

Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery

Sustainability Discourses and Social Action in Pará, the Brazilian Amazon

Promotor: Prof. Dr. Ir. J. D. van der Ploeg
Hoogleraar in Transitieprocessen in Europa
Wageningen Universiteit

Co-promotor: Dr. A.M.G. Arce
Universitair docent
Leerstoelgroep RURALE Ontwikkelingssociologie
Wageningen Universiteit

Promotiecommissie:

Prof. Dr. Terry Marsden
Cardiff University, United Kingdom

Dr. Sergio Schneider
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

Prof. Dr. Ir. Cees Leeuwis
Wageningen Universiteit

Prof. Dr. Ir. Georg E. Frerks
Wageningen Universiteit

Dit onderzoek is uitgevoerd binnen de onderzoeksschool CERES.

Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery

Sustainability Discourses and Social Action in Pará, the Brazilian Amazon

Kei Otsuki

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
op gezag van de rector magnificus
van Wageningen Universiteit,
Prof. Dr. M.J. Kropff
in het openbaar te verdedigen
op donderdag 20 september 2007
des voormiddags om 11.00 uur in de Aula

CIP-DATA KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, The Hague, The Netherlands

Otsuki, K.

Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery: sustainability discourses and social action in Pará,
the Brazilian Amazon

Thesis Wageningen University -With ref. - With Summaries in English, Dutch, and
Portuguese

ISBN: 978-90-8504-683-7

Subject headings: Brazil; Amazon; deforestation; sustainable development; social
research; settlement project; agrarian reform; brazil nut; social action

Copyright © 2007 by Kei Otsuki

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, by
print or photo print, microfilm or any other means, without permission of the holder
of copyright.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ix

1. Entering the Amazon 1

The Research Theme and Questions 5

Organisation of the Thesis 6

Notes 9

2. The Concept of Sustainable Development and Social Practices in the Brazilian Amazon 11

The Concept of Sustainable Development: An Overview 12

Sustainability and Development: Intellectual Constructs 16

Community development and participation: state-led development 16

Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: the withdrawal of the state 18

The Rights-Based Approach: return of the state 20

Politicisations of the Brazilian Amazon 23

The national discourse of integration 23

The global discourse of forest conservation 24

The Amazon as a global common 25

Sustainable development and NRM approaches in the Amazon 26

Reconstruction of communities 28

Local practices and counter-tendencies 29

Structure, Agency and Social Practices in the Brazilian Amazon 31

Giddens's theory of structuration 33

Bourdieu's theory of practice 34

Individual and collective actions and landscape 35

Notes 38

3. Methodological Issues and Reflections 45

Research Encounters 45

The community survey and development practice 47

Micro-events and macro-statements 48

Fieldwork 50

Ethnographic Case Study Methods 51

Actor-oriented approach to development 52

<i>Extended case studies</i>	53
<i>Ethnography: description and contextualisation</i>	54
<i>Social relations in the field and ethnographic verities</i>	56
The Social Actor, Individual, Organisation and Collective: Working Definitions	58
Notes	61
4. A Reading of Landscape Change in Pará	63
Inside 'Deforestation'	63
<i>Highway PA-150</i>	66
<i>"Go more to the inside"</i>	70
Grotão as a Social Field	71
<i>Origin: castanhais, owners and nut collectors</i>	72
<i>Demarcation of Grotão</i>	76
Posseiros' Social Domains	77
<i>Social domains and arenas</i>	78
<i>'Disorganised' posseiros</i>	79
<i>Identification and organisation processes</i>	82
Cemeteries of Brazil Nuts	83
<i>Community-based natural resource management and institutions</i>	85
<i>Fazenda Bamerindus</i>	87
<i>Loggers' roles in the social field</i>	89
Conclusions	90
Notes	92
5. Social Events and Community Identifications	99
Identifying Leaders and Collectives	99
Life of Limirio	103
<i>Origin of Paradise</i>	105
<i>The Assembly of God</i>	108
<i>The first association and the beginning of ASDA intervention</i>	109
<i>The first election and the opening of internal political spaces</i>	111
Reconfigurations: Kito's Political Move and Limirio's Death	112
<i>AVM and the differentiation of community</i>	113
<i>Two collectives and political domains</i>	117
<i>Death of Limirio</i>	118
<i>The Rice Festival</i>	121
<i>The Funeral and the Festival: symbolic and pragmatic action by the settlers</i>	123

<i>After Limirio</i>	125
The Old Man and the Sawmill	126
<i>Laws and rules</i>	128
<i>Rio Preto</i>	131
<i>The arrest</i>	132
Conclusions	134
Notes	136
6. Community Projects and the Process of Individualisation	143
Knowledge and the Context of Intervention	143
A Community Project without a Community	146
<i>The sustainable and participatory development project</i>	147
<i>The views of Silvio on the banana flour project</i>	149
<i>Some different views of the settlers on product choice</i>	152
<i>The 'real community need': a milk processing unit</i>	154
<i>The fragmentation process</i>	157
<i>Intervention, action and knowledge processes</i>	160
Individualising Community Projects	162
<i>Raimundo's 'own' projects</i>	162
<i>Manu's life project</i>	164
<i>Experiences with intervention and collective action</i>	167
A Theoretical Discussion on Action and Knowledge	168
<i>The Theory of Action: from rationality to creativity</i>	169
<i>Knowledge processes and arrangement of individual actions</i>	170
Conclusions	172
Notes	174
7. The Making of a Sustainable Business	179
The Boundaries of an Epistemic Community	179
NGOs and Sustainable Development in Pará	181
<i>NGOs in the Brazilian Amazon</i>	182
<i>The trajectory of ASDA: from a public service provider to a business incubator</i>	183
<i>The production chain model</i>	185
<i>Framing a poor community</i>	187
The Making of Local Experts	189
<i>Doutora</i>	190
<i>Framing 'caboclo'</i>	192

“Learning from Social Entrepreneurs” 193
 Development Marketplace 194
 The Global Philanthropy Forum 196
 Localising and globalising knowledges and epistemic practices 198
Conclusions 200
Notes 201

8. A Conclusion: Sustainable Development and Human Agency in the Brazilian Amazon 205

 Rethinking the Social in Sustainable Development 205
 The Amazon Forest as a Changeable Process 207
 Social practices and landscape 208
 The human agency of the Amazonian settlers 209
 Collective and the individual 211
 The Role of Social Researcher in Sustainable Development 212

References 217

Summary 245
Samenvatting 248
Sumário 252

Curriculum Vitae 256

List of Tables

Table 1 Appropriation of *castanhais* by major owners in Marabá (1960-1980) 73
Table 2 Estimated household number in the village of Novo Paraíso 100
Table 3 Key actors in Grotão 101

Acknowledgements

I owe a lot of debt of gratitude to many individuals and institutions. First of all, my thanks go to the Foundation for Advanced Studies in International Development (FASID) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan for their generous scholarship. It enabled me to carry out my fieldwork in Pará and to complete this book. I am also indebted to the Poverty and Environment Program of Department of Environment at the Federal University of Pará in Brazil, as they provided me different job, travel and research opportunities in 2003-2006. I especially want to thank Prof. Nazaré Imibiriba and Vicky Shreiber for their support and friendship.

I cannot name here all the people who have directly and indirectly helped my fieldwork. Special thanks go to late Limirio and his family; Kito; Raimundo; Nonato and Rosa; and Manu and his family. I should also mention Analis and Naide as my friends in the village of Novo Paraíso; and Dona Sebastiana who accommodated me in her small hotel in the village after Limirio passed away. I am very grateful to all the *técnicos* of ASDA, especially Goro, João and Augusto; and officials of INCRA and IBAMA in Marabá and São Geraldo do Araguaia. I should not forget to mention Janete who always helped me with logistics and financial arrangements.

Dr. Alfredo Homma of Embrapa Amazonia Oriental encouraged me to conduct research on Brazil nut cemeteries. He continues to be one of the most prominent social scientists based in the Brazilian Amazon, and I really appreciate his support and sharing of valuable information with me. Through him, I could get acquainted with people from the Land Pastoral Commission in Xinguara and Conceição do Araguaia who eventually helped me understand land, forest and social problems associated with settlement projects in Pará. Regrettably, I could not cover a wider range of stories about conflictive social situations in Pará in this book, but I would like to acknowledge the influence which late Sister Dorothy Stang had on my work. I also wish to thank Pastora Marga Rothe for her prayers and friendship.

Wageningen University offered me a base to write about this research. First and foremost, I want to express the deepest gratitude to my mentor, Dr. Alberto Arce. He had patiently supervised my chaotic writing for nearly two years and never gave up on me. He also gave me various opportunities at the University, which enriched my academic and social life in Wageningen.

My promoter Prof. Jan Douwe van der Ploeg guided me to finish the thesis by giving me comments and putting me in a timeframe. Prof. Norman Long saved me from having a nervous break down in the final stage of writing by encouraging me to develop my thoughts further. And, without Dr. Eleanor Fisher, who kindly revised my English and edited the entire thesis, I could have never completed this book.

Colleagues at the Rural Development Sociology Group and Rural Sociology Group provided me intellectual, practical and mental support. Many thanks go to Petra Derkzen, Jilles van Gastel, Martijn Koster and Nuray Tumer who kindly volunteered to translate English summaries into Dutch; and Dr. Luis Antonio Cabelo Norder who revised the Portuguese summary. Ans van der Lande-Haij, Corine Diepeveen and, above all, Jos Michel were the secretaries who supported different stages of my life in Wageningen. I especially want to thank Ans for giving me advice on the layout of this book and Jos for being always helpful with frequent paperwork. Prof. Leontine Visser accommodated me in her chair group for the entire writing period; Dr. Paul Hebinck helped me with the layout of the thesis; and Dr. Sarah Southwold gave me an opportunity to work in her course. I also wish to thank Dr. Gerard Vershoor for his excellent barbecue technique; and Dr. Sabine de Rooij for her friendship.

