accessible place to leave a bar of soap while one is bathing, a flat surface upon which to vigorously scrub and beat soiled clothing, a fun spot from which children jump to swim in the river in the hot afternoons, and a strategic location from which to clean fish and game meat away from the dirt and domestic animals in the yard (Figures 5-13; see also Figure 5-6). In the rainy season, the pier is superfluous; the river envelops the yard and the pier is pulled onto high ground so that it is not swept away in the current of the river. Thus the position and use of the pier are indicative of the season of the year.

¹⁸ I did see several houses with attached casas de farinha.
The yard also contains the casa de farinha. Farinha is made from a “bitter” variety of manioc (*mandioca*) that represents the staple carbohydrate of the ribeirinho diet. The processes involved in its preparation are necessary to remove the cyanogen toxins before consumption. After being harvested from the swidden agricultural fields of individual households, the manioc roots are carried in the basket, made from fibers from the palm trees near the yard (see above), to the edge of the river. The roots are then soaked in the shallow waters of the river, where the river meets the front yard, for several days. The roots may be soaked in an old, submerged canoe made from hardwood tree in the forest so they are not lost in the river.

The next steps involved in processing and preparing the farinha are performed collectively. Family and friends load their respective roots into their canoes and paddle to a central location—usually settlements with multiple households, ample supplies, and multiple casas de farinha—to process the manioc and prepare the farinha. Thus, processing the manioc becomes a social activity conducted with neighbors, usually kin, from nearby households. As the many steps involved in processing the manioc are conducted, people are socializing, eating, and playing. The steps involved in the processing of manioc and the collective and social aspects of this important ribeirinho task are evident in the photos provided in Figure 5-14.

Having soaked the roots for several days, the ribeirinhos peel the manioc and grate the roots on a piece of metal with holes punched through it. This step is performed inside the casa de farinha, usually by men, over an old, dugout canoe elevated to hip level to facilitate grating. The canoes thus index both the forest and the river, yet in the place of the home. Next, the pulpy mash is transferred to a cotton hammock where it is
washed and strained. I observed mostly women performing this step. The hammock used is store bought, acquired through the middleman and normally used for sleeping. In its capacity in the processing of manioc, the hammock functions as a sieve. The mash is manually washed with water carried up from the river, pressed by hand through the hammock, and strained. Excess water is collected in a plastic bin below the hammock. Third, the mash is transferred to sacks and then transferred to a large, wooden press that is operated with the help of several men, since it requires lifting a heavy log that places weight on the mash, squeezing out the remaining liquid. Finally, the mash is ready to be toasted into flour. It is spread over a very large iron griddle and stirred for several hours over a fire until it is fully toasted. The final product is the dry, granular “flour” known as farinha, which has an extremely grainy and crunchy texture and is consumed with every meal.

The preparation of farinha is a process of place-making and gathering. While the harvesting of the root in the swidden fields may be done individually, the preparation of farinha is often a social task that brings people from multiple homes together. The various steps involved in preparing farinha gather other places, indicated by indexes, into the home.

The preparation of farinha also depends upon the city for its processing, as indicated by the ribeirinhos’ use of an iron griddle, plastic bins, and other manufactured objects. Similarly, fishing and Brazil nuts are dependent upon the demand created by the exterior market. These products move far beyond the familiar landscape of the ribeirinho who prepared them. The “city”, backgrounded and unfamiliar to most of the ribeirinhos, is foregrounded in their tasks.
Inside: The House

The house is the structure that provides the most elemental protection of the ribeirinhos and their products. More than a shelter, the building of the house is among the most complex acts of inscription that occur in the taskscape because it involves extensive artisanal knowledge and technology acquired over a lifetime. Furthermore, building the house gathers various places in the taskscape, including the forest and river. Once built, the house is an epicenter of gathered tasks, people, places, products, and temporalities.

The construction of the house is collectively shared by men, women, and children. The task involves organizing people willing to provide manual labor, gathering the materials from the forest, and planning and preparing the meals and other social events that accompany the construction process. When a new home is built, the ribeirinhos first need to clear the area of forest. The timber species felled during this process are utilized in home construction. Beams and posts are made from hardwood trees locally known as Coração-de-Nego, Itauba, Maraúba, Amargosa, Ameiju, and Camuri. Some homes were made of thatch walls, while others were open-air structures. In general, however, the ribeirinhos make the walls out of a composition called *pau-a-pique* that involves materials from the forest, yard, and river.

To make a pau-a-pique wall, wooden rods are affixed to the floor and extend vertically to the desired height of the ceiling. These rods are crosscut every few centimeters by bamboo rods, and the two materials are tied together with vines at their intersections, forming a porous wall that is filled in with mud. The mud is formed from the silty clay that is dug up from the yard, mixed manually with river water, and shaped by stomping, pounding, kneading, and slapping until its consistency is amenable to
rolling it into "balls". The balls, which are extremely heavy, are carried over to the side of the home. Portions of the balls are applied wet to the primitive wall as a kind of stucco, pushed into the spaces between the bamboo and wood, and smoothed over the top (Figure 5-15). This technology is typical throughout the region. The ribeirinhos use either the pau-a-pique or thatch in their home construction. A few homes had begun to incorporate wood into their home construction, which is associated with the city and thus appears to carry more prestige. However, the ribeirinhos often complain because wood houses are hotter.

One of the most difficult tasks in the construction of the house is assembling the roof. The roof is made from layers of palm fronds, usually harvested from nearby Babaçu palm trees, which are intricately woven into large sections of thatch and mounted onto the beams on top of the home. Men and women are skilled in weaving thatch and children often practice on small sections of the thatch so that knowledge is passed on to subsequent generations.

Maintenance of the home is fairly regular practice. Because of the natural materials used in home construction, sections of the home, such as the walls, may need to be replaced after 5 to 10 years. It was not uncommon during my interviews and visits to the households that a man or woman would notice a fiber tie or some minutiae coming undone some 15 feet above our heads. Without stopping the conversation, they would deftly climb the central posts of the house, walk without fear on a horizontal beam no wider than a few centimeters in diameter, cross the length of the house, and swiftly resolve the problem.
At the beginning of this chapter, I indicated that the home is the place from which the ribeirinhos begin and end their day, and from which all tasks extend. By focusing on specific tasks and places, I have detailed the gathering that occurs during a typical daily “round”. The round is implied through a discussion of the mundane, daily tasks of the ribeirinho. As such, the round shifts in accordance with changing circumstances, such as seasons, which play a role in the time of harvest of the Brazil nut (and consequently, of accessing the forest on a regular basis) and fishing for market during the summer months. The home is the beginning and end point of this critical round, and consequently of the kinds of products and materials that are gathered into its midst.

The home is a place of storage for commercial products after they have been procured and processed. After collecting the Brazil nuts from the forest and washing them in the river, they are stored in large sacks and placed in the house against a wall to protect them from rot, animals, and theft. Although the sacks are not a permanent fixture in the house, they are used for sitting, eating, and conversing inside the house (Figure 5-16). When the middleman does arrive, the nuts, like the fish, leave the familiar domain of the riverine landscape.

At night, families typically sleep in store-bought hammocks with mosquito nets, both of which are acquired through middlemen. Hammocks are gathered at the base and tied up or slung over beams during the day to facilitate movement through the house. However, one or two hammocks may be left down during the day for rocking infants and for rest. As light fades at the end of the day, the ribeirinhos retire to their hammocks. Darkness lasts for 12 hours in the Amazon, and the early evening is mostly whiled away with stories, often about the rubber boom, an encounter with a jaguar near
the home, an injury sustained while working in the fields, or a successful hunt in the forest. Even while they are at rest in the house, memories, people, places, and tasks continue to be gathered.

Conclusion

Similar to the myths and rituals inscribed in the physical landscape of indigenous Amazonia, the ribeirinho landscape is inscribed with people, places, and tasks from previous generations. These become manifest in the context of mundane extractive activities. Thus, the taskscape is not easily separable by task or by place—seemingly the two basic components of the taskscape. Rather, the taskscape emerges from the multiplicity of places, times, and tasks that are gathered and related to each other in the context of the ribeirinhos’ activities. Thus, I have endeavored to operationalize Ingold’s (1993) concept of taskscape to illustrate the ways in which ribeirinho practices are not merely subsistence or economic activities, but are tasks that have enabled them to dwell and form a sense of place and identity over time in the riverine landscape. This approach departs from that of standard, cultural ecological literatures on caboclo peoples by highlighting the significance of mundane activities in the creation of places and identities, and the ways in which other times, places, and tasks form part of places in the present. As I show in the next chapter, Topophilia, the processes by which the taskscape emerges are the same by which the ribeirinhos form of a sense of place and identity, leading to affective attachments, feelings, attitudes, and emotional bonds with place.

To gather “placewise” (Casey 1996:25) is not to provide an exhaustive description of places in the riverine landscape, but rather to capture the referential and recursive dynamics among and between them, and through time. Thus, in this chapter I have
endeavored to connect the characteristic places of the taskscape to other places and times. The experiences of the ribeirinhos during the rubber boom are foregrounded in the materiality of the rubber trees and the intersecting trails linking that era with the Brazil nut harvest in their conveniently alternating seasonality. During the Brazil nut harvest, the river moves from background to foreground when the Brazil nuts must be washed to separate the good from the bad, and when the middleman arrives in his boat to exchange goods from the city for the sacks of Brazil nuts accumulated in the ribeirinhos’ homes.

Forest, river, and home are intricately connected within the riverine landscape. Through the recurrent operations of materiality, movement, and inscribing, the river both connects and separates adjacent places within and outside the ribeirinho taskscape. Even as the ribeirinhos name the places gathered in this chapter, places within places emerge, consistent with the movement and inscribing that occurs in emergent taskscape. The river is a fluid boundary and passageway and thereby embodies the place that lies not only between other places, but also, and as a consequence, between hunger and food, sickness and medicine, and even life and death. Through the river, other places connect continuously through movement and materiality; the physical relationship between river, house and yard shift seasonally with the rains and the rise and fall of the river’s volume. Furthermore, through the river, the products that sustain the ribeirinho household, transformed by their labor, leave the familiar landscape of the ribeirinhos and are transported to the city by way of middlemen. The canoe, which derives from a hardwood tree in the forest, has been transformed by the ribeirinhos’ labor, knowledge, and skills into a vessel that enables the task of fishing and of
preparing farinha, as well as providing a means of transportation and, consequently, communication with other households. Fish bait may come from a terrestrial grub in a rotten log on the forest floor, a palm fruit from a tree in the forest at the edge of the river, a scrap from the yard, or from a different fish in the river itself. The movement and materiality of each place is constantly woven into the fabric of the next place in the always emergent taskscape. People, places, tasks, and the materiality, movement, and inscribing that link them, are constantly in a state of becoming.

The home is the hub at which the mutually constitutive processes of the taskscape converge. Quite literally, the house is the daily beginning and end point of movement for the ribeirinhos and their products, exemplifying the ways in which people, places, times, and matter are continuously gathered in the taskscape. The hub emerges constantly through countless tasks accomplished, remembered, and planned: the daily lives of families, punctuated by births and deaths, and seasonal comings and goings; the cultivation of rubber trees and the processing of manioc flour in the yard; the storage of defunct tools and technologies, and the accumulation of sacks of thousands of Brazil nuts in the home; the discourse employed by the ribeirinhos in conversation at mealtimes, or while lying awake in their hammocks in the early hours of darkness.

The taskscape is not merely a collection of tasks or places, but a gathering, “placewise” (Casey 1996), of the dynamic relationships among and between them into a network. The “gathering power of place” (Casey 1996:25) is such that through their engagement with the emergent taskscape through their tasks—the subject of this chapter—the ribeirinhos develop a sense of place and identity. As I explore next, in
Chapter 6, this sense of place and identity are likely to change over time because like the taskscape, they are emergent.
Figure 5-1. An illustration of ribeirinho “place”, drawn by families of the Iriri River.
Figure 5.2. The Brazil nut harvest. (A) The pé-de-bode used for collecting Brazil nut fruits (foreground), leaning against a basket (paneiro) used for carrying the nuts out of the forest. Note the gun (espinarda) in the background. (B) Breaking open the Brazil nut fruits (ouriços) amassed in the grove with a machete. (C) Washing the Brazil nuts in the river, using the basket (paneiro) as a sieve. (D) Storing the Brazil nuts on the thatch platform (paiol) in the yard, to aid in drying the nuts and protecting them from animals. Photos A, C, D: Vivian Zeidemann. Photo B: usaid.gov
Figure 5-3. A depiction of tree tenure in a Brazilian extractive reserve (i.e., “Land Owned by the Government”). Note the distribution of rubber trails relative to Brazil nut trees. Although this image depicts a reserve in which both Brazil nuts and rubber are economically viable, for the purposes of this project, all references to rubber (e.g., colocação, rubber trail) may be considered “backgrounded”, brought into the foreground in during the Brazil nut collection. Source: Ankerson and Barnes 2004:164.

Figure 5-4. A house on the Iriri elevated on a platform, to allow the river to flood underneath during the rainy season. Source: ICMBio).
Figure 5-5. Fish caught and cleaned at the river’s edge. (A) Evidence of a successful day of fishing. (B) Cleaned fish are stored on a rock until the ribeirinho finishes cleaning all fish. (C) Cleaning fish on the pier.

Figure 5-6. Leaving on a fishing expedition (fishing for market).
Figure 5-7. Hunting peccaries from the river. (A) The ribeirinhos spot a herd of peccaries in the distance, and harvest a few individuals. (B) Cleaning the peccaries at the river’s edge. (C) Washing the cleaned carcass in the river. (D) Gifting game meat downriver.
Figure 5-8. A view of a kitchen from the yard. Note the open spaces to facilitate air circulation and disposal. In this photo, a woman is washing meat with river water and disposing of dirty water and food scraps through the open window. Food scraps are eaten by domestic animals in the yard.
Figure 5-9. A view of two ribeirinho homes. (A) Note the impeccably cleared yard. (B) Note the location of the home relative to the river and to the forest.
Figure 5-10. Drying lines with salted fish in the yard.
Figure 5-11. A former rubber soldier explains, and then shows, the way to tap rubber, using a rubber tree cultivated in the yard. The defunct tools, retained in the house for safe keeping, were pulled out to explain the ways in which rubber used to be collected.
Figure 5-12. Rubber receipts kept in the house and retrieved in the context of interviews about the past. (A) A ribeirinho displays his last rubber receipts. These receipts, in particular, were from the 1980s, when a minor market for rubber existed. They are signed by Frisan Nunes, son of the legendary rubber baron Anfrísio Nunes (B).
Figure 5-13. The role of the pier in ribeirinho practices. (A) The pier (and canoe), bridging the yard and the river. (B) Washing clothes in the river, using the pier.
Figure 5-14. Processing and preparing farinha. (A) Having been harvested from the fields and soaked in the river, the roots are grated in a canoe in the casa de farinha. (B) Using river water, the mash is washed in a hammock as part of the removal of cyanogens. (C) The mash is pressed in a wooded press made from wood from the forest, to remove excess water. (D) Farinha is stirred on an iron griddle over an open fire.
Figure 5-15. Finishing a *pau-a-pique* wall. (A) Mud from the yard is mixed with river water (from the plastic jugs) and formed into balls. (B, C) The mud balls are carried to the house. (D) The mud is smoothed in between the wood and bamboo foundation of the wall.

Figure 5-16. Sitting on Brazil nut sacks stored inside the house during a household interview.
CHAPTER 6
RIBEIRINHO TOPOPHILIA

In Chapter 5, I explored the ribeirinho taskscape as a gathered network of places, times, and tasks. I showed how people and places are mutually constituted through the tasks that provide for the ribeirinho household. In this chapter, I examine the implications of that analysis for ribeirinho identity and sense of place.\(^1\) As described in Chapter 2, the dominant literatures on Amazonian peasants frequently referred to as caboclos treat them as inherently “out-of-place”; a mere product of environmental, political, and economic drivers. In this chapter, by contrast, I demonstrate that through the taskscape as process, and in conjunction with (and in response to) broader processes in the Amazon over time, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri have developed an emergent, emplaced identity and a sense of place in the region.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first examines identity and, specifically, the relationship between etic (“outsider”, imposed, produced) and emic (“insider”, folk; locally constructed) identities among Amazonian peasants and the ribeirinhos, in particular. I compare the etic extractivist (extrativista) identity with the emic ribeirinho identity. The former, extrativista, was created in the 1980s as part of the political and environmental dialogue involved in the rubber tappers’ movement and the development of the extractive reserve concept. I demonstrate that the latter, ribeirinho, emerges from the taskscape.

---

\(^1\) The works of Basso (1996), Gray (2003), Morphy (1995) and Santos-Granero (1998) illustrate that discursive and non-discursive knowledge and practices are indicative of a durably installed sense of place. In Chapter 5, I examined mostly non-discursive practices and the ways in which places gather through the ribeirinhos’ tasks. In this chapter, the data upon which I rely are mostly discursive, based on interviews, informal conversation, and questionnaires.
In Chapter 2, I reviewed how scholars of Amazonian cultural and political ecology tend to classify Amazonian peasants according to a “template” (Harris 2000:84) or a “cultural type” (Steward 1955, Moran 1974a) that proved inadequate for this study. In contrast to the dominant literatures on Amazonian peasants, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri consider themselves neither extractivists nor caboclos. Harris (1998, 2000, 2009) presents the hazards of reifying the term “caboclo” as a cultural type, as is evidenced in the existing literatures. He reminds us that the term is derogatory: “it is not one of self-ascription: it is a local term of abuse” (Harris 2009:74). As a result, Harris opts to use “rieirinho” to refer to his informants. Like Harris (2009:74), I have used the term “rieirinho” throughout this project to refer to my informants. But unlike Harris, I do not regard it as a substitution for caboclo. Rather, I use it because it is the term most frequently used by the ribeirinhos to describe who they are in relation to the particular circumstances of their dwelling as part of the riverine landscape.

However, the distinction between emic and etic is not always clear. Like the taskscape, identity is always in a state of becoming. Over time, etic identities may become emic as the practices to which the imposed identity refer become routine, embodied, and incorporated into daily life. Indeed, it is likely that the term rieirinho is also an etic identity that originated with European colonists several centuries ago. I explore the slippage between emic and etic, using examples of identities imposed, adopted, and yet to be incorporated to highlight my analysis. For example, the rubber soldier (soldado da borracha) identity was clearly etic, constructed as an integral part of a savvy recruitment campaign during WWII (see Chapter 3). This identity was adopted by the nordestino recruits relatively quickly. At the time of my research, the rieirinhos
had not adopted the extrativista identity; but then again, it was only recently incorporated into the rhetoric of the region. Nonetheless, it is possible that the ribeirinhos will adopt the extrativista identity in the future.

In the second section, I connect the routine practices and gathering acts of the taskcape, described in Chapter 5, to the development of a sense of place among the ribeirinhos. As reviewed earlier, Bachelard (1969) used the term topophilia—love of place—to describe the affective relationship people form with place. Specifically, Bachelard (1969:xxxi) defines topophilia as “the human value of the sorts of space that may be grasped, that may be defended against adverse forces, the space we love.” Basso (1996:54) refers to this concept as a sense of place, “that close companion of heart and mind, often subdued, yet potentially overwhelming.” Ponzetti (2003) refers to this as an attachment to place, which he defines as “an elaborate interplay of emotion, cognition, and behavior in reference to place.”

Like identity, ribeirinho sense of place emerges from the taskcape. As discussed in Chapter 5, walking the trails, paddling a canoe, making farinha, and tending to the home are not only economic activities; they are simultaneously acts of remembrance (Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), sources of identity (Gray 2003; Ingold 2000), and expressions of belonging (Bender 2002). In other words, they are place-based tasks from which a sense of self and place emerge. The most powerful expression of a sense of place is topophilia, the title of this chapter and a particularly apt concept for the ribeirinhos, who profess their love of place in spite of their experience of great difficulties and suffering and their history of intermittent invisibility. I illustrate this love of place with
examples of ribeirinho discourse and exegesis. This approach is complementary to, and yields results consistent with, the factor analysis described in Chapter 4.

Identity

Etic Identities

As I have discussed in previous chapters, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri did not have rights to land, did not possess identity documents, and, as a result, also did not have access to government services such as health care and education until the creation of the extractive reserve. It was as if their very existence was denied by the government; as a result, they were an “invisible” people in the Land of the Middle. Extractive reserves partially redressed these critical oversights in the Terra do Meio by granting marginalized ribeirinhos people use concession to land and resources.

The scholarship on Amazonian peoples and conservation, outlined in Chapter 2 and revisited in Chapter 4, alternates between defense and rejection of the premises of extractive reserves, which combine the objectives of rural development with those of environmental conservation. Much of this literature treats the “extractivists” of interest as a people inherently out-of-place, on-the-move (Bender 2001), and out-of-time; they seem vaguely anachronistic and, as such, are either regarded as a great hope for Amazonian conservation because of their low-impact livelihoods or, alternatively, as an invasive, environmental adversary that will overexploit forest resources. The scholarly literature on the subject of extractive reserves and extractivist populations is polarized around whether extractivists, a non-indigenous people, “belong” in these forests at all. The myth of the “ecologically noble savage” identified by Redford (1991) among indigenous people is threaded throughout this debate. These divisive opinions have led to unrealistic expectations for extractive reserves and the “extractivists” therein and, in
the wake of the original successes experienced by the rubber tappers’ movement in the 1980s, has created a period of “post-victory dilemmas” (Ehringhaus 2006) in which extractive reserves are challenged or defended as an integrated conservation and development model.

Anthropologist Eduardo Brondízio (2008, 2009) critiques the extractivist identity assigned to rural forest peasants because it portrays them as passive actors whose primary function is to extract forest products, such as Brazil nut, rubber, and the açaí berry, for consumption in the exterior. This approach, according to Brondízio, assigns a particular history and economic understanding of the population that overlooks the complex ways in which the economic production of forest goods is intricately enmeshed in the daily lives of forest peoples. This assessment resonates with my experience among the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River. Incorporating a phenomenological approach, as I have undertaken here, further demonstrates that the ribeirinhos’ economic activities cannot be separated from the affective, symbolic, and social aspects of their dwelling.

As described in Chapter 1, the original intention of my study was to understand the involvement of so-called “extractivists” in the social movement that helped create the Terra do Meio mosaic, of which the Iriri Extractive Reserve forms a part. I was intrigued by the parallels between the rubber tappers’ movement in the western Amazon during the 1980s and the dramatic completion of the Xingu Protected Areas Corridor (XPAC) by a grassroots social movement, including the “extractivists”, in the eastern Amazon (Allegretti 1990; Schwartzman 1989; Schwartzman et al. 2010). During my first visit to the Iriri, however, I was surprised to discover that, for the most part, the ribeirinhos were not aware of the terms “extractivist” or “extractive reserve”. In fact, 61 of my 66
informants were entirely perplexed by these terms because they had never heard them before. During my interviews on extractivism, the creation of the Iriri Extractive Reserve, and the extractivist identity about which I had read and heard so much in the scholarly literatures and in my coursework, I received uncomfortable, blank stares and awkward silences in response to my questions. Many of my informants tried to appease me and hazard a guess of what the terms and concepts meant. I have elected not to include these interview excerpts here because, while revealing in their own right, they misrepresent the potential for the ribeirinhos to engage as part of regional and national society, and of protected areas, and particularly extractive reserves, in the region.

However, this awkward early experience was anomalous since nearly all of the ribeirinhos I interviewed were eager to share their stories and talk about themselves with little reservation. Most of their stories revolved around a romanticized and nostalgic history of their role as rubber soldiers and the generally positive relationship they had with the rubber barons (see also Chapter 3). At times, their rubber-centric storytelling and conversation confounded and exhausted me since I initially could not fathom their apparent obsession with the glory days associated with a task that they no longer practiced. Only later did I begin to grasp the ways in which the past is both literally and symbolically present for them on a daily basis; it is “foregrounded”.

However, their stories were not all tales of an idyllic past. They also wanted to share with me their concerns about the lack of schools\(^2\) and the presence of outsiders encroaching upon their livelihoods, and to express their grief over the deaths of loved

---

\(^2\) The social movement has begun addressing many issues, including health care and education. These interventions have occurred recently, and after my fieldwork had concluded. An update on these important endeavors is provided in the conclusion.
ones who had died of simple diseases while across the river the Indians had access to antibiotics and antimalarials. They were desperate for change, but at the same time proud of where they lived and how they lived. As I began to record these descriptions, digitally and in my field notes, I noticed a pattern: they almost always called themselves ribeirinhos, and they spoke about themselves with reference to place and tasks.

**Emic Identities**

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, the term ribeirinho is rarely problematized in the scholarly literatures. When mentioned at all, it is used as a sub-category of caboclo (Wagley 1976) to describe a particular inhabitant of a specific ecological zone (Nugent 1993, Wagley 1976). According to Brondízio (2009:185), the Spanish language equivalent *riberiño* “is a category—while geographical—that involves different social classes, while caboclos are essentially lower class.”

As mentioned above, during my first visit to the region I was surprised by the lack of knowledge about an extractivist identity and extractive reserves. I also became aware that the term “ribeirinho” meant much more than just “living at the edge of the river”. I asked the ribeirinhos for an explanation. I was able to do this during my household interviews, and so modified my questionnaire to include a section on “ribeirinho” as a concept that I would explore through 66 systematic interviews, in addition to participant observation. Two recurrent concepts regarding ribeirinho identity were present throughout this process: (1) ribeirinho as a “way of being”; and (2) ribeirinho as emergent from the taskscape.

A ribeirinho, according to my informants, is first described as someone who lives on the river’s edge. Literally, this was *na beirada* (on the bank), *na beira do rio* (on the bank of the river), and *no beiradão* (way out on the edge of the river, but conveys a
sense of pride and uniqueness). At the beginning of my fieldwork when I would ask directly, “what is a ribeirinho?”, they would often begin with these small utterances, followed by a shy (é isso só) (“that’s it”). However, in informal conversation without prompting or provocation from me, I became aware that ribeirinhos frequently utter the expression *eu nasci e me criei aqui, na beira do rio* (“I was born and raised here, on the banks of the river”) after any introduction, or at the beginning of any substantive conversation or story about themselves. These statements were also clearly linked with the river, and in discourse, to the term “ribeirinho”. They are said with pride. Many said it while slapping their chests with the palms of their hands, fingers extended, over the area of their heart.