Studying in the often cold and dark Netherlands, I seldom felt *saudades* for sunny tropical *Amazônia* thanks to a group of friends who shared the *Latino* spirit: Special thanks go to *mis queridos hermanos*, Gustavo Blanco and Pablo Laguna, not only for being my best beer-sharing comrades but also for showing interests in my thesis, reading chapters and sharing information about different literature and authors. Laura, Carolina, Veronica, Nassim, Carlos, Alejandra, Margarita, Virgílio, Charlyne, Vladimir, Cecília and Edward formed a group of formidable *latinos* in Wageningen, and I will never forget our dinners and *fiestas*. I also want to thank Lola, Paul and Elena for sharing hardships and ambitions of being PhD students with me.

Two years ago, Douwe Halbertsma came into my life and stayed on - I especially thank him for loving me and being so patient with my changing moods. I am also very grateful that he helped me elaborate maps of the study area and design the cover of this book. Lastly, I want to dedicate this book to my parents who never lost their confidence in me and never ceased to love me.

Rotterdam, 5 August 2007



Research Setting

Entering the Amazon

In July 1999 I first stepped into the Brazilian Amazon. I travelled to the state of Pará in the Eastern Amazon (*Amazônia Oriental*) as a research assistant for a small research project examining sustainable tropical agriculture by Japanese immigrant farmers.¹ The research project sought to analyse an 'agro-forestry system' developed by Japanese immigrants, which was considered an example of sustainable agricultural practices in the humid tropics (Fearnside 1995; Smith et al. 1995, 1998; Yamada 1999).

The local staff members of the Japanese International Cooperation Agency based in Belém, Pará's capital city, introduced several Japanese farmers to our research team as those who practiced agro-forestry.² We visited their farms (mostly headed by the first generation immigrants) in the northeast of Pará, which were mainly plantations of a variety of fruit and palm trees. I had imagined that these farmers would be proud of their 'sustainable' agricultural practice, but they invariably said that they had never thought that they were conducting sustainable agriculture. They only kept doing what they had to do and knew how to do to survive in the rainforest, and 'agro-forestry' was an outcome of their agricultural practices which had developed over many years. I also learned that I could not generalise that 'Japanese farmers' were all equally 'sustainable' because some farmers specialised in extensive cattle ranching, black pepper and oil palm monoculture, or in distribution businesses.

After the research project, I contacted a local NGO affiliated with the Federal University of Pará in Belém. This NGO was known for its 'innovative sustainable development' projects in Pará. I wanted to know more about Brazilian farming practices, as many of the Japanese farmers had told me that local Brazilians (whom they called *caboclos* in a slightly despising manner, see Chapter 7) were 'destructive', 'sloppy' and 'not well organised'. I was curious about what the Brazilians were actually doing, what sustainable development

2 *Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery*

meant, and how the projects sought to improve the poor Brazilians' (or Amazonians') life conditions and change their 'destructive' behaviour. At the same time, although it was an interesting experience, I did not want to exclusively focus on the Japanese farmers since they were a minority group in the Amazon,³ and I did not know anything about the Brazilian farmers who were said to be destroying the rainforest in the first place. I wondered whether the Brazilians were really disorganised and destructive or whether they also had stories similar to those of the Japanese farmers, which were only later described as 'sustainable' by outsiders.

A German sociologist founded the NGO in 1992 to promote sustainable development projects in both rural and urban communities in Pará. The coordinators of the NGO were very receptive, and let me accompany the NGO's *técnicos* (agricultural extensionists) who visited communities where the projects were implemented. We started by visiting several villages in the northeast of Pará. I did not at the time understand Portuguese very well and, therefore, could not make sense of what the villagers or *técnicos* were telling me. However, by walking around and observing houses, farms and the forest, I could at least tell that there was significant variation in the organisation of the houses (including kitchens and wells), home gardens (called *quintais*), farms, manioc processing units (*casas de farinha*), roads, paths and streams (*igarapés* for taking a bath, washing cloths) from one village to another. Access to basic infrastructure like electricity, portable water and principal (paved) roads affected this difference in organisation. The main things shared by each village, whether in *várzea* (floodplain) or in *terra firme* (dry land), were the church (Catholic or Protestant) and a football field situated more or less at the centre.

I also noticed that the relationship between the *técnicos* and the villagers varied. In one village, everyone knew the *técnico* who showed me around, whilst in another few people talked to him.⁴ Although I did not comprehend their conversations, it was easy to recognise the difference between the villagers who were friends with the *técnicos* and those who were indifferent.

In short, I was impressed by the diversity that existed between the small rural communities in Pará. The impression might have had something to do with my preconception about how 'poor communities' should have looked. To me, the villagers looked quite 'poor', and I expected that they would be equally united to improve their life standards with support from the

técnicos. Instead, I saw different groups of ‘individuals’ who flexibly formed their relationships with the *técnicos* and also with the surrounding natural environment. Their behaviour also appeared to be quite pragmatic since they seemed to take whatever opportunities to eke out a living and, therefore, although they lived in the forest, it would be too simple to call them ‘forest dwellers’ (cf. Ribeiro and Little 1996; Nugent and Harris 2004). The *técnicos* later explained to me that these ‘poor people’ needed ‘empowerment’ (*capacitação*) to organise themselves to improve their life conditions in a sustainable manner and then I realised that my ‘preconception’ had been shaped by a general belief, shared by the *técnicos* that ‘community organisation’ was necessary for sustainable development.⁵

The experience in the northeast of Pará was followed by a series of trips to the southeast of Pará whose landscape looked, to me, utterly ‘devastated’. Along the state road PA-150 from Belém to the southeastern centre of Marabá, for about five hundred kilometres, I could not see any forest left. It was hard to imagine that the southeast of Pará had been known for its dense brazil nut forest until the 1980s (see Chapter 4). On the roadsides, landless farmers’ shacks covered with black plastic sheets formed precarious settlements, and I naïvely thought that the well-known tale about large landowners (*fazendeiros*) destroying forests and oppressing poor landless farmers (*sem terras*) was ‘real’.

When our car entered the devastated area, the *técnico* who was driving me said that the area was called “*cemitério das castanheiras* (cemetery of brazil nuts)”. I did not understand its meaning very well at that time, but innumerable dead trees bleached from burning filled the landscape. Then, a small village appeared below the hill and, as we drove into the village, the *técnico* exclaimed in clumsy English: “Welcome to New Paradise!” because the village was called *Novo Paraíso*, literally, New Paradise. Upon arrival, I discovered that most of the villagers were ‘small producers (*pequenos produtores*)’ who had plots outside the village. Therefore, it seemed that the devastated area I had seen from the car was not only owned by the large landowners but also by the small ones. I was very confused, in the middle of hellish smoke and dust.⁶ I asked many questions like: Why is this place called Paradise? Why do people burn the forest and are they happy about it? Why and how do small farmers conduct activities that create the same landscape as the large farmers? Is this devastation really because these Brazilians are lazy and ignorant and do not appreciate the forests’ value or even agriculture?

4 *Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery*

These questions eventually led me to live and conduct fieldwork among the settlers in Novo Paraíso and surrounding areas in 2000. I subsequently worked at the above-mentioned NGO to understand how sustainable development projects worked in Pará. These experiences led me to question my original image of 'sustainable development' and 'community' and its organisation. In principle, I realised that people in Pará were more individualistic than I had imagined. Like the Japanese farmers, people (including the *técnicos*) were doing what they had to do or what they knew to do to survive and earn a livelihood in the rainforest. Even if an activity looked community-oriented, each individual seemed to maintain his or her own way of understanding and carrying out the activity in relation to the others and the environment. It was often outsiders who described the activity as 'sustainable' or 'unsustainable' in reference to the condition of the forest.

As I started to understand Portuguese, I also noticed that different meanings were attached to the word *comunidade* (community) in different contexts. Sometimes, a *comunidade* simply indicated a neighbourhood in which the people in question (i.e. 'community members') resided. But the use of *comunidade* also appeared to be more symbolic, especially when the term was applied to a locality by outsiders (for its 'development'). When it was used by outsiders, the meaning of *comunidade* was not always shared by community members in the same way. In other words, while the word *comunidade* indicated the existence of a 'collective identity' (Cohen 1985), the process of identification with the collectivity could vary among the individual members.

Then I began to imagine the people in Pará as individuals and a 'community' as something that could be identified differently by members and their membership to groups and organisations. I wondered if the devastation of the rainforest could be viewed as an autonomous expression emerging from people making a livelihood in their spontaneous community. Isn't there a possibility that an individual can translate and reconfigure sustainable development projects to pursue his or her own project of 'sustainable development', which looks totally 'unsustainable' in the eyes of outsiders? If we really want to promote 'sustainable development' to preserve the Brazilian Amazon rainforest and also to alleviate poverty in the region, don't we need to understand individual conduct on the ground in ethnographic detail?

In Brazil, 'to sustain (*sustentar*)' is usually used in the context of 'to make a living' or 'to sustain a household'. This can indicate that ordinary people might have different ideas about their 'sustainable development' from

that of *técnicos* or experts. Likewise, community organisations that *técnicos* asserted to be indispensable for 'sustainable development' could have been differently understood or formed by community members.

The *técnicos* often talked about community organisation as a synonym of a farmer's association or a cooperative that should be formally institutionalised. Formal organisations are necessary for *técnicos* to establish contact with their beneficiaries and implement sustainable development projects. Thus, they often said that the poor were 'disorganised' when they did not have a formal organisation or when the organisation was weak. However, as the variation in meanings of *comunidade* suggested, people can always create different informal groups and forms of identification with the collectivity to improve their life conditions in a sustainable manner in their social world. Therefore, the causal relation between 'disorganisation' and 'deforestation' or organisation and sustainable development might not be as obvious as the *técnicos* implied.

The Research Theme and Questions

The present study tries to deepen the analysis of linkages between people's behaviour, local organisations, and the condition of the forest in Pará and its representation. At one level of analysis, I examine the concept and discourse of sustainable development to discuss how certain problems such as 'poverty' and 'deforestation' have been framed in the development context of Pará. The 'general belief' shared by the *técnicos*, and indeed myself, that community organisation is necessary for sustainable development is shaped within a framing process. The study aims to understand how local, national and international development institutions are involved in producing and reproducing such belief in implementing sustainable development projects in Pará.

At another level of analysis, I elaborate on social events in the settlement area of Novo Paraíso introduced above to show the organising processes developed by Amazonian settlers on the ground. I consider the settlers as agents of 'localising' development projects underpinned by global and national development policy discourses. In the localisation process, the settlers' actions form certain 'counter-tendencies' (Arce and Long 2000, see Chapter 2), which are shaped as manifestations of the settlers' own projects of 'sustainable development'. As I noted above, the settlers' projects of sustainable

development may appear to be contradictory to the ideal of sustainable development promoted by the development experts and institutions. Here, I draw from the actor-oriented approach to development (see Chapter 3) to differentiate the settlers' projects as 'life projects' vis-à-vis development projects, and look into interface situations in which struggles over resources, meanings and representations take place between various actors (settlers, *técnicos*, government officials, NGO coordinators etc.) at the frontline of development in Pará (cf. Arce 1989). These struggles, in turn, elucidate problems associated with the discursive construction of the concept of sustainable development and its practice which does not properly reflect the real cause and consequence of 'poverty' and 'deforestation' in the Brazilian Amazon. In short, the struggles can help us to understand counter-tendencies to the dominant discourses.

These two levels of analysis are conducted by asking the following research questions: How can we deal with groups of the 'individual poor' who do not share a collective sense of 'natural resource management' or do not make a joint effort to improve living standards through a formal organisation? Is community-oriented organisation necessary for sustainable development in the first place? If individuals participate in sustainable development projects, how does their participation enable them to (re)constitute a sense of collectivity? How does this (re)constitution, in turn, affect an individual's livelihood organisation and life project in relation to the natural environment? And, how do institutional actors such as the state, NGOs, market, international development agencies and scientific communities deal with the (re)constitution process?

The study tries to answer these questions and search for an analytical framework to understand the relationship between the individual, the collective (which can indicate both formal organisation and informal grouping, see Chapter 3), the natural environment and landscape, and their representations in the Brazilian Amazon. The study focuses on current sustainable development debates, natural resource management studies and social theory to understand empirical material collected in Pará.

Organisation of the Thesis

Chapter 2 presents theoretical frameworks to understand the concept of sustainable development and people's social practices. It gives, first, an

overview of the concept of sustainable development and how the concept has been historically and intellectually constructed. To do this it focuses on people's organisations and institutions discussed in the framework of natural resource management (NRM). Second, the chapter proceeds with an overview and analysis of sustainable development policy processes and NRM strategies in the Brazilian Amazon to show how community institutions and organisations have been analytically and practically reconstructed in the Region under the banner of sustainable development. This reconstruction revealed counter-tendencies in many parts of Pará, which this study examines in detail. Lastly, in order to elaborate a theoretical framework to explain these counter-tendencies, the chapter introduces the concepts of human agency and social practices by referring to theories of practice developed by Giddens and Bourdieu. They will help us to understand the relationship between people's practices and natural environment as 'landscape' in the settlement area of Novo Paraíso, as discussed in the following chapters.

Chapter 3 discusses methodological issues involved in fieldwork, ethnographic writing and presentation of the thesis. Strictly speaking, Novo Paraíso, the main field of this study, is the central village of a government settlement project called Grotão dos Caboclos, and the settlers who reside in Novo Paraíso often have properties (and family members) in different settlement projects around Grotão, and their sense of belonging to particular localities is elusive. Thus, I start my analysis from individual settlers who form various groups and construct social life without being bounded by community arrangements within one settlement. The chapter briefly discusses methodological implications of social 'situational analysis' which I mainly use in this study to observe, describe and reconstruct individual settlers' different grouping (and also individualising) cases in their social situations rather than in an 'imagined community' by the researcher. The chapter also elaborates some working definitions of basic concepts used in this study (e.g. 'social actor', 'individual', 'organisation' and 'collective').

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 elaborate on the settlement's history, key informants' life histories and activities, and sustainable development project processes in the settlement. Chapter 4 gives a general overview of the history of Grotão dos Caboclos which is recounted with reference to the socio-economic history of brazil nut extraction economy and agrarian reform in the southeast of Pará. An overview of extraction economy and agrarian reform is crucial to visualise landscapes that surround and form Grotão and to understand how physical,

political and social spaces have been opened in the study area. The chapter introduces the settlers of Grotão as *posseiros* and conceptualises Grotão as a social field in which *posseiros* flexibly identify their life project processes with the locale, with government intervention, and with others' experiences to shape their collectives in various forms. By introducing the concept of social field, the chapter sets the ground for the social analysis of the landscape that is usually simply expressed as extensive deforestation.

Chapter 5 elaborates on self-organising processes of the settlers at different levels in Novo Paraíso by describing the life histories and projects of three key actors and by chronologically following social events that elucidate characteristics of the settlers' social arrangements and identification processes with emergent collectives. The chapter shows that the local style of social arrangements is established through various channels that include landscape changes, national political contexts, local power struggles, religious activities and NGO intervention. In the arrangement processes, both collective and individual actions are identified, which indicate the quality of human agency that the settlers can exercise in their changeable social and natural environment.

Chapter 6 discusses how different types of actions can work to individualise the original collective arrangements of the settlers. It introduces the situation in which a 'sustainable and participatory project' implemented by the Brazilian NGO and financed internationally has failed to achieve its intended outcome because of the settlers' individualisation processes that were partly provoked by the project itself. The situation reveals how individuality of each settler is temporarily retained in relation to the institutionalised collective, in this case, the small farmers' association of Grotão, as the settlers have acquired knowledge and learned the possibilities of social rearrangements through participations in the project. This process begs for a theoretical explanation on relations between individuals' identification processes, socially accepted rationalities, local knowledge and sustainable development practice. The chapter looks into the theory of action to conceptualise action as catalyst that connects these elements of 'individualisation in sustainable development' and to deepen the understanding of human agency of the settlers.

The cases shown in Chapters 5 and 6 illuminate the diversity of settlers' actions and their multiple identifications with different groupings, which also result in individualisation or apparent 'disorganisation'. The grouping and individualising dynamics can account for the configuration of the NGO's

sustainable development project that carries out its logic of organisation or a singular model of well planned system for institutionalising natural resource management in the settlement. However, NGOs in general do not act with one voice (just as the farmers' association) but they seem to establish its organisational principle and purposes of actions by negotiating with different voices that emerge from inside and also that surround them. Chapter 7 explores how the local NGO that operates in Grotão has embraced the global discourse of sustainable development to plan and carry out a sustainable and participatory project. It elaborates on how their way of carrying out a certain type of project has been further encouraged and indeed configured by the international development community. The chapter introduces the concept of epistemic communities and expert systems in order to grasp the process of negotiations between the local NGO, the international development community, and the supposed beneficiaries. Cases of international events in which the NGO has participated are elaborated in order to reify the negotiation process. They clearly show the establishment process of a new 'fashion' in development discourses that are shaped through interaction between different types of experts, including NGO workers who are recognised as 'local experts' in epistemic communities in international development. The presence of so-called 'beneficiaries', such as the settlers of Grotão, is eventually contained in mobilised images among the experts.

Chapter 8 presents a conclusion and gives a general overview of key issues. The chapter delineates theoretical and practical implications of the main findings for ongoing debates regarding sustainable development of the Brazilian Amazon.

Notes

¹ See the project report: *Sustainable Tropical Agriculture of Japanese Immigrants in the Brazilian Amazon* by Nishizawa, Koshiishi, and Otsuki (2000) (in Japanese and Portuguese). It was funded by Japan-Brazil Association (supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and Global Environment Foundation (supported by the Ministry of Environment). At that time, I was a master's student at the University of Tokyo in Japan.

² The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) was formerly the Overseas Migration Agency of Japan. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, the Japanese government promoted a series of migration programmes to give opportunities (i.e. lands and jobs) to

landless poor farmers in Japan. Systematic Japanese immigration to Brazil started in 1908 to São Paulo, in the south, mainly for coffee plantations. Migration to the Amazon officially started in 1929 when a Japanese company promoted cacao plantations in Pará and the State of Amazonas. In 1954, Overseas Migration Agency became JICA. In 1964, Japan entered the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and JICA started to administer the largest Official Development Assistance (ODA) budget in the world. Meanwhile, Brazil continued to embrace the largest population of Japanese immigrants in the world (approx. 1.3 million in 2003 according to the JICA headquarters in Brasília), and JICA in Brazil kept strong ties to these immigrants through its local offices, which operated in São Paulo and Belém. In January 2005, the local offices were closed as JICA was partially privatised.

³ And, they kept very 'traditional' (or conservative) Japanese views and customs, which I had always wanted to escape from. Speaking ill of Brazilians is one example, though from the second generations onwards, they generally identified themselves as Brazilians. I was not very interested in *indio* (Amerindian) studies either, unlike the majority of anthropologists who had worked in the Amazon, since my interest was principally in the 'ordinary' Brazilians who are the main actors changing the Amazonian landscape.

⁴ In fact, some *técnicas* (female extensionists) also accompanied me. For the sake of simplicity, I will use the male form of *técnico* unless the gender specification is analytically important.

⁵ Indeed, as Leach et al. (1999: 225) clearly show, the concept of sustainable development has been closely linked to the promotion of 'local-level solutions derived from community initiatives'. See Chapter 2 and also Holmén and Jiström (1994); IIED (1994).

⁶ July and August used to be the main months for farmers to conduct *queima* (burning) in the Amazon. In 2000, the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA) limited the official burning time to two weeks at the end of August. See Chapter 4 for details.