To the deliberate and systematic questioning about “what is a ribeirinho?”, I was surprised to hear that after identifying it first in reference to the place of the river (above), they explained what a ribeirinho does. Their idea of a ribeirinho is different from that which is depicted in the scholarly literatures described in Chapter 2 and above. In other words, rather than describe a ribeirinho as a cultural type, with particular physical features and social characteristics (e.g. Moran 1974a; Wagley 1976), they talked about it as a collective way of being as doing, through their practices. This collective way of being was largely positive, focused on shared capacities and abilities. Skills such as hunting, fishing, river navigating, and farming were the most commonly named. The collective aspect was evident in their discourse, where at the end of almost every sentence, *mais nós* (with us) and *como nós* (like us) was added. For example, Pedro said, “A ribeirinho is someone who works with us.” Ribeirinho is thus a collective

---

3 These statements are further explored in “sense of place”, below.
identity, created through the shared experience of being in the landscape, through livelihood practices.

Gilson and his wife Liliane had a particularly compelling explanation of what it means to “be” a ribeirinho. As we discussed what a ribeirinho was, and in the context of us laughing and joking about many topics, I asked if I could be a ribeirinho. Their response was “yes”. I asked them to elaborate, as the following interview excerpt demonstrates.

Hilary: Being an American and a foreigner, not from the river, can I be a ribeirinha?

Gilson: Yes

Liliane: Yes, you can. Come here and live with us.

H: (Laughter, and pause). But, if I don’t know [anything about it], how can I be a ribeirinha?

L: But you will stay here with us, and we will...(breaks off laughing)

G: We will explain everything to you! (escalating laughter from all)

L: No, we will show you! (loud laughter from all)

G: OK, so, now I will tell you (pauses; interrupted by laughter). I will tell you right now. (laughter dies down). [If you are a ribeirinho] you go into the forest, and you are able to get around easily. You go down to the river, you grab your canoe, and you catch a fish easily, you see? You bring your food home this way (6/17/2006).

For Gilson and Liliane, being a ribeirinho is, of course, something that cannot be easily “taught” to an outsider by way of demonstration or explanation. Just as becoming a rubber tapper was difficult for the nordestinos because it was not initially “secondhand” or embodied (sensu Bourdieu 1977 and de Certeau 1984; see Chapter 3), I could not be a ribeirinha by mere fact of living in the region for a short period of time.
A similarly evocative conversation occurred with Pedro Paolo, who talked about the diversity of places, sights, and activities that occur in the course of a typical ribeirinho day. He did so in comparison to what someone from the city might do and experience. We had not been discussing the city, but the fact that he evoked the city in conversation was significant, because he did so to express his pride about what he does and where he lives.

The river here has a lot of fish, and we fish every day. We hunt in the forest, where there is a lot of game. There, and in the yard, we collect our fruits—açaí, pineapple. Like someone from the city, who every day walks around, looking up what he needs to for his job, living his life; we do the same. If I go to the river to fish, I see a big fish, a turtle, a huge caiman, an ariranha with a fish in its mouth. I go to the forest, I walk around. I grab a parrot from the tree. Maybe two! I climb the tree to the nest, grab the baby parrot, and raise it [as a pet] because it will become attached to me, right? That is a typical day for me. I feel proud to be living here on the beiradão.

(6/20/2007).

Comparable to the excerpt by Gilson and Liliane, Pedro Paolo describes the typical day of a ribeirinho as a gathering of places, tasks, and experiences. He begins with the river, but quickly recounts tasks that occur in other places. He is clearly proud of where he lives in relation to those tasks.

As these passages indicate, a ribeirinho is more than a person who lives in a location (e.g., “on the banks of the river in the Amazon”). Ribeirinho is a term that refers to dwelling; it includes skills, knowledge, and experiences that are “durably installed” (Bourdieu 1977). As Casey (1996:18) says, “There is no knowing or sensing a place except by being in that place, and to be in a place is to be in a position to perceive it. Knowledge of place is not, then, subsequent to perception but is ingredient in perception itself. To live is to live locally, and to know is first of all to know the places one is in.” The knowledge and skills related to livelihood practices were highlighted
frequently by the ribeirinhos and were connected to the essence of what it means to be 
“ribeirinho”.

As described in Chapter 5, people, their social and technical activities, temporality, 
and place are mutually constituted (Casey 1996; Ingold 1993, 2000; Reynolds 1993). 
When Gilson speaks at the end of this excerpt (above), he is speaking seriously about 
the facility with which a ribeirinho navigates the riverine landscape. His description 
entails the seamless movement of a ribeirinho between the places of river and forest, 
facilitated by the skills needed to engage the material aspects of both, with the end 
result of providing for the family.

While the term “ribeirinho” seems obviously connected to the river, or the land 
adjacent to the river, the ribeirinhos use it in reference to a variety of tasks and places. 
Ribeirinho places materialize through the livelihood practices, skills, and knowledge 
employed in each one and in relation to one another, and in relation to the periods in 
which they are (or were) engaged.

By way of extension, in describing their practices the ribeirinhos are also 
describing the geographic extension of their everyday lives in the material landscape. 
For example, César said a ribeirinho is a person “who takes care of the area”, and by 
area he meant the extension of what he and his family considered “their place”. Further 
probing unlocked the extension of their family land, which extends out several 
kilometers to their Brazil nut trees (6/20/2006; see Chapters 4 and 5). Similarly, Edilson 
said that the places of the river, forest, and home were “one and the same”:

It’s all the same. On the banks of the river, it’s there that you know [he is a 
ribeirinho]. Do you understand? On the banks of the river you have a home 
from which you paddle [your canoe], and there you know the river and you 
know the forest, right? He dabbles in the river, he knows the fish. He is able
to catch the fish he wants. The river, the crops—it’s all one and the same (é tudo uma coisa só). (7/4/2006)

To the same question, Guilhermina replied, “Well, a ribeirinho lives on the banks of the river, washes a few things, fishes, right? A ribeirinho lives from fishing, from farming; from looking for food.” When I asked her if a ribeirinho was different from a farmer, she replied as the previous informant did: “é tudo uma coisa só” (6/15/2006). The following interview excerpts reveal a similar conversation with a different informant:

Hilary: So then tell me, since you always talk about being a ribeirinho, tell me what it means to be a ribeirinho? What is “ribeirinho”?

Sérgio: It’s the guy who lives on the beirada.

H: Is that it?

S: Yes! (laughter)

H: (teasing) All this talk of being a ribeirinho, of the beiradão, and that’s it?

S: (laughter) Ok, then. What he does is he puts some crops in the ground, so that we can eat. He first clears one linha,4 two linhas…from there he gets the name “ribeirinho” (6/13/2006).

Another person told me, “A ribeirinho knows the river, but also how to grow crops in the fields.” Thus, a ribeirinho is someone identified from the practices that gather the places of the river, home, forest, and swidden agricultural fields (crops). These passages reference the tasks of fishing, farming, and maintaining the home; the related activities of clearing farm land and planting crops; and paddling and “dabbling” in the river. All of these practices contribute to “knowing” a place, both in the active sense of “knowing” how to perform one’s task and in the abstract sense of having acquired knowledge over a lifetime that may also have been passed down from one’s predecessors.

---

4 A linha is a linear measurement used in farming. It is literally a “line”: a row of plantings, as may be seen in a garden.
Temporality in the Interstices: The Slippage between Etic and Emic Identities

As the previous sections illustrate, my data support the assertion that for my case study, *ribeirinho* is an emic identity, whereas *extrativista* is etic. The ribeirinhos speak with ease about ribeirinho. The ribeirinho identity emerges from the gathering of places through tasks. This is why, without any sense of irony, they equate a “riverine person” with someone who engages practices in the forest, swidden fields, and home. However, very few of my informants readily identified themselves as *seringueiro* or *soldado da borracha* in the present. Those who did, did so dubiously.

María said that the ribeirinhos of the Iriri no longer consider themselves *seringueiros*, but that if rubber returned—if it “came back to life”—the ribeirinhos would be rubber tappers. Antônio said, “I don’t tap rubber anymore, but I was a *seringueiro*. I liked tapping rubber, but I can’t do it anymore [because it is not being bought]”. Luis responded, “Rubber tapper? No. Because we don’t tap rubber here. Back then, during that time, yes, we were rubber tappers. If the rubber boom returns, then we will be rubber tappers again.” Another ribeirinho summarized the aforementioned points succinctly: “We don’t consider ourselves rubber tappers because it doesn’t exist here” (“*aqui não tem*”).

During the rubber boom, the ribeirinhos and their descendents were dubbed *seringueiros* and *soldados da borracha*—both etic identities—that appear to have been incorporated relatively quickly and are now “backgrounded” (sensu Hirsch 1995). This suggests that the boundaries between etic and emic identities are fluid. In the interview excerpts provided in the section on emic identity, place and task-based experiences and “knowing” are treated as innate, ribeirinho qualities. However, as discussed in Chapter 3, the nordestino recruits to the region were trained in the skills now considered
inherently ribeirinho, including fishing, paddling a canoe, and, of course, rubber tapping. For example, the knowledge of fishing to which Pedro Paolo and Edilson referred was acquired during the rubber boom.

Rubber is still active in the landscape because, as Chapter 5 demonstrated, there are indexes of that past activity that become apparent in the context of current activities. Thus, the term “rubber tapper” may be an identity as defunct as the rubber trees, tools and receipts identified in Chapter 5. Nonetheless, the identity is intersubjective; like the trees, tools, and receipts, it is easily accessed and linked with their tasks. In case rubber returns, the ribeirinhos are ready to resume the practice.5

Sense of Place

Definitions of “topophilia”, “sense of place”, and “attachment to place” provided by Bachelard (1969), Basso (1996), and Ponzetti (2003), are useful to describe ribeirinho sense of place6 as an emotional and affective bond with place. As demonstrated in Chapter 5, places are created and gathered from the ribeirinhos’ extractive activities (their “tasks”). In this section, I show that the ribeirinhos form sentimental attachments in relation to those places as a result of those tasks (sensu Gray 2003:233). The tasks that enable the ribeirinhos to dwell are economic activities that result in products destined for

---

5 Interestingly, a project was initiated in the neighboring Riozinho do Anfrião Extractive Reserve in 2009 by one of the NGO stakeholders in the region. The objective was to assist the ribeirinhos with an economic activity they were interested in initiating, to improve their quality of life and develop positive feelings for the reserve. The NGO has plans to conduct a pilot study in the Iriri Extractive Reserve in 2010 (Marcelo Salazar, pers. comm., 8/12/2009). I have not observed these projects directly and so cannot comment on their potential within the scope of this project.

6 I rely upon the general term “sense of place”, although I often revert to “attachment to place” when referencing my data or practices or speech acts that allude to “attachments”. Similarly, I use the term “topophilia” when the ribeirinhos describe their positive feelings toward where they live, but because of the emotional strength it conveys, I also develop it as the most obvious expression of a sense of place.
market, and have also created places and gathered time, memories, and emotions into them (see Chapter 5).

Understanding ribeirinho sense of place entails recognizing that the material and emotive aspects of livelihood practices (and therefore, of dwelling) are inseparable. According to Gray (2003:225) referring to Scottish shepherds, “The hills are not just spaces for work”: like the myths and rituals inscribed in the landscape that reproduce indigenous societies (e.g. Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), extractive activities have enabled the ribeirinhos to dwell in place over time. Thus, like identity, ribeirinho sense of place emerges from the taskscape. Walking the trails, paddling a canoe, making farinha, and tending to the home—examined in Chapter 5 and revisited in “identity”, above—are not only economic tasks that provide for the household. They are simultaneously acts of remembrance (Morphy 1995; Santos-Granero 1998), sources of identity (Gray 2003; Ingold 2000; see above), and expressions of belonging (Bender 2002). In other words, they are place-based tasks that over time invoke an affective sense of, and attachment to, place. The most powerful expression of a sense of place is topophilia.

Almost all of my informants told me how much they value the ease with which they can “live well”, particularly in reference to food and the environment. These conversations often came about in the context of asking me about where I live and how my family lives. Mostly, they were pleased with their skills and knowledge (that I did not possess). In reference to food and resources in the region, they often use the term *fartura* (abundance). One young woman, who had never been to the city, shared that her dad is always “going on” about the *fartura* of the region. “He says there is nothing in
the city that comes free. Here, if we want meat, we hunt it and eat it. We want fish? We fish, and eat it. We grow food, too, and eat it. There is fruit right here; it came from that tree next to my house. You want it? All of this is here for us.” Antônio said, “There is so much fartura here—the fish, the meat—whenever you want it, you just go out and get it, and you can eat it immediately (na hora).” César and Edma explained their appreciation for where they live as follows:

César: The people who live on the beirada…well, we have our “little things” (as coisinhas da gente)

Hilary: What “little things”?

C: You know, “little things”.

Edma: Fish

C: Fish!

E: Grabbing a fish [from the river].

H: OK, grabbing a fish.

E: Eating a tasty, grilled fish.

H: OK, eating a tasty, grilled fish.

E: On the beach! (6/14/2006)

This interview excerpt is one that explores the conveniences of “the little things” of ribeirinho life; in this instance, it is an appreciation for the ability to catch, cook, and eat a tasty fish. The conversation builds from “the little things” to the more specific, preferred cuisine and place of consumption.