The Concept of Sustainable Development and Social Practices in the Brazilian Amazon

This chapter begins with a review of the concept of sustainable development, which has become dominant in development policy making for the Brazilian Amazon in the past decade. It discusses how the international development agenda placed the concept of sustainable development as the key solution to problems of poverty and environmental degradation and how some different reactions to the concept emerged in the 1990s.

Second, the chapter further explores the intellectual construction process of the concept of sustainable development. It presents the examination of community development approach in regard to the concept of 'sustainability', which shows the shift in the unit of analysis from community and household to the social actor. The trajectory demonstrates analytical advances in the community development approach, which have evolved out of the changing analytical relationship between the state and market, as well as community institutions and the individual. Here, I introduce Sustainable Livelihood Approaches and discuss the Rights-Based Approach to development in detail as I consider it to be one of the latest examples that addresses the issue of the individual and the institution in sustainable development.

Third, the chapter gives an overview of sustainable development policy processes in the Brazilian Amazon to understand the nature of relations between the individual and the institution in the study area. The Amazonian rainforest has been highly politicised both nationally and internationally, since the Brazilian federal government initiated a series of national integration programmes in the 1960s. This leads to a review of what could initially be seen as a dualism between national developmentalist and international conservationist approaches to the Brazilian Amazon, and it is argued here that from the mid-1990s the concept of sustainable development helped policy

makers and development practitioners overcome this dualism. In general, the concept of sustainable development enabled the state to renew its control over the Amazon through natural resource management (NRM) strategies. This renewed control let the image of communities in the Amazon be reconstructed even though among inhabitants a sense of community had long been modified. At this point, I briefly illustrate the reconstructed image of communities and counter-tendencies observed in the settlement area in Pará.

Lastly, the chapter examines the concept of human agency and social practices discussed in social theory, in order to set an analytical ground for understanding counter-tendencies in the study area. It principally aims to shift the emphasis away from analytical and practical problems associated with getting community institutions right for sustainable development to problems associated with interpreting human action in social space created in the course of landscape change. It is intended that an analysis of social space will lead to a greater understanding of how individuals in the settlement area in the Brazilian Amazon flexibly identify with collectives created in the process of deforestation, whose institutions do not stem from or necessarily lead to 'traditional' social norms and order. In this understanding, the forest can work to both constrain and enable individual and collective actions which, in turn, produce and reproduce social spaces by altering the landscape. Thus, the Amazonian settlers' institutions are inherently flexible and fluid as they are closely linked to the way individual settlers construct and identify with their society in the context of physical and social spatial changes.

The Concept of Sustainable Development: An Overview

The concept of sustainable development became ubiquitous in international development after the World Commission on Environment and Development presented *Our Common Future* (The Brundtland Report) in 1987.¹ The Report explains the background of the Commission that was initially called by the United Nations' General Assembly in 1982 in order 'to propose long-term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000 and beyond' (WCED 1997: ix).² According to the Report, sustainable development was urgently needed because 'many of the development paths of the industrialised nations are clearly unsustainable' (*ibid*: xii) and, thus, 'developing' countries should not follow the same paths.

The Report soon declares that 'poverty reduces people's capacity to use resources in a sustainable manner; it intensifies pressure on the environment' (*ibid*: 49), and it proceeds to recommend 'an annual growth rate of 3 per cent for the South as well as for the North (to accommodate higher exports from the South)' (Guha and Martinez-Alier 1997: 46). With this recommendation, the concept of sustainable development was integrated with ongoing, growth-based 'pro-poor' policy in international development (see Finnemore 1997 for a historical overview of pro-poor policy); it was also incorporated into rural development schemes, which sought to 'secure livelihoods that minimise resource depletion, environmental degradation, cultural disruption and social instability' for poor populations around the world (Barbier 1987 cited in Pearce et al. 1989: 173, see also Casado, Gonzales de Molina and Guzmán 1999: 138-143).

In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (The Earth Summit) was called in Rio de Janeiro in Brazil to set actual international development policy agendas to achieve sustainable development 'by the year 2000 and beyond'. The agendas included the Rio Declaration; The Convention on Climate Change; The Convention on Biodiversity; Declaration on the Forest; and Agenda 21, and the Summit also initiated the NGO Global Forum (in which 9,000 NGOs participated, see Chapter 7) and the Business Council on Sustainable Development (for an ethnographic account of the Summit, see Little 1995). Not surprisingly, the main theme of the World Development Report, an annual report by the World Bank, was 'development and environment' in 1992; this elaborated political and practical recommendations to make development sustainable ('[s]ustainable development is development that lasts' The World Bank 1992: 34).

The Summit clearly showed the international development community's interest in putting the concept of sustainable development into practice, and it had a significant influence over international and also national political proposals to 'develop' the Amazon (e.g. Ribeiro and Little 1996). At the Summit, the Amazonian countries agreed to install the Amazonian Commission of Development and Environment (Comisión Amazónica de Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente 1993),³ and G7 countries and the Brazilian federal government officially launched the Pilot Program to Preserve the Brazilian Rainforests (PPG7).⁴ In addition, the World Bank launched the

Global Environmental Facility and the Rainforest Unit, a co-funding body of PPG7.

The central argument that underlines these new proposals is: 'Without adequate environmental protection, development will be undermined; without development, environmental protection will fail' (The World Bank 1992: 25). This statement does not clearly tell us whether economic growth should be pursued to effect environmental protection or whether environmental protection should be prioritised though it requires a radical change in the current course of economic growth. This indecisiveness has attracted criticism of the concept of sustainable development, since referred to as 'an ambivalent norm' (Sachs 2003 [1992]).

The ambivalence became apparent at the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in South Africa in 2002. Through a decade of experience worldwide, development professionals came to recognise that when the concept of sustainable development was put into practice, it had to embrace every sector of development such as health, sanitation, education, income generation, agriculture, environmental conservation and services (e.g. The World Bank 2002). As a result, sustainable development practically 'meant nothing' (The Economist 2002). This situation demonstrated the fact that '[t]he global cultural norm of sustainability has quite different meanings and interpretations in different contexts around the world' (Mol 2001: 25) and cannot be uniformly applied to different contexts (Heinrich Böll Foundation 2002).

Intellectual reactions to the normalisation of sustainable development can be roughly classified into three groups: 1) positive reactions that led to political and technical studies on 'how to achieve sustainable development'; 2) critical reactions that discarded the concept as another justification of Western-centred capitalist dominance; and 3) Latin American reactions that proposed 'our own agenda' in contrast to international agendas.

The positive reactions appear to be instrumentalist and often crisis-oriented and thus continue to appeal to the general public and development agencies. The first major study on 'how to achieve sustainable development' was written by Redclift (1987), who introduces technical and political solutions to the Earth's development and environmental crisis. After the Earth Summit in 1992, a number of studies emphasised 'bottom-up' approaches to establish 'sustainable patterns of development from below'

(Elliot 1999[1994]: 1) and started to vigorously propose community-based sustainable development projects (see below and also Chapter 4 for details).

Critical reactions to the concept of sustainable development located it as western-centred, capitalistic and messianistic. For example, Sachs (2003[1992]) argues that environmentalism and poverty concerns were desperately connected in the name of sustainable development in order to establish the new *raison d'être* for troubled international organisations such as the World Bank. He also criticises the 'centralism' that sustainable development can cause since environmentalism confers power on the state to administer and manage natural environments within its territory ('eco-cracy' in his term, *ibid*: 33). In the same vein, Escobar (1995: 192-193) emphasises that sustainable development turned nature into environment to be 'managed'. He argues that the 'global ecocracy' based on the Western rationality has turned Western scientists into 'environmental managers' to promote 'capitalization of nature' and make people in the Third World merely a part of the resource to be protected.

Latin American reactions emphasise the importance of social problems which are often unquestioned in the sustainable development debate. For example, Gudynas (1993), a Uruguayan sociologist, describes environmentalism as the Western 'ecomessianism' and argues that it has deliberately turned political attention away from social problems in Latin America to environmental problems, even though the two are inextricably linked. According to him, 'the North's views' are so 'reductionist' that they commonly identify the main ecological problem in Latin America as deforestation in the Amazon (*ibid*: 170). Therefore, he proposes a development agenda of 'our' environment in the South (cf. Guha and Martinez-Alier 1997, Fernandes and Guerra 2003).

Critical views on sustainable development are important in order for researchers to resist the temptation to blindly accept or even to construct oversimplified analytical models based on politically generated images of sustainable development. However, given that 'problems' of poverty and environmental degradation have already been framed in the name of sustainable development, and given also that sustainable development projects have been taking place worldwide for the last two decades, mere criticism does not allow us to make a deeper analysis of how the concept and practice of sustainable development play out in reality. In this sense, critical reactions by academics are perhaps too negative; indeed, Latin American reactions that cast

a question of representations of environment upon the sustainable development debate may be more relevant to the present study as we principally try to understand how 'deforestation' is framed and problematised in contrast to actual social development processes observed in the Brazilian Amazon.

Sustainability and Development: Intellectual Constructs

Before proceeding with an analysis of sustainable development in the context of the Brazilian Amazon, we need to further examine how the concept of sustainable development is constructed, in order to position ourselves in the broader development debate. Like any concepts used in development policy, sustainable development has an intellectual 'heritage' (Crewe and Harrison 1998; Midgley 2003), and its current normalisation can be tracked back to the failure of the state-led community development between the 1950s-1970s (cf. Holdcroft 1984). Here, I review some approaches in relation to sustainable development, which have been derived from a community development approach: Community Participation (1970s -); Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches (early 1990s -); and the Rights-Based Approach (late 1990s -).⁵ The review may help us deepen our understanding of 'community' in relation to the state and market which are 'the relevant relational categories that situate, and that must be examined together with, community' especially in the context of 'community-based environmental conservation' and current natural resource management (Li 2001: 157).

Community development and participation: state-led development

Following the two world wars, communities were geographically defined and incorporated into the newly established territorial boundaries of nation-states. As Arce (2003a: 201) puts it, communities were instruments for the nation state to engineer 'social relations through new redistributive regimes and...[to]...present itself to achieve a more socially inclusive society' (see also Scott 1998). Communities were the base for the 'good society' to generate its 'common good' (Biddle and Biddle 1965) or the 'industrial base' for a nation-state to pursue economic development (Warren 1970). Thus in the early stage, community development was concerned with how to 'promote better living for the whole community, with the active participation...[of its

members]' (the United Nations Report on Rural Development in 1948 cited in Batten 1957: 1). Community development agencies were needed to actively organise and train community members to participate in the development plan as they were expected to share the same values and objectives and take a collective action (cf. Wileden 1970). Dore (1981: 18) calls this process 'bureaucratic institutionalisation' and defines community action 'as a means of creating public goods; for the simultaneous production by individuals; and for promoting greater community solidarity'.

These early views of community were criticised as being too homogeneous, disregarding power struggles and conflicts between community members, which had been overlooked by community development agencies (Brokensha and Hodge 1969). In the 1970s, the concept of 'community participation' was introduced 'in response to the criticisms' which had been made of the 'community development movement' (Midgley 1986: 17, see also Holdcroft 1984). The idea of 'participation' was based on a Western ideal of democracy (Cohen 1968, Apthorpe 1970, Midgley 1986) and, by emphasising participation, community development could supposedly embrace community members' needs and wants.

The practice of community participation emphasised the importance of community members' involvement in the planning process ('participatory planning' according to Conyers 1982). However, difficulties were encountered in terms of who should define and decide the priority of community needs and wants, whether the needs and wants were real, and who the target community members were. At the same time, the focus on participation tended to ignore the roles of community development agencies in the project process since the project evaluation starts to depend on what the 'target' people have done (cf. Biddle and Biddle 1965).

Drawing on Robert Redfield's anthropological monograph published in 1941, Apthorpe (1970) suggests that people had become more individualistic in indigenous communities in Central America due to migration and high mobility induced by urbanisation. Thus, he proposes the concept of 'people planning' to consider the 'human factor', that is, the freedom of choice of individuals (see also Ortiz 1970).⁶ In line with the emergence of neo-liberalism in the 1970s (see below), the conceptual inclusion of individuals in development planning eventually pushed aside the standardised view on community from development studies and practice. Meanwhile, the concept of participation was integrated with mainstream development thinking

(Midgley 2003), especially in rural development in the mid-1980s and 1990s (as vigorously promoted by Chambers 1994).

Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: the withdrawal of the state

In the 1970s and 1980s, neo-liberalism prompted the weakening of the state's role in development and introduced 'market-led' development. Developing countries started to adopt (or were forced to adopt) structural adjustment programmes implemented by the IMF-World Bank, and eventually internalised neo-liberal policies in the 1990s (cf. Mallaby 2004). The normalisation of sustainable development in developing countries in the 1990s was in fact closely linked to this internalisation of the neo-liberal policies, as neo-liberalism allowed the 'enterprise culture' (Midgley 2003) and the concept of 'management' (Long and Ploeg 1995) to prevail in development planning. The terms used in corporate management like transparency, accountability and capital were incorporated into development projects and programmes, and 'managerialism' was effectively combined with the 'ecological managerialism', which had been promoted by the Western ecologists in the post-world wars period particularly in Africa (Adams 1990).⁷ In this context, natural resource management (NRM) became a major component of development.

As the state withdrew from the main development stage, non-government organisations (NGOs) and private sector started to play a significant role in carrying out NRM strategies. International organisations such as the United Nations and the World Bank set out to support NGOs and to ally with business communities (Mallaby 2004) and, as 'ecological politics' prevailed especially in developed countries, a wide range of scientists began to be involved in international development (cf. Beck 1995).

Since the state was no longer the only provider of 'development' and 'community' had been questioned as a unit of action, new conceptual models and planning strategies were sought at this moment in development studies and practices. The new models could not ignore the concept of 'sustainability' normalised in international development, and Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches were proposed as one of the promising models in this context (e.g. Chambers 1988; Chambers and Conway 1991; Scoones 1998; Carney 1998; Neefjes 2000; Brocklesby and Fisher 2003).⁸

Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches 'begin with an understanding of the "household" and the resources it owns or can access' (Conway et al. 2002:

1). By breaking down the conceptual unit of action from community to household, the Approaches can now take individual decision-making, power struggles within a social organisation, risk and sustainability into account (Ellis 1998). At the same time, the concept of 'livelihoods' allows the researcher to focus on social dimensions and 'people-oriented' resource management as livelihoods analytically include income, kinship, social network, gender relations, property rights (Ellis 1998) and people's 'capabilities', 'their means of living' and 'assets' (Chambers and Conway 1991).⁹

Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches explain 'sustainability' as follows:

A livelihood is environmentally sustainable when it maintains or enhances the local and global assets on which livelihoods depend, and has net beneficial effects on other livelihoods. A livelihood is socially sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, and provide for future generations (Chambers and Conway 1991: i).

Chambers and Conway (1991: 11) explain that the principal components of a livelihood are 'tangible assets', such as stores and resources, and 'intangible assets', such as claims and access to the stores and resources. In order to achieve livelihood sustainability, they stress the significance of 'security', which can be enhanced by the private action of 'a household to add to its portfolio of assets and repertoire of responses' to elaborate a strategy against 'vulnerability'. Ellis (1998) calls this process 'rural livelihood diversification' which gives individuals and households more capability to enrich their livelihoods.¹⁰

A wide range of scholars and development agencies have embraced the idea that 'assets' are the principal components of a livelihood. However, both tangible and intangible assets later came to be neatly classified into different types of 'capital' (Scoones 1998; Farrington et al. 1999; Bebbington 1999), and this capitalisation of assets served to ignore poor people's realities and worldviews, which Chambers (1988) had intended to introduce to development planning in one of his first works on vulnerability and security in the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (Arce 2003a).

For example, Farrington et al. (1999: 4) claim that practical applications of a Sustainable Livelihoods Approach must start with 'an analysis of people's livelihoods and how these have been changing over time'. However, as their

framework is based on 'five types of capital asset (i.e. human, natural, financial, social and physical) which people can build up and/or draw upon' (*ibid*: 3), the 'analysis of people's livelihoods' is destined to be 'normative' (Scoones 1998: 14). This means that the framework leaves little space for setting how people deal with the situations in their local contexts as a starting point of development planning as well as natural resource management (see also Cleaver 2002 for a criticism of the framework). Moreover, if we blindly follow this capital framework, people are conceptually reduced to capital managers while development workers become like bankers who assess the poor people's capital assets to decide the possibility of further funding and projects.

The Rights-Based Approach: return of the state

In the late 1990s, the Rights-Based Approach was taken up by major development agencies¹¹ in parallel to Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches (Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall 2004; see also Moser and Norton 2001 for the relationship between sustainable development and the Rights-Based Approach, and Alsop 2005 for an overview of the Approach). It firstly drew on the universal human rights declared by the United Nations in 1948,¹² and later included 'economic, social and cultural' rights of the people in question (ODI 1999). By addressing the issue of rights, the Rights-Based Approach aimed to 'repoliticise' development (Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall 2004; Moser 2005) and it often added 'political capital' to the five capital asset types proposed in Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches. The repoliticisation of development worked to shed light on 'inequalities in power relations and property rights', which Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches could not properly encompass (Chambers 2004).¹³

The Rights-Based Approach has, though mostly implicitly, influenced the current debate on and actual practice of natural resource management (NRM). In Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches, natural resources were 'held and used collectively', and 'social capital – understood to mean the advantages that can accrue from strong social relationships' was considered essential to guarantee environmental sustainability (Conway et al. 2002: 2). The Rights-Based Approach builds on this affirmation and assumes that NRM is effective when peoples' social networks are firm. In order to guarantee the firm social network on the ground, the Rights-Based Approach stresses the importance of legal arrangements to legitimise the people's access to natural

resources. Then, the state, as the only legitimate duty-bearer, must play a crucial role in resource management, and this return of the state to the picture of development has worked to reframe and repoliticise 'participation' that 'had turned instrumentalist as it was popularised' (Nyamu-Musembi and Cornwall 2004: 11).¹⁴

This new concern with peoples' social networks, resource access, participation and legal arrangements has raised a difficult question since '[r]ights are largely assigned to individuals' (ODI 1999). This means that an individual has a right not to participate in resource management or has a right to destroy his or her resources. As Cleaver (1999: 605-608) points out, participatory approaches prevailing in current NRM practice have lacked an adequate 'model of the individual' to understand, for example, 'incentives to participate', 'social norms and structures that influence individual's decision to participate', 'changing social position of individuals over life-courses' and the difference between 'inclusion and subordination' (see also White 1996). It is thus at this point that the issue of 'institutions' starts to emerge.

Many scholars in the field of nature conservation and management turned their attention to the issue of community in the 1980s in order to advocate local (or 'indigenous') people's rights over their natural environment (e.g. Korten 1987; IIED 1994; Agrawal and Gibson 1999). 'Community-based natural resource management' was established as a new area of expertise and became increasingly popular in NRM studies and also sustainable development policy making. The renewed focus on communities in NRM and legal arrangements proposed in the Rights-Based Approach resonated when they both had to deal with the question of institutions (see Chapter 4 for a review of community-based natural resource management). The study of Environmental Entitlements Framework presented by Leach et al. (1999) has been significant because it directly probes the question of institutions in community-based natural resource management by referring to the Rights-Based Approach (though they called it the 'Livelihoods Approach').