Many of the women shared with me that they appreciate the peace, quiet, and tranquility of where they live for the well-being of their children. The lifestyle that provides the food was treated as part of living well. Selene said, “Here there is so much tranquility. All of us can fill our bellies. In the city the parents go hungry so the children
can eat. Here, the food here does all of us well. Without having to scramble through life, looking for money, working terrible jobs, buying bad food with the little money we would earn [in the city]. We live well here.” In reference to security, Lucilene said that she lives “free of worry” in her home as opposed to the city, where “a ribeirinho sleeps fearfully, because someone will do us or our children harm. Children are in danger in the city. Where do they go while we go to work all day and night? Where can they play? How will they eat?” These comments suggest that in contrast with “this place”, the city is where a ribeirinho does not belong. In other words, ribeirinho identity is formed in part in contrast with city identity, as two different places where one can “be”. This is comparable to Richardson’s (2003) analysis of the market and plaza as intersubjective worlds (i.e., being-in-the-plaza and being-in-the-market). Like the plaza and the market, the city and the Iriri are two distinct worlds that acquire their meaning in relation to each other; specifically, through the ways people behave and move within each one.

Other examples of “living well” were made in reference to the environment of the region. In conversation, the ribeirinhos frequently mention the pleasant temperature of the forest, the clean air, the flavor and freshness of food, and the quality of the water. Again, these references were often done with a nod toward their skills, good fortune, and knowledge in comparison with outsiders. They were looking for me to affirm that in fact, the fish tasted better than in the city, the water was cleaner, and the forest, clear cut in city and along the highway, provided important relief from the sun along the Iriri.

Among the ribeirinhos, statements of “belonging” to place—literally, born, raised, and therefore “of” place—occurred in the context of asking unrelated questions on my
household questionnaire,\textsuperscript{7} or organically in conversation.\textsuperscript{8} The ribeirinhos frequently utter some variation of the expression \textit{eu nasci e me criei aqui, na beira do rio} (“I was born and raised here, on the river banks”). According to my data, the first clause (i.e., \textit{eu nasci e me criei aqui}) is almost always uniform; the second, if used at all, may reference “in this place” (\textit{neste lugar}) more generally, other places in the riverine landscape, or in reference to the variations of river bank, described above in “emic identities” (e.g., \textit{no beiradão, na beirada}). Often, being of a place is implied in the statement “I am a child of this place” (\textit{Eu sou filho deste lugar}).

This rhetoric is employed in both positive and negative contexts. In negative contexts, it occurs as part of heated discussions in defense of place; for example, during conversations with each other about commercial fishing operations (see Chapter 5) and about outsiders assuming a leadership role in the region.\textsuperscript{9} I also recorded instances of it being used as a positive statement of pride and authenticity. For example, it is used as a way of introduction and explanation as I met people and began to ask them about their lives, and it is summoned at the beginning of stories told about themselves, their family, and the history of the region. In general, these statements are expressions of belonging to place because of familial continuity in the region, or individual duration of residence.

\textsuperscript{7} As I discuss below, my transcriptions in which this statement occurs indicate that they used it in response to questions about migration and the future on my household questionnaire, provided in Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{8} In other words, I did not probe the ribeirinhos for this information and it often occurred outside of the context of interviews and even discussions with me.

\textsuperscript{9} For example, as middlemen or as a representative of the recently created “Resident’s Association” required of extractive reserves (see Chapter 4).
For example, César said, "We were born and raised here, on this river, in this forest. The ribeirinhos are children of this place (filhos deste lugar). We were born and raised here, and we live our lives here, and our children will live their lives here, God willing." Interestingly, many of these statements began with the word "First" ("Primeiramente"), as if the topic that followed were authenticated by a native opinion. For example, when I asked Dona Rosalinda her opinion about the creation of the reserve, she prefaced her response with, “First of all, I was born and raised here, and I get along very well in this place.” In this context, Dona Rosalinda’s legitimacy precedes and trumps the official recognition represented by the establishment of the extractive reserve.

During an interview about their hopes for the future, in which I asked, “Do you think your children will continue to live here when they grow up?”, João and María reported that their children will likely continue to live in the region because “they were born and raised here, and those who are born and raised here, inside our area [the riverine area; área ribeirinha], rarely do they adjust to life outside of here.” Again, the contrast with non-ribeirinho helps to define ribeirinho in the context of place and economic activity. The same question was answered similarly by Sérgio as follows:

Sérgio: I think that they will.

Hilary: That they will?

S: Yes. That they will.

H: And do they want to live here?

S: Yes.

H: Why? Why do you think they will want to live here?
S: Because for us here who were raised here, when we leave, it is bad (*fica ruim*). (laughter)

H: Yeah.

S: Yeah.

H: And is this normal? Living here, forever?

S: It’s because they do well in this place (literally, “give themselves to”—*se dão no lugar*)

H: Yeah.

S: Yeah. They “give themselves to the place”, and if when they get big [and they happen to leave, they will come back]. It is just like me. I was born and raised here and I left here when I was a grown man with hair on my chin, I went to Altamira and there I began to work in gold mining. I spent 11 years working in gold mining. And I left the city, left my work, with some money in my pocket and I came back here to live, where I was born.

H: Did you always think you would return?


Being “of” a place is what grants legitimacy to ribeirinho expressions of self, opinions, and experiences of place. Longevity and duration of occupation are important to their experience of place and, thus, to their sense of belonging to “this” place and distinctly not belonging to other places. As the ribeirinhos suggest, the continuity of this sense of place extends to future generations.

When the ribeirinhos leave their place, they long for it. This is often referred to as *saudade*, a Brazilian expression that conjures feelings of nostalgia and longing, or to *sentir falta* (miss). Leaving a place is thus an emotional experience that is connected not just to the physical place of the land, but to the network of places, experiences, and tasks gathered together over time that made that place. This sentiment was beautifully expressed by Claudio.
The place that is right for me is this one, here. I missed this place when I tried to live in another place. When we are accustomed to being in a place, going to another place leaves us longing, right? The ribeirinho misses the ways of the land, the ways of the place, the ways that we lived in that place. (6/16/2006)

María shared that she cannot make the choice to send her children to school in the city because, as she has seen before, they feel too much *saudade* for home and will come back. Similarly, César revisited the basic tasks that shape the ribeirinhos’ perception of place, the emotive aspects of place, and how, over time, these form the basis of an attachment to place.

Here, you go to the river, grab a fish, bring it up to the house, eat it with the family, go to the forest and if you want, you kill some game meat (*uma caça*), you go and bring it to the house, to the people, to eat it too. And you get used to life like this, you think it’s a good life, and you never leave for another place. Any place else, we don’t want to live there. (6/20/2006)

As a result of the abundance of resources in the region, accessed through these essential tasks practiced over time, the ribeirinho no longer wishes to leave the region.

A compelling explanation of feeling a love for place over time and in relation to tasks was provided by Antônio.

First (*primeiramente*), I was born and raised here. I love the *fartura* here. And because I am a child of this place (*filho deste lugar*), I am accustomed to this place. He who is not a child of this place does not have the same understanding of this place, of the forest, of the river, of the Brazil nut or rubber tree. [We do] because we were raised here, in these places, in these professions. Our parents raised us working among the rubber trees, the Brazil nut trees, but most of all, the rubber trees. We love that forest there (motions with his head and hand), because of that tree. We feel sadness even cutting into it to collect the latex, because we know it was our dad who tapped that tree that sustained us (7/6/2007)

---

10 Indeed, few ribeirinhos have finished primary school. During my fieldwork, all families said they were exploring possibilities for sending their children to the city to become educated, but follow up the subsequent year revealed that they still had not sent them. It is incredibly difficult to send a child to school when the parent does not have contacts or communication with the exterior. In one instance, a family had managed to send their daughter to first grade in the city, but she returned before completing the school year.
These excerpts from Antônio and César indicate the ways in which places, tasks, and memories are gathered. Sense of place emerges from those gathering acts. Antônio, in particular, described the emotional attachments formed to place and, implicitly, the ways in which intersubjective identities are created over time in place. Both excerpts recount the ways in which the ribeirinhos perceive and access the abundance of resources through their tasks; the ways in which memories of past activities form part of their current sense of place; and how, through these affective and symbolic associations with place, they form part of place and do not desire to leave it.

Significantly, the “love” of place that the ribeirinhos feel has developed in spite of the difficulties they have endured. Yet in spite of their losses, they continue to feel attached to place. Benedito’s story reflects this contradiction.

I like living here. It’s like this: I was born and raised here. I married here, too. I was a father to 14 children! Ten died. Then, I left this region to take my wife to get treated in Altamira. She was dying here, so we left to see what the doctors would say. We never really found out what was wrong with her. She died there; she didn’t stand a chance. I stayed there for a while longer. I didn’t know what to do. But then I realized I needed to come back here. I like it here because this is my way of life and I have a good quality of life here. I go fishing, I go hunting. This is my way of life (6/23/2006).

Benedito’s losses were a result of living in the region. Ten of his children and his wife died because of medical reasons. Without access to medical care, many people die in the Terra do Meio. Regardless, Benedito wanted to return to place and to keep practicing his “way of life”. Lucilene’s story is similarly compelling because of these inherent contradictions between attachment to place and the struggle and sense of “lacking” so much in place. “I like living here. But I don’t like that the children can become seriously ill, and there is no medicine. There is no health post, no school. But it is better here than in the city. I think it’s great here. It’s easier for us, for our children.
Everything you want, we have” (6/20/2006). Because there were no schools at the time of my fieldwork, children were denied their right to learn. In the absence of medicines or medical care, also the case during my fieldwork, people died of basic illnesses and diseases. Yet they “have everything”. Because of the salience of their tasks and their ability to practice those tasks over time, they are “part” of place; they have “given themselves” to place and have persevered, in spite of losses. In spite of their challenges and their losses, however, they love place and feel that they belong to it. These excerpts indicate a deep attachment to place and a task-based identity that transcend the brutal challenges of poverty and isolation.

**Conclusion**

Identity emerges from the dialectic of materiality between subject and object. As this case study demonstrates, identity emerges from the relationship between person and place when engaged in practices. Like the myths and rituals of indigenous societies, the experiences and temporality of tasks create a sense of place for the ribeirinhos. Ribeirinho practices are economic activities that have enabled them to dwell and develop a sense of place and self within the riverine landscape. In other words, the ribeirinhos have an intimate understanding of place and have formed attachments to place because their livelihood practices enable them to dwell, not in spite of the economic value derived from such practices.

In previous chapters, I indicated that the ribeirinhos are literally and figuratively treated as an “in between” and “placeless” people. They are characterized as a population buffeted about by external forces. They are also located in the interstitial “Land of the Middle”. The ribeirinhos may also be regarded as a temporally or historically interstitial people, caught between their experiences of the passage of time.
in generations, and time as measured in terms of the periodization imposed by the
outside, the present of which I refer to as “conservation”. However, their experience of
place precedes conservation; their sense of, and relationship to, place spans
generations and has emerged as a result of tasks that have occurred because, and in
spite, of external forces. Thus, the ribeirinhos’ understandings of who they are and of
their “place” are emic; being part “of” place grants legitimacy to their experience and a
sense of primacy to their claims on land and resources.

Longevity and duration of occupation are important to the ribeirinhos’ experience
of place and, thus, to their investment in and attachment to place. They were born and
raised in the region on the tasks that enable them and their predecessors to dwell.
Although rubber is no longer commercially viable, their nostalgia and indexes of the
past, indicated in previous chapters, make clear that sense of self and of place; indeed,
the very ways in which the landscape is inscribed coalesce around the former practice
of rubber tapping. This may change over time as new tasks are introduced or as former
tasks, like rubber, are modified, such as that which is currently occurring in the region
due to State and NGO interventions associated with the extractive reserve. Imposed
and constructed identities have been incorporated in the past and will continue to be
incorporated in the future.

The ribeirinhos of the Iriri River are primarily the surviving rubber soldiers and their
descendants who chose to remain in place. They are a product of a particular time in
history. The state made them rubber soldiers—an identity they adopted—and provided
them with training, equipment, and skills to survive in the riverine landscape. However,
like the products destined for market, their identities change over time in relation to the
tasks in which they engage. Nostalgia, memories, and acts of inscription will likely disappear as subsequent generations of ribeirinhos engage in different practices and have a different experience of place. Over time, they may call themselves extractivists. Their relationships with other places could also change over time; for example, with the city, as they have greater access to city goods and resources. Their relationship with place and an extractivist identity may become stronger as schools and medical care, both of which are currently underway in the reserve but were not during my fieldwork, become customary and are positively associated with the creation of the reserve. The ribeirinhos are a people “in the middle” in the sense of historical time, and their perception of self and of place will change as they respond to the shifting policies of the government and market forces that affect what they do and, consequently, where and who they are.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This study has examined the emergence of place and identity among a riverine (ribeirinho) peasant population perceived as out-of-place in the Amazon. Although the arrival of the ribeirinhos’ forbearers from northeastern Brazil and their own persistence in the region are inextricably linked to broader environmental, social, economic, and political incentives and processes, I have argued that over time, the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River have developed their own sense of place and identity that are grounded in and emergent through their natural resource-based, extractive activities.