The concept of 'entitlements' was originally developed by Sen (1981) in his seminal study of poverty and famines; the concept was later adopted by Leach et al. (1999) to elaborate on the idea of 'environmental entitlements' in NRM.¹⁵ According to their definition, environmental entitlements are: 'alternative sets of utilities derived from environmental goods and services over which "social actors" have legitimate effective command and which are instrumental in achieving well-being' (Leach et al. 1999: 233). Thus,

environmental entitlements are conceptually distinguished from formal rights (and what they call 'endowments') enforced by the statutory system whereas they may 'represent' formal rights at one time to acquire 'a new set of entitlements' for another time in the local 'empirical context' (*ibid*: 233). They are closely related to the social legitimisation of rights undergirded by 'customary rights of access, use or control, and other social norms' (*ibid*: 233).

Here, the unit of analysis and action is neither community nor household but the social actor.¹⁶ The concept of the social actor retains the original meanings of livelihoods that stem from people's realities and worldviews within development planning and NRM. In addition, the focus on the social actor widens the scope of the 'model of the individual' in regard to participation since the focus raises the issue of individuality and sociality of the individual in relation to his or her understanding of participation and rights and entitlements in NRM.

In practice, we may wonder: Who guarantee rights and regulate entitlements? Chambers (2004), for example, partly answers the question by proposing the concept of 'obligations' to ensure 'our' (i.e. those who enjoy enough rights) involvement in achieving 'their' (i.e. poor and powerless people's) rights. He is rightly sceptical about expecting the state to be the only effective duty-bearer. Therefore, he proposes our 'moral and ethics' to ensure the involvement of transnational corporations or international development agencies to monitor and guarantee poor people's rights (*ibid*: 26). However, as he does not sufficiently develop the idea on how poor and powerless people themselves can negotiate their rights with the state, transnational corporations or international development agencies, his proposal may indicate a kind of charitable paternalism.¹⁷ In order to avoid such paternalism, researchers should go back to the social actors in question and ask them how they want their rights to be recognised.

The Environmental Entitlements Framework incorporates the use of 'entitlement mapping' drawing on methods originally elaborated by Sen (1981) in order to grasp how social actors recognise their livelihoods rights in relation to natural resources. In these mapping activities, government agencies, NGOs and local actors are supposed to work together to identify and, if necessary, formalise locally recognised entitlements. In this process, NGOs closely work with the state to support people's participation in NRM and are, to a large extent, repoliticised. This repoliticisation may be considered as a part of

'state-society synergistic strategies' to span the previous 'public-private divide' in development (Evans 1996).¹⁸

In sum, the Environmental Entitlements Framework has shown the possibility of considering the 'poor' as individual actors and illustrated the possible influence of their informal groupings on community-based NRM ('communities cannot be treated as static or undifferentiated, made up as they are of active individuals and groups' Leach et al. 1999: 232). The Framework has also reconceptualised the role of NGOs, the state and the market in sustainable development in reference to people's livelihoods and organising processes in their social and natural environment (which indicate 'institutions', that is, 'regularized patterns of behaviour between individuals and groups in society' according to Leach et al. 1999. See Chapter 4 for more discussions).

Referring to this general overview of sustainable development and current NRM thinking on issues of community, entitlements and institutions, I want now to turn to an outline of development processes in the Brazilian Amazon in order to introduce the local context of sustainable development in the Region.

Politicisations of the Brazilian Amazon

Contemporary history of the Brazilian Amazon largely represents a history of politicisation (including the process of depoliticisation and repoliticisation). This was needed firstly for the national government to integrate and develop the territory (1950s - 1990s) and secondly for the international community to apply discourses of global environmentalism and sustainable development (1970s - present).¹⁹ The concept of sustainable development was vigorously promoted in the context of regional development in the Amazon in the 1990s, in order to 'sustain Amazonia' (Hall 1997) for the inhabitants as well as for humanity (see below). This overview presents a number of issues that will be discussed in this study, such as the discursive and practical reconstruction process of 'community' as a unit of analysis and action in the Brazilian Amazon and its influence over actual social development processes.

The national discourse of integration

The politicisation of the Amazon started in the 1950s as the federal government attempted to fully incorporate the Amazonian territory into the national-state

of Brazil. In 1953, the federal government demarcated the Legal Amazon for its 'development',²⁰ and installed the first federal agency, Superintendency for the Economic Valorisation Plan of the Amazon (SPVEA), exclusively for the Amazon's economic development (Homma 2003). The decision to relocate the national capital from Rio de Janeiro (in the south-eastern coast) to Brasília in the state of Goiás (in the centre-west) was made to bring 'order and progress' to the nation's *interior*²¹ and, when Brasília was inaugurated in 1960, the first road to penetrate the Amazon, known as the Belém-Brasília Highway (BR-010), was officially opened to connect the new national capital to the Amazon's largest city, Belém in Pará.²² Before the opening of the Highway, the Amazon was only accessible by fluvial transport or air, and was isolated from the national political and economic centres while maintaining its dense primary forest.

In short, in the national context of 1950s Brazil, the Amazon became politicised as a region to be integrated and developed. Community development projects were widely implemented in the form of health posts and schools both in old and new settlements. This included Amerindian villages (*aldeias*) that the Catholic Church had organised since the colonial era (Wagley 1953; Ianni 1981[1978]). In the period of the military regime, between 1964 and 1985, the federal government further promoted a developmentalist policy by launching a series of integration programmes²³ and by implementing new municipalities, the smallest administrative districts in Brazil. The new municipal governments in the Amazon became the principal carriers for community development projects planned by the state and federal governments.²⁴ At the same time, large ranchers and private entrepreneurs from the developed south of Brazil were invited to settle in the Amazon to facilitate its rapid economic development.

The global discourse of forest conservation

In the 1970s, the international community started to politicise the Amazon as a unique ecosystem, a source of genetic resources and biodiversity, and even a solution to global climate change. As 'environmental mobilisation' intensified in international politics (Buttel 1996), the Brazilian federal government had to face international calls pressing for the conservation of the Amazon rainforest. In fact, this international pressure initially fuelled the elaboration of a geopolitical discourse by the military government, which held up the

well-known slogan: *Integrar para não entregar! Terra sem homens para homens sem terras!* (Integrate the Amazon in order not to let it fall into foreign hands! Land without men for the men without lands!²⁵). The slogan resulted in a discourse of *internacionalização* (i.e. the internationalised Amazon) among Brazilian politicians and intellectuals who tried to 'nationalise' the Amazon (e.g. Petit 2003; Pinto 2005).²⁶

Against this background, global environmentalism partly induced systematic deforestation, as the federal government used this discourse to promote road construction, mining, a hydroelectric dam, and 'grassification' (Sternberg 1973)²⁷ or colonisation. The global media covered 'the drama' 'with pictures of huge palls of smoke' and stories of 'seemingly clear villains' (i.e. large cattle ranchers, logging companies, governments and international donors such as the World Bank) and 'tragic victims' (i.e. small fruit and nut collectors, environmental activists and symbolised 'martyrs' like Chico Mendes²⁸) (Hurrell 1991: 197). The image of 'drama' raised public awareness and started to mobilise a large number of scientists and experts to make inquiries into deforestation and 'sustainability' problems in the Brazilian Amazon.²⁹

The Amazon as a global common

In the 1980s, scientists and experts attributed the cause of 'deforestation' in the Brazilian Amazon to 'the failure of the modern state' and its bureaucracy (Bunker 1985) or 'wrong' national policy applications to the region (e.g. Moran 1983; Schmink and Wood 1984; Hecht and Cockburn 1989; Goodman and Hall 1990). In the field of cultural ecology, discussions were generated on 'human adaptation' and 'carrying capacity' (e.g. Fearnside 1983; Meggers 1996 [1971], see also Moran 1990) in order to scientifically prove that the Amazonian rainforest was a 'fragile' environment unsuited to commercial agriculture or cattle ranching (e.g. Browder 1989; Nishizawa and Uitto 1995).

In the 1990s, conservation discourses began to present the Amazon rainforest as one of 'our global commons' and called for direct involvement in its conservation by the international community (Bromley and Cochrane 1994). For example, Goodman and Hall (1990: 1) state:

The 1990s will be decisive for Amazonia. Before the dawning of the third millennium, planners and policy-makers must decide whether the world's

largest remaining area of tropical rainforest will follow much of Africa and South-East Asia down the path of irreversible destruction, or whether the resources of this vast region will be harnessed for the benefit of Brazilian society and the world as a whole.

This statement implicitly touches upon the problem of historicity of the Amazon in international development, which is now expected to benefit 'the world as a whole' simply because its deforestation came later than in Africa and South-East Asia. At the same time, this fact begs clarification on the nature of Amazonian development and the global conservationist discourse: First, it is not relevant to compare the Amazon with tropical rainforests in Africa and South-East Asia that have been destroyed through population pressure and fuel wood consumption (e.g. Conroy and Litvinoff 1988; Guha and Martinez-Alier 1997). In the Amazon, regional population density is low (about 2 per km² in 2000, see IBGE 2001) and fuel woods consumption is minimal. Overall, about 20% of the Amazon's original forest is said to have been destroyed (Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Floresta 2005). However the threat does not appear to affect the way local inhabitants or governments 'destroy' the forest, whereas a number of studies warn them of the coming crisis (e.g. Fearnside 1990; Clüsener-Godt and Sachs 1995; Sponsel et al. 1996; and Kingsbury 2004).³⁰

Second, the presentation of the Amazon as a global common entails the scientific assumption that is directed to the biophysical future of the forest with 'a high level of uncertainty' (Keeley and Scoones 1999). The future of the Amazon is analytically and politically conflated with the future of the global environment as science started to play an important role in politics in the 1990s (Beck 1992, 1995).³¹ In this political environment, the history of the Amazon and the problem of 'chronic poverty' within its population was neglected (Kitamura 1994) since the inhabitants seemed to be suddenly 'discovered' in the course of deforestation as a part of the Amazon ecosystem (cf. Moran 1990).

Sustainable development and NRM approaches in the Amazon

Participants of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (The Earth Summit) in 1992 shared a view of the Amazon as a global common, and developed programmes to put the global conservationist discourse into practice. For example, as we saw above, the Brazilian Tropical

Rainforest Fund (PPG7) was launched, and it started to finance various types of 'sustainable and participatory development projects' at municipal levels in the Amazon (see Chapters 6 and 7). The Summit showed that environmentalism was also growing among activists and intellectuals in Brazil who started to put political pressures on the federal government.³²

The federal government thus started to generate environmental policies and long-term plans for 'sustainable economic development' of the Amazon. This change in policy environment encouraged scientists and activists to establish NGOs and research institutes in major Amazonian cities like Belém and Manaus (the state capital of Amazonas) and to initiate sustainable development projects by allying with local government institutions.³³

Local governments quickly adopted the concept of sustainable development within their policy discourse prompted by federal government policy and the active involvement of international agencies and NGOs. In the case of Pará, the state government promoted the slogan, 'development without destruction' in the mid-1990s (Oliveira et al. 1998). For local governments, 'development' was a non-negotiable priority since environmental policies and projects could not be implemented without economic development or financial support from the federal government and international agencies. By the same token, in order to obtain financial support, they needed to promise that they would not destroy the forest.

At this point, the issue of 'poverty' was (re)discovered in relation to environmental conservation in general and locally implemented NRM strategies in particular. The discovery was not directly linked to identification of chronic poverty amongst the Amazonian population, as Kitamura (1994) suggests (see above); instead being linked to a renewal of the image of 'poor' Amazonians who would eventually destroy the forest if they were not properly supported (or indeed 'developed').

It is now well known that the deforestation rate is high when the economic growth rate is high in the Brazilian Amazon because of an associated increase in timber and charcoal production (for iron refineries) or expansion of commercial agriculture and land speculation (Wunder 2001). The land-seeking poor can accelerate deforestation, but it is more likely that extensive deforestation takes place when a group of poor people becomes richer or simply when large farmers or companies are involved. In other words, 'poverty' itself is unlikely to be the cause of extensive deforestation (Guha and Martinez-Alier 1997; see also Chomitz 2007 for a recent overview on

the relationship between poverty and deforestation), but it has been discursively made the cause of deforestation for governments to pursue economic development with support from the 'pro-poor' and conservationist international development community.

Environmental policy processes put the issue of poverty on the policy agenda without substantially modifying institutional arrangements to tackle social problems that have created situations described as poverty in the Amazon. In this sense, the concept of sustainable development generated a 'coalition' of experts (policy makers, scientists and NGO workers) who created a 'common story-line' (Keenley and Scoones 1999: 25, see also Hajer 1995) to justify the view that poverty causes deforestation (and vice versa) in the Brazilian Amazon.

In the course of introducing the issue of poverty to forest conservation, the practice of sustainable development became technocratic to achieve multiple (i.e. ecological, economic, social and financial) 'sustainabilities' for the poor (cf. see the idea of capital assets embedded within Sustainable Livelihood Approaches, though integrated schemes in the Amazon did not explicitly use such an approach³⁴). As Brazil internalised neo-liberal policies in the 1990s under the Cardoso government (Fleisher 1998), many state companies and banks, which had been influential in Amazonian development, were privatised, and the managerialism prevailed. In this process, the state gained a new role as environmental manager while NGOs, the private sectors and local producers' organisations were encouraged to embrace 'sustainable business' activities (Ministry of Environment and PPG7 2002, see Chapter 7).³⁵

Reconstruction of communities

In order to achieve multiple sustainabilities in the Amazon, the government had to tackle the rights of old and new inhabitants to the forest and cleared land while tightening its control over the remaining forest. Recently, for example, the Pará state government started to promote 'macro ecological and economic zoning' as one of the most effective strategies for pursuing 'development without destruction' through its territorial reorganisation.³⁶ The idea of new controls over the Amazonian territory even renewed the regional cooperation among the Amazonian countries, as the Amazon Cooperation Treaty, which had existed since 1978, implemented its permanent secretariat (Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation) in Brasília in 2002 to

make 'integrated political efforts' to achieve 'the Amazon continent's sustainable development' (ACTO 2004).

The renewal of political controls and the various sustainable strategies that had been elaborated by scientists and technocrats led to the analytical reconstruction of 'communities'. It was principally because the strategies – such as sustainable agriculture (i.e. the agro-forestry system), fruit and nut extraction,³⁷ non-timber forest products (NTFPs), development and environmental services including ecotourism and the carbon trade - essentially required 'well-planned systems' in local communities (Caviglia 1999). These sustainable strategies recognised the importance of 'indigenous knowledge' (Posey and Balée 1989) to 'agricultural intensification' which was said to be 'the only realistic strategy for addressing poverty and environment problems' in Latin America (Pichón and Uquillas 1999: 23). Thus, 'communities' were deliberately and conceptually connected to the indigenusness of the Amazonian population in relation to the forest, which had long been modified.

In this context, Amazonian farmers and settlers came to be depicted as 'disorganised', and both government and non-government sustainable development projects and programmes started to design producers' organisations to implement the strategies. The main assumption here is that the poor have been too powerless and untrained to organise themselves to improve their production capacities and to achieve commercial as well as environmental sustainabilities. Thus, they need to be empowered to form 'their own' organisations, such as associations and cooperatives, in those projects and programmes.

Local practices and counter-tendencies

In sum, the current reconstruction of the community and producers' organisations that are widely seen in the Brazilian Amazon are outcomes of the complex process of interactions between national and international political discourses. Amazonian people and government agencies on the ground have continuously experienced different applications of these political discourses. In this respect, we can roughly outline their everyday practices affected by the discourses as two forms of 'counter-tendencies' (Arce and Long 2000). The first counter-tendency is directed towards the politico-administrative reorganisation of localities initiated by government agencies; and the second is

directed towards socio-economic organisations shaped by local people's 'organising practices' (Nuijten 1992).

Politico-administrative reorganisations indicate the configuration of official area demarcations. Through the implementation of zoning and monitoring systems, forest (or extractive) and indigenous reserves have been designated as conservation units (including national parks) by the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA);³⁸ and settlement projects have been officially implemented in the cleared land by the National Institute of Colonisation and Agrarian Reform (INCRA) (see Chapter 4 for details). Demarcation of forest and land through the use of maps has generated conflict between indigenous populations, settlers and government officials; indeed on various occasions government has had to resort to military force to settle these disputes. As a result of the conflicts, the initial demarcation and zoning were often reconfigured, and empirical borders between forest, rural or urban were often blurred in local contexts (cf. Cleary 1993). Thus, people no longer identified themselves as rural or urban or forest-dwellers as they had experienced several spatial changes over time.

Socio-economic organisations indicate, for example, producers' cooperatives, women's associations, political parties and church organisations. They are not geographically based reorganisations but dependent on pragmatic needs of individual actors who use organisations to claim property rights and obtain credits or to attract projects. These organisations are likely to be short-lived unless they acquire firm political positions in the process of geographical reorganisations mentioned above, since they are often merely the 'means' for actors to achieve their temporary goals. In spite of the flexibility and fluidity, outsiders often misinterpret socio-economic organisations as 'community organisations' in which their members share the same or similar goals and purposes.

Several historical records and studies show that complex society existed in the Brazilian Amazon long before the federal government started to implement integration policies (see Little 2001 for an overview). This previous society was mainly shaped by catechist movements (e.g. Wagley 1953; Ianni 1981[1978]; Parker 1980) but also penetrated by the commercial extraction economy (principally of natural rubber and brazil nuts). Though less studied, the 'society' (or societies) of immigrants was equally complex and largely influenced by political situations in their region of origin and by development policy processes in Brazil (e.g. Lisansky 1990).

Today, we may assert that characteristics of the previous complexity of Amazon society may have changed substantially. But we can fully grasp the 'change' only by understanding local actors' accumulated experiences with the development process since, as we have discussed so far, official claims of 'change' are largely discursive. We may understand actors' experiences of change in relation to the official claims by observing how these Amazonian actors are involved in the politico-administrative reorganisation and the socio-economic organisation, as these organisational processes indicate how actors deal with their own histories. As we discuss in different parts of this study, experiences and histories are principal 'resources' from which individual actors further accrue their capability to rearrange actions and practices (so that they may reconfigure their organisations). Thus, it is wrong to assume that Amazonians are 'disorganised' and need to be 'empowered' or trained to be able to organise themselves. It is more likely that they are already organising themselves in ways that are different from how government officials or development experts expect because they are capable of accumulating and using their 'resources'.

Structure, Agency and Social Practices in the Brazilian Amazon

How do we analyse the capability of the local Amazonians who accumulate their experiences and use their resources in the course of development interventions? In this last section, I want to introduce a theoretical discussion on human agency and social practices and peoples' relations to the forest in the Brazilian Amazon in order to set a general analytical framework to understand the flexible and fluid nature of settlers' organisations and communities.

The Environmental Entitlements Framework (Leach et al. 1999) discussed above introduces the concept of human agency to community-based natural resource management in order to address 'how structures, rules and norms emerge as products of people's practices and actions, both...[in the]...intended and unintended...[forms]' and to 'contextualise...[community]...by describing...a temporary unity of situation, interest or purpose' (Leach et al. 1999: 230, see also Cleaver 2002 for a discussion on the relationship between 'agents' and 'institution').³⁹ By inquiring into the nature of human agency of the Amazonian settlers in Pará, we may come to understand how their 'practices and actions', which stem from their everyday existence and interactions with the surrounding environment,

produce and configure local 'structure, rules and norms' in relation to the government and non-government interventions.