In preceding chapters, I described how Amazonian peasants are generally examined through the lens of cultural and political ecology. I have built from standard approaches by introducing a phenomenological perspective into this study of peasants in the Amazon. This has enabled me to focus on ribeirinho agency and the emergence of place and identity through the livelihood practices that enable them to survive and dwell. Nonetheless, cultural and political ecology constituted my point of departure for this work and were critical to the development of this project. My perspective on Amazonian peasants had been shaped by those literatures and the interdisciplinary work of ecologists and social scientists on extractive reserves that emerged in the early-to mid-1990s. In these various scholarly literatures, Amazonian peasants, such as the ribeirinhos with whom I worked, are considered caboclos—a unique Amazonian ethnic group (Chernela and Pinho 2004; Nugent 1993; Wagley 1976) that resulted from the intermarriage of northeastern migrants with Amazonian Indians that have been described as “deculturated” (Schmink and Wood 1992:xxiv). Since the 1990s, caboclo populations living on lands designated as extractive reserves are increasingly referred
to as *extrativistas* (extractivists) to describe their economic function of meeting external demand for forest products, and for their increased visibility in political arenas; subsets of some of these populations elsewhere in the Amazon now self-identify as extrativistas.

At the beginning of my fieldwork, I was particularly interested in the ways in which extractivists become political agents within Brazilian civil society. I focused on an isolated population on the Iriri River in the Terra do Meio region because I was intrigued by what seemed to be parallels with the seminal experience of extractivist empowerment in the western Amazonian state of Acre during the 1980s. With the support of national and international allies, the rubber tappers’ movement of Acre developed, promoted, and achieved the establishment of a new category of federal protected areas, called extractive reserves, to provide for the conservation and sustainable use of land and resources by traditional, “non-indigenous” populations located within their boundaries.

In the early 2000s in the Terra do Meio region, a social movement known as the MDTX (*Movimento pelo Desenvolvimento da Transamazônica e Xingu*-Movement for the Development of the Transamazon and Xingu) was characterized in similar terms as the rubber tappers’ movement of Acre in the 1980s. The MDTX was originally a family farmer’s social movement focused on the Transamazon Highway. More recently, the movement formed alliances with the indigenous and extractivist peoples of the Terra do Meio, along with over 150 regional, national, and international environmentalists, activists, and policymakers, to stop frontier expansion by cattle ranchers and soy farmers in the still undeveloped forests surrounding the Transamazon Highway. In these forests, land-related conflicts had been escalating for decades in the absence of
government and clear designation of lands. The MDTX ultimately succeeded in advancing the creation of the Terra do Meio protected areas mosaic, a linked suite of protected areas that completed the Xingu Protected Areas Corridor (XPAC), which is the largest conservation corridor in the world. The XPAC is a forest corridor comprised of indigenous territories, extractive reserves, strict protected areas and a national forest that is home to 11,000 people, most of whom are members of 24 indigenous tribes and ribeirinho families (Schwartzman et al. 2010).

Despite heated opposition from powerful speculators and ranchers, the creation of the Terra do Meio mosaic through the leadership of this social movement provided a compelling foreground for the development of a research project on what I then articulated as attachment to place and participatory protected area management. From my prior academic and professional experiences, I had become interested in the topic of “place”—the ways in which people use, build, cherish, and protect the places they call “home”, even in the face of adversity—and the potential value of that “attachment to place” for conservation interventions. I looked forward to making a contribution to scholarly understandings of these issues and hoped that my study might usefully inform the implementation of extractive reserve policy and planning processes.

But when I went to the Iriri in 2006, the media, activist, and scholarly emphasis on the social movement and the primacy of the implementation of the reserve seemed out of synch with my informants’ reality. The “extractivists” appeared to be largely disarticulated from the political policies and land designations created upon their familiar landscape, even as those policies and designations attracted increasing regional, national, and even international attention. Most of the “extractivists” of interest to my
proposed project had never heard the term *extrativista*, and for them the *Reserva Extrativista* (Extractive Reserve) concept was either entirely unfamiliar or poorly understood. Through observations, interviews, surveys, and questionnaires that I had developed for what increasingly seemed to be the “wrong project,” I developed a more informed understanding of this population during my first field season.

Rather than identifying themselves within the context of a social movement or political process, my informants regarded themselves in relation to where they live (their “place”) how they live (their practices), and their legitimacy to place (“I was born and raised here; I am “of” this place”). With this realization, the “identity” of interest to my project shifted from the etic *extrativista* to the emic *ribeirinho*—a “riverine person”—a deceptively simple identity that is rarely explored in the scholarly literatures on caboclo and extractivist populations. Furthermore, my informants talked about themselves as participants in past eras in Brazil’s modernist history, and particularly the rubber boom, but they did so in relation to “place” in the present: the current, material landscape in which they are immersed and with which they engage on a daily basis through their practices. They took pride in showing me the defunct tools and technologies of their past practices as indexes (Gell 1998) of other times and places.

Through these experiences with the *ribeirinhos*, I recognized that while my project as it pertained to “place” and identity was viable, the place of interest was not the extractive reserve, but rather the *ribeirinhos’* experiences of place over time. I was excited by this realization but I was also somewhat baffled. The relationist, historically contingent and temporally focused aspects of the Amazonian peasantry that lay at the core of how the *ribeirinhos* described themselves were not well-represented in the
cultural and political ecology literatures in which I had been trained. These literatures were necessary, but proved insufficient to underpin an analysis of the ways in which this population had formed attachments to place and a place-based identity. Furthermore, the positivist inquiry paradigm to which these literatures belong was inadequate for a study of local experience of place. Rather, my study required a methodological relationist\(^1\) approach and its corresponding ontologies and epistemologies.

As described in Chapters 1 and 2, methodological relationism enabled me to draw from divergent theoretical perspectives bring a historically displaced or “placeless” peasantry into closer rapport with phenomenology and practice theories. Within that approach, I explored two related theses:

1. Everyday activities in the material landscape are integral to place-making and identity formation, and
2. The past, including historical practice and memory, permeates the present-day landscape.

Anthropologist Tim Ingold (2000:171) suggests that phenomenologically informed perspectives are well-developed theoretically, but are difficult to apply in research. In this project, I found that not only is it possible to operationalize and apply phenomenologically informed perspectives, but that doing so within a post-positivist ontology and epistemology creates an extremely rich project with ample opportunity for validating results. This approach enabled me to successfully bring divergent theoretical perspectives together to understand and assess different aspects of my research.

\(^{1}\) As discussed in Chapter 2, methodological relationism is a metatheoretical perspective that accounts for the complex, shifting relationships and linkages between micro- and macro-scalar phenomena (Ritzer and Gindoff 1994).
problem using a variety of techniques, ranging from ethnographic to survey techniques. This combination of techniques helped me to identify and characterize my research problem, discover the salient themes and issues relevant to the problem, and, when relevant, to answer the questions of “how much”, “how many”, and “how often” (Bernard 2002:363). For example, the most formal and derived technique I elected was a factor analysis, described in Chapter 4. Yet I also rely upon descriptive statistics, analyses of interview texts, participant observation, and emically produced maps and figures. The ethnographic data incorporated the ribeirinhos' voices into my study and, consistent with post-positivist epistemology (e.g., Guba 1990), I treated my interactions with the ribeirinhos as an integral part of the inquiry process. This perspective is salient in my personal reflections—my experiences as I experienced the ribeirinhos—that appear in most of the chapters.

**Review of Previous Chapters**

In Chapter 1, I introduced my research question and theses. I reflected that the modernist approaches used in science and policy, which are applied to “land”, “space”, and the “environment”, undermine those people perceived as “out-of-place” (Bender 2001) or “invisible” (Nugent 1993). These populations do not easily adhere to the geographic fixation inherent in State interventions to land, yet their movement does not necessarily preclude a meaningful relationship to place. I explained that I would address this oversight using a case study of Amazonian peasants with particular emphasis on the relationship people have with place, the role of history in place-making, and their sense of place and identity. I explored the visibility metaphor, identified by Nugent (1993) among caboclo societies and explored by Thomas (1993:22) as the privileged sense in Western society because it makes place “intelligible to the human eye” (see
also Foucault 1979). Departing somewhat from Nugent (1993), I explore the ways in which the ribeirinhos and their “places” are alternately “visible” and “invisible” to the State, in relation to broader economic and political forces. I concluded the chapter with a brief overview of the research design, including my intent to use Ingold’s (1993) taskscape as a model in the dissertation to fully explore the relationship between the ribeirinhos, place, and practice.

In Chapter 2, I identified the strengths and weaknesses of the existing literatures on Amazonian peasants. The cultural ecology literature tends to present place as an ecological system and culture as an adaptation. Cultural ecologists depict peasants as somewhat disconnected from the historical contingencies of their livelihoods and the places in which they live. Nonetheless, cultural ecologists were the first to identify caboclos as a unique Amazonian identity. Similarly, political ecology tends to emphasize macroscalar phenomena of market forces and policies to describe “extractivist” populations, and therefore does not adequately emplace peasants in the landscape. Yet the novelty of the extractive reserve concept was, in part, its emphasis on the traditional resource use and environmentally friendly extractivist identities. These identities furthered a provocative, innovative, and timely agenda that sought to balance the dual agendas of development and environmental conservation in the extractive reserve concept.

I also argued that a relationist approach that introduces phenomenologically informed practice theories to cultural and political ecology complements dominant explanations of Amazonian peasants as an economically motivated population that is out of place and “on-the-move” (sensu Bender 2001). Phenomenology and practice
theories emphasize the lived experience of people in place through time, and in relation to broader political, economic, and environmental processes. Furthermore, this approach helps overcome the subject/object and macro/micro dichotomies upheld in dominant scientific perspectives.

In Chapter 3, The Rubber Soldiers, I reviewed the displacement of Brazil’s nordestinos (northeasterners) from their homelands, their recruitment to the Amazon to tap rubber during WWII, and the preliminary stages of place-making in the Amazon as rubber tappers. The dominant perspective among scholars of the Amazonian rubber boom, reflected in several key works, is one that attributes nordestino migration to environmental, political, and economic forces. The nordestinos are often characterized as naïve laborers who, tempted by a more lucrative lifestyle and battered by a series of droughts, eagerly left their northeastern places of origin to make money tapping rubber in the Amazon. However, their experience of dislocation and relocation was more complex than these literatures suggest.

Specifically, in Chapter 3, I addressed three principal, cross-cutting themes to highlight the nordestinos’ journey from displacement to the beginnings of emplacement. These themes are (1) displacement and nostalgia for place; (2) practices, including the often difficult and awkward adoption of new livelihood practices in a new place; and (3) the formation of a place- and task-based identity. In doing so, I incorporated an experiential perspective into the history of the rubber boom and bust. Many of the experiences of the rubber soldiers, relayed to me by my informants and through secondary sources, are positive. The individual and collective recounting of this period
by the ribeirinhos was often at odds with negative reports in the scholarly literatures, which describe abhorrent, slave-like working conditions in a debt peonage system.

During this period, the nordestinos were trained in the activities that now form part of their embodied habitus (Bourdieu 1977), including how to maintain oneself through subsistence living in the Amazon, how to navigate a canoe on the river, and how to tap rubber. Ironically, this training was integral to early place-making because it allowed them to become proficient and subsequently master a variety of practices, and led to the development of corresponding, place- and task-based identities as rubber tappers and rubber soldiers. These skills enabled them to persist and remain in place after their abandonment by the government after the rubber “bust”.

The ribeirinhos of the Iriri River are mostly descendents of these rubber soldiers who have chosen to remain in place. It is because of their experience of this historic period in the Amazon that my informants continue to feel nostalgia for the rubber boom. Thus, Chapter 3 chronicled the foundational beginnings of the rubber tappers in the region, including the beginning of a transformative shift in sense of place and identity, from nordestino to seringueiro and, ultimately, to ribeirinho. That transformation accompanied a corresponding trajectory from visibility during the rubber boom, to “invisibility” during a period of place-making and identity formation, and subsequently to renewed visibility during the current period of “conservation.”

In Chapters 4-6, I shifted my focus from the broader theoretical and regional perspectives to the local experience of the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River. In Chapter 4, I describe the period between the rubber “bust” and the creation of the Iriri Extractive Reserve in 2006, when the ribeirinhos lived a mostly subsistence lifestyle in the forest,
occasionally seeking employment along the frontier to make ends meet, only to return, in most cases, to the Iriri. I presented the results of a variety of techniques utilized to understand “place” from different angles, including participant observation, qualitative analyses of household questionnaires, and a factor analysis. The results of these techniques indicate that the ribeirinhos have a sense of, or attachment to, place that is simultaneously affective and utilitarian. The two dimensions cannot be divided or approached separately. During the current period of “conservation”, as I describe and approach it in the chapter, my informants developed an emic identity as ribeirinhos that is explored in Chapter 6.

In Chapter 5, I operationalized Ingold’s (1993) concept of taskscape to illustrate the ways in which ribeirinho practices are not merely subsistence or economic activities, but are tasks that have enabled them to dwell and form a sense of place and identity over time in the riverine landscape. Similar to the myths and rituals inscribed in the physical landscape of indigenous Amazonia, the people, places, and tasks from previous generations inscribe the ribeirinho landscape. These become manifest in the context of mundane extractive activities. Thus, the taskscape is not easily separable by any essentialized task, place, or “type” of people. Rather, it emerges from the multiplicity of places, times, and tasks that are also in process, and that are gathered in the context of the ribeirinhos’ activities.

Interestingly, even as the ribeirinhos name the places described in Chapter 5, other places emerge within named places that are not visible to outsiders, including footpaths and cut trails that facilitate movement through the forest, and infrastructural investments, such as a pier or a casa de farinha, that bridge places and in which
multiple tasks occur.\textsuperscript{2} Thus, because of the recurrent operations that unfold in the context of a day or even a season, each place is woven into the fabric of the next place in the always emergent taskscape.

In Chapter 6, I show how the ribeirinhos have developed an intimate understanding of place and have formed attachments to place because their livelihood practices enable them to dwell, not in spite of the economic value derived from such practices. They hope and predict that their children will remain in the region because they, too, love it and are part “of” it. The material and symbolic aspects of their tasks are conjoined. This approach highlights the significance of mundane activities in the creation of places and identities, and the ways in which other times, places, and tasks form part of places in the present.

**Principal Findings**

The ribeirinhos who live along the Iriri River define themselves by where they are (on the riverbanks) and by their practices (“tasks”). The tasks of interest to this study are extractive activities practiced over time: fishing, collecting Brazil nuts, and, formerly, rubber tapping. These tasks have enabled them to dwell in the riverine landscape for several generations and are integral to their sense of place and identity. Ribeirinho perspectives on place and identity that I encountered are relationist, and the distinctions between material and symbolic so prevalent in the scholarly literatures seem erroneous in light of the ribeirinhos’ understanding of who they are and what they do in the places in which they dwell. I highlight four principal findings from this study that can further

\textsuperscript{2} These are the “buildings” to which the phenomenological philosopher Heidegger (1977) referred. According to Heidegger (1977:322), building only occurs if one is dwelling. “Buildings” may range from visible, deliberate, infrastructural investments, such as a house, to subtle places undetectable to outsiders that emerge from dwelling, such as trails and even livestock (e.g., Gray 2003).
First, the ribeirinhos have a strong sense of, or “attachment to”, place. Under the theoretical terms of cultural ecology or even political ecology, place appears, if at all, as peripheral to the determinants of change. Hardships due to privation, distance from services, and the difficulties and dangers of making a subsistence lifestyle do not impede or prevent the ribeirinho’s attachment to place or an optimistic outlook on life. Despite the dominant narrative of displacement in which this population has been categorized, they have retained their own agency. While their history as nordestinos was uprooted, they have chosen to remain who, and where, they are now.

Second, place is understood by the ribeirinhos in relation to their tasks. As Ingold (1993, 2000) and Reynolds (1993) assert, there is no separation between technical and social activities. While these two spectrums of human experience cannot and should not be separated, dominant ontologies and epistemologies that drive most research agendas achieve precisely that dichotomy. The ribeirinhos’ tasks are not merely subsistence or market activities that are driven by external forces; they are the ways in which the ribeirinhos dwell. Their practices involve an intimate engagement with the material world through inscribing, movement, and materiality. Through their everyday practices, the ribeirinhos have “built” place; thus, as a result of their practices, the ribeirinhos and place are co-constituted and mutually implicated. Through the experience of engaging in tasks over time, feelings of belonging, identity, and a general “sense of place” emerge.
Third, the forces and contingencies of time and history are experienced by the ribeirinhos in unanticipated and unappreciated ways. “Place” emerges in relation to current, “foregrounded” tasks and imagined, potential, or past, “backgrounded” activities (sensu Hirsch 1995). Furthermore, although decades have passed since the rubber boom, the ribeirinhos’ sense of self and of place continues to coalesce around their experiences of the former task of rubber tapping. Rubber tapping is the most prominent, “backgrounded” reference present in the foreground of many ribeirinho activities and places. The referential ways in which the past is evoked in the present—through their practices and affective experiences of place—are not easily explained in light of standard accounts of the rubber boom. Temporality, a constant feature of dwelling in which multiple moments in chronological time or history may be experienced in the present (Ingold 2000:194), is an important though often undetected dimension of the riverine landscape. Ribeirinho identity and sense of place have emerged from their tasks over time, and, most significantly, in relation to the wartime rubber boom, which they recall with nostalgia and pride. Thus, even as they no longer consider themselves rubber tappers because the task is not economically viable, their current relationship with place hinges upon this formative, backgrounded activity. This history is inscribed in their landscape, anchoring their place-based identity as ribeirinhos. While the analogy is imperfect, for the ribeirinhos this inscribed history, and the narratives it contains, underpins an attachment to place that, for indigenous peoples, derives from kinship, religion, and mythology.

Fourth, like place, ribeirinho identity is emergent. Emic identities may encompass the heuristic, taxonomic labels of outsiders yet remain distinct, complex, and both
rooted in and emergent through place and task over time. Imposed and constructed identities may be incorporated as new tasks are introduced or as former tasks, like rubber tapping, are modified. In this region, the emic, place-based ribeirinho identity developed during a transformative period of isolation following the wartime rubber boom. As the region returns to visibility during the current “conservation” period, a new etic identity of “extractivist” may take root, just as the task-based “rubber soldier” identity transformed the place-based “nordestinos”. This may already be occurring in the region due to State and NGO interventions associated with the creation of the extractive reserve and other protected areas in the Terra do Meio mosaic, particularly as government services begin to reach the ribeirinhos as a result of these strategic alliances between peasants, environmentalists, and the State.

**Implications of the Study**

In this study, I operationalized Ingold’s (1993) concept of the taskscape, developing it as a model to more accurately understand the dynamic relationship between people and place within an Amazonian peasant population. The taskscape “grounds” the phenomenological concepts of experience and temporality in the material world and the quotidian tasks that support the household. This approach helps to identify the recursive and referential relationship people have with “place”, the multi-scalar phenomena that form a part of that relationship, and the creation of a place-based identity and attachment to place that emerge from it.

Furthermore, this study has implications for interdisciplinary analyses of land use and land cover change (e.g., Wood and Porro 2002). The use of the taskscape as a model could help identify a cultural dimension of land use and land use change that is pertinent to the experience and understanding of a variety of populations, but that is
largely absent from the cultural and political ecology paradigms. The complementarity of phenomenology and practice-based approaches to conventional, materialist approaches warrants much wider exploration.

Beyond the etic identities that have been the bases of policy interventions in Brazil over time, there are more specific identities, discernible through or articulated with place, that need to be understood in their own terms and through a different theoretical lens than the standard literatures of cultural or political ecology allow. Ribeirinho is an emic identity that is place-based and task-based; it captures the mutual constitution of people and place in relation to the various activities that enable them to dwell. The ribeirinho experience documented in this project defies the expectation that caboclos are an essentialist category and a cultural “type” that is the same in space and time, or an inherently out-of-place population buffeted by external forces.

The ribeirinhos have "inscribed" the landscape in meaningful and efficient ways; they express topophilia (a love of place), and they articulate that they belong to place. These aspects of ribeirinho society may easily pass undetected to an outsider conducting a survey, taking a GPS point, or making an important political decision from an office in another state entirely. In the absence of this understanding it is no wonder that policy and much of the scholarship of Amazonian peasants emphasize placelessness, mobility, and the near-invisibility of a built landscape.

There are important considerations for policy making that may be derived from this study. While the Brazilian State has created the “proper places” (de Certeau 1984:121) of extractive reserves, this land designation does not reflect the ways in which the ribeirinhos have been creating place through their practices over time. The swift
implementation of protected areas by the government exemplified the contrast between the ways place is regarded and treated by the State, on the one hand, and by those who dwell in the landscape, on the other. Furthermore, the creation of these formal, “proper places” (sensu de Certeau 1984) by the State should minimally include the provision of government services within a reasonable period of time (e.g., no more than a year). Although the reserve has been created, the “invisibility” in which the ribeirinhos lived for decades continues to plague the region. Among the numerous implications of this study, I highlight three of particular interest.

First, the drawing of boundaries around “protected areas” requires great care due to the profound impact those boundaries may have on existing populations. There should therefore be an opportunity for recourse to correct boundary errors. The immediate enforcement of restrictions related to access, use, and occupation of the Iriri Extractive Reserve created “negative spaces” (sensu Munn 1996) that conflicted with the ribeirinhos’ traditional use and occupation of the lands and resources they consider home. Although the creation of the reserve increased their visibility to the State, several families were suddenly considered illegal squatters. One possibility for resolving this problem would be to allow for an adjustment of the boundary between the Iriri Extractive Reserve and the Terra do Meio Ecological Station. This correction would avoid the forced relocation of over a dozen families who were missed by the initial survey utilized to draw these borders. The occupation of the various Terras Indígenas (Indigenous Lands-TIs) may prove more challenging, but could possibly be addressed formally and directly with indigenous and ribeirinho people rather than through an anticipated enforcement of boundaries by relevant State agencies. As described in Chapter 4, my
informants were clear that they had been invited to live on the TIs by the indigenous people, that the arrangement was mutually agreeable, and that neither the indigenous people nor the ribeirinhos initiated relocation. Following the creation of the reserve, representatives from NGOs and the Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade (Chico Mendes Institute for the Conservation of Biodiversity–ICMBio), the institute within Brazil’s Ministry of the Environment that oversees federal extractive reserves, informed the ribeirinhos that, “sooner or later”, they would be forcibly relocated by FUNAI, without warning, and so they ought to participate in a thoughtful plan for relocation now in the context of the activities related to the reserve. However, since the indigenous people have clearly defined tenure and usufruct rights within their territories, a formal agreement for these ribeirinho households to remain during the lifetime of the heads of household merits serious consideration.

Second, the medical and educational needs of the ribeirinhos should be prioritized above all other activities implemented by NGOs and the State in the Terra do Meio mosaic. Death from preventable, treatable, and common diseases and illnesses is fairly normal in this region. Also, during the time of my fieldwork, the ribeirinhos were illiterate. Since completing my fieldwork, several NGOs have pushed hard on the municipal government to get health care and schools into the region. This has been an uphill battle with the municipal government, which claims to be resource poor and have jurisdiction over too large an area to properly serve the distant and remote Terra do Meio region. However, any policy initiative that expects to be met with local enthusiasm and participation should prioritize crucial, century-long oversights of the State. The lack of initiative by the State meant the social movement and the ribeirinhos became
responsible for part of the responsibility of education. With help from the NGOs, the ribeirinhos committed to building their own schools from local materials and the NGOs agreed to provide financial and logistical support for the schools. They brought their proposal to the municipal Secretary of Education, who agreed, with reluctance, to provide teachers and materials. The results have been mixed; nonetheless, as a result of these efforts, it is reported that beginning in May 2010, 93 students were receiving some primary education in four schools distributed throughout the Iriri Extractive Reserve (Marcelo Salazar, pers. comm. 11/15/2010).

By contrast, permanent health posts have not arrived. Leading NGOs from the social movement are working with the municipal government to provide permanent health posts. As a start, they signed an agreement with the municipal Secretary of Health to dispatch three medical expeditions per year and to evacuate critical cases by air on an as-needed basis. Thus, incremental steps have been made, which are positive indicators that the reserve concept will bring benefits for the ribeirinhos that will improve their quality of life. Nonetheless, these efforts must remain a priority and the current funding and logistical support provided by NGOs in the United States and national and regional NGOs will likely have some limit. At some point in the near future, the State will have to assume more responsibility for the services they are required to provide.

Third, within anthropology, sociology, and interdisciplinary studies, scholars interested in caboclo societies should be open to incorporating a broader theoretical

---

3 For example, many teachers quit within a few weeks of their contract because of the extreme isolation of the region. Also, many school supplies and blackboards did not arrive, the teachers were not properly trained, and the instruction was not tailored to the realities of traditional Amazonian peoples in the forest. The movement is actively working to address these issues (Marcelo Salazar, pers. comm., 11/15/2010).

4 With the creation of the reserve, a few State-commissioned medical teams circulated on boats on a few occasions.
perspective than that which is conventionally available in the cultural and political ecology literatures. Several concepts from phenomenology and practice theories were relevant and applicable to this study, and helped to address shortcomings of the reductionist approaches provided in Amazon-relevant literatures. Furthermore, the model developed from Ingold’s taskscape could be made more broadly relevant by applying it to other studies of people and place. It is particularly applicable to, and potentially useful for, other populations like the ribeirinhos of the Iriri River, who are perceived as “out-of-place”, “invisible”, “unproductive” or “anachronistic” vis-à-vis broader society. While peasant populations—so-called “part societies with part cultures” (Kroeber 1948:284)—are obvious subjects for future studies of place, others who appear to have a “thinness of experience” (Bender 2001:76), such as diasporic and migrant populations, merit more attention in the scholarship of place.
Questionário familiar n° ______________________
Data: ______________________
Coordenadas Geográficas (UTM) X: ______________________ Y: ______________________
Nome da seringal: ______________________ Município: ______________________ Estado do ______________________

1 - INFORMAÇÃO GERAL
Nome do entrevistado: ______________________ Apelido ______________________

Identificação dos membros da Unidade Familiar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Parentesco</th>
<th>Local de nascimento</th>
<th>Sexo</th>
<th>Idade (anos)</th>
<th>Ocupação***</th>
<th>Escolaridade</th>
<th>Estuda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( ) Sim ( ) Não</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensino****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – Esposa, 2 – Esposo; 3 – Filho/a; 3 – Neto; 4 – Avô; 5 – Outros.
** 1 – outro estado (indicar qual); 2 – nasceu e cresceu no seringal na resex ou outros; 3 – nasceu na cidade; 4 – nasceu na colônia; 5 - outros
*** 1 – Produtor; 2 – Meeiro; 3 – Arrendatário; 4 – Aposentado; 5 – Professor; 6 – Agente de Saúde; 7 – Outros
**** 1 – Ensino fundamental completo; 2 – Ensino fundamental incompleto; 3 – Ensino médio completo; 4 – Ensino médio incompleto; 5 – Ensino Superior completo 6 – Ensino superior incompleto
### (1) Residência de familiares

Não residentes na colocação (familiares que deixaram a colocação)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Sexo</th>
<th>Parentesco*</th>
<th>Idade</th>
<th>#Onde mora?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – Esposa, 2 – Esposo; 3 – Filho/a; 4 – Neto/a; 5 – Avó; 6 – Outros.

# 1 – Cidade mais próxima; 2 – Capital; 3 – outro seringal; 4 – mesmo seringal; 5 – colônia perto da reserva; 6 - outros

Por quê motivos se mudou ?

- [ ] ficar perto de parentes
- [ ] casamento
- [ ] briga de vizinho
- [ ] pouca castanha e borracha
- [ ] acesso/distância para cidade
- [ ] não tinha escola/posto saúde
- [ ] pouca caça
- [ ] pouca pesca
- [ ] outros __________________________________________________________

Residentes não permanentes na colocação
(trabalhadores temporários/membros da famílias passando tempo etc...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Sexo</th>
<th>Parentesco*</th>
<th>Idade</th>
<th>Para que?**</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – Esposa, 2 – Esposo; 3 – Filho/a; 4 – Neto/a; 6 – Outros.

** 1 - para coletar castanha; 2 - cortar borracha; 3 - trabalhar na derrubada de roçado; 4 - para colheita de roçado; 5 – limpar pasto; 6 – outros
2 – MIGRAÇÃO E PERCEPÇÕES DO LUGAR

(1) Chefe da família

Por quanto tempo você já morou nesta colocação?

- [ ] menos de um ano
- [ ] 1 a 2 anos
- [ ] 3 a 5 anos
- [ ] 6 a 10 anos
- [ ] 11 a 15 anos
- [ ] 15 a 20 anos
- [ ] mais de 20 anos
- [ ] sempre morei aqui

Onde morava antes de vir para esta colocação?

- [ ] outra colocação no mesmo seringal
- [ ] outro seringal dentro da reserva
- [ ] colônia próximo da reserva
- [ ] na cidade
- [ ] outro estado
- [ ] sempre viveu neste seringal
- [ ] outros: ____________________________________

Por quê motivos saiu do lugar anterior?

- [ ] ficar perto de parentes
- [ ] casamento
- [ ] briga de vizinho
- [ ] acesso/ distância para cidade
- [ ] não tinha escola
- [ ] não tinha posto saúde
- [ ] pouca castanha
- [ ] pouca borracha
- [ ] pouca caça
- [ ] pouca pesca
- [ ] outros ____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Por que motivos veio para aqui?

☐ ficar perto de parentes
☐ casamento
☐ trabalho

Em que? ____________________________
☐ acesso/ distância para cidade
☐ ter acesso a mais recursos

Quais? (caça, pesca, castanha, borracha, madeira, óleos, etc) ______________________

☐ Outros _________________________

Você é o primeiro ocupante desta colocação?  ☐ Sim    ☐ Não

Você sabe quando esta colocação foi aberta?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não Quando? __________________________

Esta colocação é parte da divisão de outra colocação mais velha?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não

Esta colocação já foi dividida alguma vez?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não Quantas vezes? __________________

Caso resposta positiva, quando? (anos/anos em caso de mais de uma vez)________________

Quais os motivos para divisão?

☐ Casamento do filho (a)
☐ Arrendamento
☐ Para ter mais área para desmatar
☐ Para filho ser cadastrado na associação como morador
☐ Outros __________________________

Tem parente morando na comunidade?  ☐ Sim    ☐ Não

Grau de parentesco

______________________________

O Sr. tem casa na cidade?  ☐ Sim    ☐ Não Faz quanto tempo? __________________________

(2) Familiares não residentes na colocação (familiares que deixaram a colocação)

O Sr. tem familiares não permanentes na colocação (trabalhadores temporários/membros da famílias passando tempo etc...)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Sexo M/F</th>
<th>Parentesco*</th>
<th>Idade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – Esposa, 2 – Esposo; 3 – Filho/a; 4 – Neto/a; 4 – Avô, 5 – diarista, 6 - Outros

Por que motivos saem da colocação?

☐ coletar castanha
☐ cortar borracha
☐ trabalhar na derrubada de roçado
☐ colheita de roçado
☐ limpar pasto
ano escolar
trabalhar nos assuntos da resex
passar tempo com família
outros

O Sr. tem familiares que saíram da reserva?  □ Sim  □ Não

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nome</th>
<th>Sexo M/F</th>
<th>Parentesco*</th>
<th>Idade</th>
<th>Quando?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* 1 – Esposa, 2 – Esposo; 3 – Filho/a; 4 – Neto/a; 4 – Avô; 5 – diarista, 6 - Outros.

Por quais motivos saíram?

□ ficar perto de parentes
□ casamento
□ briga de vizinho
□ acesso/distância para cidade
□ não tinha escola
□ não tinha posto saúde
□ pouca castanha
□ pouca borracha
□ pouca caça
□ pouca pesca
□ outros

Problemas e Conflitos

Qual o maior problema na Reserva?

Quais são os três maiores problemas ambientais no seringal?
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

Quais são os três maiores fontes de conflitos e brigas no seringal? (Pode ser com pessoas de fora também.)
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________

Quais são os três maiores problemas/necessidades no (nome local)?
1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
Qual são os três maiores problemas/necessidades no IBAMA/CNPT?
1. ______________________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________________

No último ano, alguém invadiu sua colocação?  [ ] Sim  [ ] Não  [ ] Não sabe

Por quê foi invadida?
☐ terra
☐ caça
☐ retirada de madeira
☐ pesca
☐ retirada de outros produtos extrativistas (plantas, sementes, castanha, borracha)

Quem foi o invasor?
☐ morador
☐ moradores da áreas de entorno (fora) da Reserva
☐ pessoas da cidade
☐ não sabe

Onde? Explica a história:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

No último ano, alguém invadiu este seringal?  [ ] Sim  [ ] Não  [ ] Não sabe

Por quê foi invadida?
☐ terra
☐ caça
☐ retirada de madeira
☐ pesca
☐ retirada de outros produtos extrativistas (plantas, sementes, castanha, borracha)

Quem foi o invasor?
☐ morador
☐ moradores da áreas de entorno (fora) da Reserva
☐ pessoas da cidade

Explica a história:
____________________________________________________________________________

Nos últimos 5 anos teve problemas/conflitos no seringal com:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sim</th>
<th>Não</th>
<th>Sim</th>
<th>Não</th>
<th>Sim</th>
<th>Não</th>
<th>Sim</th>
<th>Não</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflito de terra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda de colocação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesca clandestina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caça clandestina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda de madeira clandestina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBAMA/CNPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefeitura
Associação (local)
Cooperativa
Vizinhos/comunidade
Outro seringal
Vizinhos (fora da res.)
Outro:____________________
**Benefícios e Esperanças**

Quais são três coisas que mais gosta de morar aqui?
1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________

Quais são os três maiores benefícios ambientais deste lugar?
1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________

Você está satisfeito de morar numa Reserva?
☐ sim, muito
☐ sim, em geral
☐ não, em geral tem problemas
☐ não, muito desastreäßigio
☐ não sabe
Por quê?
Explica. ____________________________________________________________

---

**Identidade**

O Sr se considera um seringueiro? ☐ Sim    ☐ Não

Um extrativista? ☐ Sim    ☐ Não

Explorar a percepção do entrevistado nesta pergunta:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

---

**O Futuro**

Sua família pretende continuar morando neste lugar? ☐ Sim    ☐ Não

Por quê?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
O Sr. acha que seus filhos vão continuar morando aqui?  □ Sim  □ Não
Por quê?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Quais são suas esperanças para o futuro da Reserva?
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Quais são suas esperanças para o futuro de seus filhos? ______________________________ 
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________


3- PROPRIEDADE DA TERRA

Como o Sr/a adquiriu esta colocaçao? Quando?
- comprou
- trocou
- herdou
- posse
- foi assentado
- concessao de uso
- divisao da colocacao
- outros

Especificar______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

Tipo de documento:
- LO – Licenca de Ocupacao
- RC – Recibo de Compra e Venda
- Direito de Posse
- Direitos Tradicionais Adquiridos
- Contratos de Arrendamento
- SD – Sem Documento
- Titulo de concessao de uso
- Outros tipos de documento

Especificar:__________________________________________________________

Tem problemas com a documentacao da propriedade?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não

Especificar______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

4- INFRAESTRUTURA INTERNA

Quais sao as principais formas de comunicaçao?
- radio amador (radio fonia)
- radio
- recados  Com quem? (vizinho, familiar, etc) ______________________
- marretheiro
- televisao
- telefone
- radio amador (radio fonia)

Tem radio funcionando?  ☐ sim  ☐ náo

Qual(is) programa(s) de radio  e de que emissora ouve?

________________________________________
### Casa e outras estruturas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estrutura</th>
<th>Quando construiu?</th>
<th>Piso*</th>
<th>Paredes**</th>
<th>Cobertura***</th>
<th>Tamanho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiol/ tulha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa de farinha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defumador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiqueiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viveiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Açude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galinheiro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – Paxiuba; 2 – Madeira; 3 – Cerâmica; 4 – Chão batido; 5 – Outros.
** 1 – Paxiuba; 2 – Madeira; 3 – Alvenaria; 4 – barro; 5 – Outros.
*** 1 – Palha; 2 – Cavaco; 3 – Brasilit; 4 – Alumínio; 5 – Outros

### Utensílios domésticos na casas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itens</th>
<th>Unidades</th>
<th>Funciona? S/N</th>
<th>Itens</th>
<th>Unidades</th>
<th>Funciona? S/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radio simples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panela de Pressão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Amador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Espingarda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relógio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guarda roupa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placa Solar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bateria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sofá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filtro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Televisão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antena Parabólica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fogão a lenha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fogão a gás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botija de gás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampião a gás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geladeira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meio de transporte próprio

- [ ] barco
- [ ] canoa
- [ ] animal
- [ ] outros

### Equipamentos

- [ ] motoserra
- [ ] motor de barco
- [ ] roçadeira
- [ ] gerador
- [ ] Outros

### Saneamento

De onde utiliza água?
- [ ] do rio/ igarapé
- [ ] da cacimba
- [ ] de poço
- [ ] outros

---
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Distância da água da casa ___________________
Tratamento de água
☐ não trata  ☐ cóa  ☐ filtro  ☐ hipoclorito  ☐ outros __________________________

Falta água no período seco?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não
Existe Banheiro /Privada?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não
Tem caixa de água instalada?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não

5 - ORGANIZAÇÃO COMUNITÁRIA

Você participa em alguma organização?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não
Quais são os nomes das organizações comunitárias?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comunitária</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nome):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindicato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Você esta satisfeito com essa organização?
☐ Sim, muito
☐ Sim, em geral
☐ Não, em geral tem problemas
☐ Não, muito desapontado
Explicação_____________________________________________________

CNS
Você conhece o CNS?  ☐ Sim  ☐ Não
Quais são os benefícios do CNS? ___________________________________

Os problemas do CNS?: ___________________________________________
Alguém desta colocação participou em:

a) Empates  □  Último: ______________________  Com Quem? ______________________

b) Mutirões □  Último: ______________________  Com Quem? ______________________

c) Adjuntos □  Último: ______________________  Com Quem? ______________________

Alguém é filiado em algum partido político? □ Sim  □ Não

6 - MOBILIDADE

Frequência que vai a cidade, por mês?
□ 1 a 2
□ 3 a 4
□ 5 a 6
□ 7 a 8
□ 9 a 10
□ mais de 10

A última vez que foi, como foi?
□ bote
□ canoa
□ a pé
□ ônibus
□ animal
□ lotação
□ Outros

Quando foi a última vez que foi? _________________________________________________

Motivo__________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

7 - RELIGIÃO

Tipo de religião
□ Evangélico  □ Católico  □ Não participa  □ Espírito □ Daime  □ Outras__________________
8 – ALIMENTAÇÃO E MERCADO

No mês passado, quantas vezes você comprou coisas de primeira necessidade?
☐ 1 a 2 ☐ 3 a 4 ☐ 5 a 6 ☐ 7 a 8 ☐ 9 a 10 ☐ mais de 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itens</th>
<th>Compra</th>
<th>Troca</th>
<th>Preço / unidade</th>
<th>Quantidade</th>
<th>Valor total gasto por mês</th>
<th>Onde compra*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Açúcar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óleo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macarrão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farinha de mandioca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabão em pó</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabão em barra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – na comunidade; 2 - na cidade; 3 – marreteiro; 4 – Vizinho; 5 – Outros

Na última semana, quantos dias comeu caça? ☐ nunca ☐ 1 a 5 ☐ 6 a 10 ☐ 10 a 20
☐ todos os dias
Peixe? ☐ nunca ☐ 1 a 5 ☐ 6 a 10 ☐ 10 a 20 ☐ todos os dias
Carne do boi? ☐ nunca ☐ 1 a 5 ☐ 6 a 10 ☐ 10 a 20 ☐ todos os dias
Outros animais (galinha, carne de porco, pato) ☐ nunca ☐ 1 a 5 ☐ 6 a 10 ☐ 10 a 20
☐ todos os dias

9 – FINANÇAS

1 - Credito
Já teve acesso a Crédito Rural? ☐ Sim ☐ Não
Caso sim, qual linha de crédito? Especificar:

Qual a situação atual da linha de crédito?
( ) Crédito quitado
( ) Crédito em vigência / Carência em vigência
( ) Crédito em vigência / Parcelas em adimplência
( ) Crédito em vigência / Parcelas em inadimplência
Qual a situação atual dos itens financiados?
(  ) Implantadas/intalados/adquiridos
(  ) Implantadas mas abandonadas.
Porque? ________________________________________________________________
(  ) Não implantadas/adquiridos?
Porque? ________________________________________________________________
(  ) Danificadas.
Como: (  ) Fogo acidental ataque de pragas, (  ) Invasão de animais, (  ) outros __________

2 - Renda
Quais são as fontes principais de sua renda?
[ ] atividades extrativistas
[ ] Madeira
[ ] Agricultura
[ ] Agropecuário
[ ] Caça / Peixe
[ ] Serviços
[ ] Artesanato
[ ] Outro ______________________

Que mais você faz para ganhar dinheiro?
____________________________________________________

Você recebe dinheiro de aposentaria? [ ] Sim [ ] Não

10 – USO DA TERRA
Como era a propriedade quanto chegou?
[ ] floresta_____ ha
[ ] capoeira____ ha
[ ] pasto ____ ha
[ ] área cultivada _____ ha
[ ] outros ______________

Quantas castanheiras existem na propriedade? ________________
Número total de estradas de seringa na colocação________________

O Sr. corta borracha? [ ] Sim [ ] Não
Caso não, quando foi o último ano que o Sr. cortou borracha? ________________
Caso sim, quantas estradas o Sr. cortou ano passado (2005)______________

Qual a idade de sua área de pastagem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idade</th>
<th>hectares</th>
<th>Cobertura anterior*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 anos ou +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a 5 anos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 a 1 anos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 – mata, 2 – capoeira, 3 – área agrícola (roçado), 4 – outros___________
Distribuição de uso da terra hoje/Área de roçado/lavoura branca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipos</th>
<th>Tarefas (ou)</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaxeira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area de culturas perene:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupunha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretende derrubar este ano? □ Sim □ Não.

Tamanho da área (ha):________ □ Floresta □ Capoeira alta □ Capoeira baixa
□ Pasto degradado □ Outros __________________________________________________

O que costuma fazer quando a área não produz mais? □ Semeia puerari a para recuperacao □ Deixa na capoeira □ Pasto □ Outros
________________________________________________________

De quanto em quanto tempo costuma roçar o pasto?
□ uma vez por ano □ a cada dois anos □ outros
________________________________________________________

Tipo de mão-de-obra utilizada para roço dos pastos:
□ familiar □ empreita □ diarista □ empregado permanente □ outro:_______

Quantas diárias de serviço foram utilizadas na ultima roçagem? ____________

Quantas diárias de serviço foram pagas? ______________

Qual foi o valor total gasto com roço de pasto no ultimo ano? R$ ____________

Tem rio ou igarapé na propriedade? □Sim □Não. Quantos? ________________

Para produzir, utiliza fogo na area? □ Sim □ Não

Faz aceiro para queimar? □Sim □Não Que outra prática usam? ______________________

Comunica ao vizinho? □Sim □Não

Convida os vizinhos para ajudar? □Sim □Não

Retira autorização junto aos órgão competentes? ____________. Quais órgãos?__________

Como a família trabalha na manutenção das culturas?
( ) adubação orgânica Quanto?_______ Valor gasto___________
( ) adubação química
( ) usa sementes selecionada
( ) Existe assistência técnica □ Sim □Não. Como é:______________________________
Como faz a limpa das culturas?
( ) capina manual
( ) capina mecânica (roçadeira)
( ) capina e controle de pragas e doenças (química)

Quais os principais impactos ambientais notados na colocação (desmate na margem do igarapé, etc)?

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

11 - PRODUÇÃO ATUAL (extrativismo, agricultura, e animal)

No mês passado, você caçou?  □ Sim  □ Não

Quantas vezes
□ 1 a 2  □ 3 a 5  □ 6 a 10  □ Mais de 10 vezes

Que fez com a carne?
□ Vendeu  Onde? ____________________________________________________________
□ Consumiu
□ Trocou. Para que trocou? _____________________________________________

No mês passado, você pescou?  □ Sim  □ Não

Quantas vezes?
□ 1 a 2  □ 3 a 5  □ 6 a 10  □ Mais de 10 vezes

Que fez com o peixe?
□ Vendeu  Onde? __________________________________________________________
□ Consumiu
□ Trocou. Para que trocou? ____________________________________________

Você pesca com congelador?  □ Sim  □ Não

A – Dados gerais da Produção extrativista (não madeireira)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produtos</th>
<th>Produção (qde)</th>
<th>Consumo (qde)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda (R$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castanha (latas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borracha (kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel de abelha (litros)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copaíba (litros)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andiroba (litros)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B – Dados gerais da produção extrativista (madeireira)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tipo (nome)</th>
<th>Total produção (# arvores / m³)</th>
<th>Consumo (qde.)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda (tora, m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C – Dados gerais da produção agrícola/lavoura branca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produtos</th>
<th>Produção</th>
<th>Consumo (qde.)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda (R$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroz Kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milho Kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijão Kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandioca Kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D – Dados gerais da produção agrícola/culturas perenes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produtos</th>
<th>Total produção</th>
<th>Consumo (qde.)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda (R$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupunha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E – Dados gerais da produção agropecuário

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animais</th>
<th>Total produção</th>
<th>Consumo (qde.)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda/animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galinha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovelha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabrito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cavalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F – Dados gerais da caça e pesca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animais (nome)</th>
<th>Total produção</th>
<th>Consumo (qde.)</th>
<th>Venda (qde.)</th>
<th>Preço de venda/animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12- TRANSPORTE E COMERCIALIZAÇÃO

**“A última vez que o Sr. vendeu, para quem e por quanto você vende a produção?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produtos</th>
<th>Preço</th>
<th>Núcleo da Assoc.</th>
<th>Cooperativa</th>
<th>Comércio na cidade</th>
<th>Marreiro</th>
<th>Trocou? (S/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrativista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borracha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castanha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrícola:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feijão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandioca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pequenos animais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrito/ovelha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caça / pesca;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serviços:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesanato:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Como é feito o transporte da produção?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trechos</th>
<th>Tipo de acesso</th>
<th>Meio de transporte</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Custo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produtos</td>
<td>rio</td>
<td>varadouro</td>
<td>ramal</td>
<td>rodagem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exemplo quanto ao trecho: se vem de casa até a BR na carroça, da BR até a cidade de ônibus, ou vem direto de barco até a cidade e assim por diante.

De quem é o transporte?
- [ ] Próprio
- [ ] Núcleo da Associação
- [ ] Cooperativa
- [ ] Prefeitura
- [ ] Fretado
- [ ] Comunidade
- [ ] Outros

Explica: __________________________________________________________

**Como é feita a comercialização?**
- [ ] Individualmente
- [ ] Comunitária

Explicar: _____________________________
13 – NORMAS DE UTILIZAÇÃO DA TERRA

Você conhece o Plano de Utilização (PU) de regras para a reserva? □Sim □Não
Você acha que o PU é importante? □Sim □Não Por quê?__________________________

Quem criou o PU? (marque todas)
☐ IBAMA/CNPT
☐ (nome local)
☐ As associações dentro dos seringais
☐ os moradores
☐ Outro:__________________________

O Sr. participou das discussões de elaboração do PU? □ Sim □ Não

Monitoramento
Quem é mais responsável pelo monitoramento na reserva? (marque apenas um)
☐ IBAMA/CNPT
☐ As associações dentro da RESEX Nome:_____________________________________
☐ Os moradores
☐ A polícia
☐ Outro:______________________________
Por quê?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

No último ano, veio alguma pessoa do IBAMA/CNPT para fiscalizar a sua colocação?
☐ Sim □ Não
O seu seringal? □ Sim □ Não

No último ano, o Sr. teve uma penalidade por uma infração do PU? □Sim □Não
Explica (Regra violada, penalidade)
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

No último ano, já conhece uma pessoa quem recebou uma penalidade por uma infração do PU? □ S □ N
Explica (Regra violada, penalidade)
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Qual regra é mais desrespeitada no seu seringal?____________________________________
Por quê?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

O Plano de Utilização mudou a forma de viver no seringal? □ Sim □ Não
Mudou para melhor ou pior? □ Melhor □ Pior
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regras</th>
<th>Voce conhece? (S/N)</th>
<th>Voce concorda?*</th>
<th>Voce acha que essa regra em geral está sendo monitorada? (S/N)</th>
<th>No ultimo ano, voce conhece um exemplo quando algum morador não seguiu essa regra? (S/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pode desmatar até 10% da colocação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pode ter até 5% em área de pasto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pode derrubar só 1 ha de mata e 1 ha de capoeira por ano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tem que pedir liçença para derrubar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tem que proteger os rios, lagos, e igarapês</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tem que proteger as praias e as beiras de varadouro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode derrubar seringueira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode derrubar castanheira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode vender madeira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode levar madeira para a cidade (vender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode caçar com cachorro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode levar caça para a cidade (vender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode pescar como venenos, ou redes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode levar pesca para a cidade (vender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Não pode vender a terra, só na direita de uso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novo morador só pode entrar com autorização da comunidade e da associação</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outra regra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outra regra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Você acha que as moradores precisam novas regras (a novo PU)?

☐ Sim  ☐ Não

Por quê?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Plano de Manejo

O Sr. sabe das modificações que estão sendo discutidas sobre as normas na reserva?

☐ Sim  ☐ Não

Se a resposta for sim, quais normas estão sendo discutidas, e por quê?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Se, fosse necessário criar uma nova regra para a reserva, qual seria esta nova regra?

________________________________________________________________________

☐ Criação de gado  ☐ Exploração comercial de madeira  ☐ Outro:__________________________
Nome do entrevistado ______________________________________________________

Rio __________________________ Nome deste lugar/ seringal _____________________

Idade? ______ anos

Desde quanto tempo mora aqui? _____ anos _____ meses

Em que Estado nasceu? ___________________________

Chegou aqui vindo de onde?

- Cidade ( ) __________________________
- Município __________________________
- Rio ( ) _____________________________ (indique no mapa TdM onde é)

Cada quanto tempo vai para Altamira? _____ anos _____ meses

Por quê?

- a) Negócio ( )
  - Em que? ________________________________________

- b) Visitar parentes ( )
  - Relação _________________________________________

- c) Vender produtos florestais ( )
  - Quais? __________________________________________

- e) Vender peixe ( )

- f) Passar ferias ( )

- g) Outro __________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Questão</th>
<th>Não concordo</th>
<th>Não concordo</th>
<th>Neutro</th>
<th>Concordo</th>
<th>Concordo muito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Este lugar é onde eu pertenço</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eu preferiria passar toda minha vida aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gosto morar aqui mais do que em qualquer outro lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eu dependo deste lugar para minha sobrevivência</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eu não gostaria trabalhar em outro lugar mais do que aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Estou muito ligado a este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eu gosto a qualidade de vida aqui mais do que na rua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Este lugar é única</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Este lugar forma parte da minha identidade pessoal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eu poderia fazer o que faço aqui em qualquer outro lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sinto que este lugar é parte de quem sou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sinto saudade daqui quando vou para fora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sinto mais satisfação passando tempo aqui do que em qualquer outro lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Este lugar é o melhor para meu estilo de vida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sinto que este lugar define quem sou como pessoa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A vida é boa demais aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eu moro aqui porque sou filho desta terra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Não me sinto muito responsável pro futuro este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Se eu fosse de outro lugar, minha vida teria sido igual do que é aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Eu gostaria morar toda minha vida aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Quero mudar para a rua algum dia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Este lugar significa muito para mim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>O que faço aqui, posso fazer em qualquer lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Este lugar me parece chato</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eu tenho muitas histórias sobre este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eu amo este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Este lugar é como qualquer outro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tenho muita família aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tenho muitos amigos aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Este lugar é muito especial para mim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sinto responsabilidades importantes neste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Este lugar é meu lugar preferido no mundo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Este lugar é importante para a minha profissão</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Eu dependo deste lugar pro trabalho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Este lugar me faz bem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Não gosto muito deste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Este lugar é ótimo para passar ferias e tempo livre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Eu formo parte este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Vou conseguir meus sonhos neste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Para mim, tanto faz morar aqui que em qualquer outro lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Quando eu saio para fora, é importante para mim voltar aqui sempre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tenho feito muitos sacrifícios para ajudar este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Este lugar me interessa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Eu conheço as histórias pessoais dos moradores aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Este lugar forma parte da minha vida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Eu preferiria tiver morado em qualquer outro lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sinto bem morando aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Gosto conversar com os meus vizinhos sobre o futuro deste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sinto que meus amigos e família gostam deste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Quando estou aqui, sinto que pertenço a esta terra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Eu trabalho com os moradores d'aqui para melhorar este lugar para nós</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sinto que minha vida depende deste lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Quando estou nesta terra, sinto que estou em casa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gosto passar tempo com os moradores d'aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Quasi não conheço muitas pessoas aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Eu poderia morar em qualquer lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Não sinto nada em particular sobre este lugar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sinto muita satisfação morando e trabalhando aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tenho sorte morando aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Eu um prazer morar aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Temos uma comunidade forte aqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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