Here, we need to emphasise that the focus of this study is on the process of 'deforestation' within settlement areas where settlers' everyday existence and interactions are not always backed by the normative existence of customary law and order. In general, as we saw above, NRM strategies and the reconstruction of communities took place in parallel with the discovery of indigenous knowledge and customary rights to natural resources, which were to be mapped and institutionalised. In contrast to these 'customary law' situations, the settlement areas in Pará require us to start our analysis with an identification of the social conditions that enable people to take different actions vis-à-vis their changing social and natural environment (for an earlier discussion on a need of sociological studies on new settlement projects worldwide, see Scudder 1991).⁴⁰ A focus on human agency may lead to a better understanding of 'the social' in sustainable development contexts within the Brazilian Amazon since it allows us to look into the ways in which social actors interact with one another, development policies and projects, and the surrounding environment.⁴¹

The concept of human agency is also methodologically important to social researchers since it permits us to explore the 'temporary unity of situation' (Leach et al. 1999, see above), rather than focusing on the 'established communities' that are at the heart of NRM models. By focusing on situations of temporary unit, local actors' worldviews can be observed and described in relation to the institutional representation of them made by outside development agencies (see Chapter 3 for a methodological discussion).

At this point, we may need to draw on social theory in order to deepen our understanding of the theoretical meaning of human agency in contrast to structural approaches that development policies and projects entail (e.g. Long and Ploeg 1989, 1994). In social theory, the relation between structure and agency has been debated since the end of the 1970s. This debate has generated a number of theoretical and methodological efforts to overcome the previous 'micro-macro', 'structure-action' or 'individual-collective' dualism (Knorr-Cetina and Cicourel 1981; see also Eisenstadt and Helle 1985; Fielding 1988; Haynor 1989). This body of work is significant for our focus on human agency in sustainable development as we seek to elucidate the relations between individual settlers, their groupings, the wider social structure, the natural environment and development intervention in our analysis.

Below, I want to introduce 'practice theory' developed by Giddens (1979, 1984) and Bourdieu (1977, 1990) as they have sought to address the dualism between structure and agency.⁴² Based on an understanding of their theoretical positions, I return to discuss how the concepts of agency and practice become useful for our analysis of sustainable development processes within settlements in Pará.

Giddens's theory of structuration

Giddens's structuration theory presents the indispensability of structure and agency in one analytical framework by placing 'the duality of structure' as its theorem instead of dualism, as he explains that 'the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organise' (Giddens 1984: 25). Here, 'structure', which is out of time and space, indicates 'rules and resources' organised as the properties of social systems that consist of 'the situated activities of human agents reproduced across time and space' (*ibid.*: 25). By placing 'social systems' between structure and agency, structuration theory overcomes the dualism and analytically transforms the structure as a deterministic 'societal frame' (dubbed a 'skeleton' in Ploeg 2003) into a changeable 'process' (i.e. 'both medium and outcome of practices').⁴³

Giddens developed structuration theory to criticise functionalist sociology established by Parsons and his followers in the 1950s-1960s (Giddens 1984: 1). Functionalists conceptualised social action as an 'enactment' of societal rules and, thus, did not create analytical space for human agency, that is, 'knowledgeability and capability' for actors to make a difference or to 'act otherwise' (*ibid.*: 14). However, as Joas (1996: 211) points out, a Giddens's achievement can be recognised not only in the theoretical content itself but also in how he criticises functionalism without accepting 'methodological individualism or logical positivism' (see Chapter 3). Indeed, the structure-agency dualism has been rooted in a polarising debate on whether social structure determines individual actions or the other way around. Giddens shifted this debate by reinterpreting 'societies as intersections of multiple sets of recurring practices' that are 'rarely cleanly demarcated in space and time' (according to Schatzki 1996: 4). Through this practice-based reinterpretation of society, Giddens resituates human agency 'not as opposed to, but as a constituent of, structure' as well as retaining agency's 'profoundly social and collective' aspects (Sewell 1992: 20-21).

Bourdieu's theory of practice

While Giddens has sought to reconceptualise Parsonian functionalism, Bourdieu has tried to establish a theory of practice principally to reconceptualise another tradition in social theory, namely Marxism, which also became structuralist.⁴⁴ He has proposed the 'theory of the social space' in order to make 'practice-based breaks' with Marxist theory (Bourdieu 1985: 723). Although their terminologies are quite different, what Giddens's and Bourdieu's theories have in common is that they try to reposition agency as a social element and a key to 'transcend objectivism and subjectivism' that have impinged upon the structure-agency dualism (Bourdieu 1992: 126).⁴⁵

In the place of Giddens's theory of structuration, Bourdieu conceptualises *habitus* that can be roughly understood as 'temporally durable social structures' constituted by the dispositions of agents, which are further defined by their positions within the space of relationships named the 'social field' (e.g. Bourdieu 1977; Wacquant 1992). Just as Giddens places structure as a process, the Bourdieu's *habitus* is *ad hoc* (Ortner 1984); an interactive space in the social field in which group-forming practices take place. This focus on group-forming practices in the social field is where Bourdieu marks his break with the Marxists who insist on 'class on paper' (Bourdieu 1985: 725).

The conceptualisation of *habitus* may seem to 'retain the agent-proof quality' (Sewell 1992: 15) since it takes agents' dispositions and social positions as essential elements of the reproduction of the social space. Agents who have similar dispositions in the same positions are supposed to share the rules and resources (which Bourdieu famously elaborates as different capitals including symbolic capital) and, thus, social structure 'out there' is still analytically maintained to indicate the agents' positions, which simultaneously shape their dispositions. Nevertheless, as with Giddens's theory of structuration, Bourdieu's contribution to the understanding of human agency in relation to structure should be recognised because his conceptualisation of *habitus* also indicates 'primary forms of classification' in which agents' knowledge of the construction of the social world is analytically taken into account (Bourdieu 1984). Bourdieu further elaborates the concept of 'mental structures' of agents, which are shaped by their position in relation to *habitus* and thus by their disposition. By doing so, he tries to overcome cognitive approaches in general

such as (symbolic) interactionism and ethnomethodology (Bourdieu 1984: 467-468).

Now, let us turn our attention to the concern with human agency of the Amazonian settlers. The immediate question is: How do we understand the social process through which an individual maintains individuality while participating in collective activities? For example, I have in mind a situation in which a settler keeps felling the forest within the boundaries of his property while simultaneously taking part in a 'community project' that promotes sustainable development. Or, is this situation better understood by looking at the individual settler's 'multiple identification processes' with different social spaces created in the process of physical environmental changes? By drawing on the contributions of Giddens and Bourdieu, we may further have to reposition the significance of individual and collective actions in the actors' immediate 'society' and structures⁴⁶ as they are shaped and reshaped in the course of physical spatial changes.

Individual and collective actions and landscape

Both Giddens and Bourdieu conceptualise individuals as 'agents' who can exercise their agency to reconstitute 'structures, rules and norms' and thus reformulate the concept of structure as a 'process of ordering' (Long and Ploeg 1995; Ploeg 2003: 12, see also Law 1994). At the same time, they both emphasise that agency is socially constructed since the process of ordering becomes only effective in constructing, maintaining or changing social and cultural relations (thus, by analytically acquiring agency, the 'individual' becomes the 'social actor', see Chapter 3). Yet, we are not sure when and how the nature of individual action can influence an actor's participation in and departure from particular collective activities. How does an individual agent actively and passively identify with social spaces that are continuously created and reshaped through physical environmental change? To what extent does the 'natural environmental structure' provide constraints and freedoms for actors when undertaking individual and collective actions?

The Environmental Entitlements Framework partly answers the last question by applying Giddens' structuration theory to an analysis of the natural environment.⁴⁷ Leach et al. (1999: 240) call for a deeper understanding of the 'structuration of the environment' and conceptualises natural environment as 'both medium and outcome' of actors' practices. By

doing so, natural environment becomes analytically 'landscape', which is continuously shaped and ordered by human action and interaction, while also presenting actors with the possibility of differently interpreting their available property and resources (see also Agrawal and Sivaramakrishnan 2000).⁴⁸

Bourdieu's theorisation of habitus and the social field has not been sufficiently discussed in NRM studies despite its potential usefulness for the analysis of social relations established and configured in changing landscape.⁴⁹ In my understanding, the idea of 'entitlement mapping' proposed in the Environmental Entitlements Framework indicates an identification of actors' 'dispositions and positions' within an environment because entitlements are classified over natural resources according to these actors' social positions and thus dispositions within the social field. Therefore, if we accept that a particular natural environment is part of actors' habitus, we can also describe the natural environment as a cultural resource (and landscape), and the actors' logic of deforestation can be understood as the making of new physical and social spaces that reshape their positions and dispositions. However, as Ortner (1984: 150) argues, the Bourdieu's concerns with action might be focusing too much on 'ad hoc decision making' in habitus and fail to analytically include the long-term 'life projects' understood from actors' own standpoints.

Understanding actors' projects is crucial for us to analyse how rules and resources emerge from the process of actors' struggles and negotiations in their lifeworlds (see Chapter 4 for a discussion on life projects and lifeworlds). The emergence of these rules and resources is embodied within a local style (or knowledge) that allows actors to claim their rights to land and forest in the Brazilian Amazon. Counter-tendencies often indicate that such local styles of development are shaped through 'a course of action that runs counter to what development experts assume to be optional' (Arce and Long 2000: 182). In the study area, the local style of development is internalised continuously in an actor's individual (or household) livelihood organisation, which has depended on the land and also forest transactions (cf. see Ingold 2000 for an analysis of natural environment as both 'livelihood' and 'global' condition).

This means that the internalisation of the newly established rules and resources may also work to individualise the local style that has emerged around claims to the land. In this respect, each actor is indeed 'capable and knowledgeable' of configuring rules and resources to repeat his or her experience in practicing forest felling, agricultural production, property rights

claims and land transactions. In this process, we may need to pay attention to the relationship between individual actions and collective action. It shows how social relations and interactions in the new settlement are shaped and configure physical and social spaces, which further reshape the form of the settlement and landscape.

In sum, on the theoretical level, the present study aims to explore the relationship between social practices and landscape by deepening the understanding of human agency and social space in reference to NRM approaches applied to the settlements in Pará. The focus on agency and social space offers us an analytical context to outline the relationship between local actors' individuality and collectivity (including formal organisation) in dealing with (or 'structuring') development policies and NRM projects. When we understand the relationship, we may be able to analytically introduce actors' worldviews into policy debates on sustainable development and assess NRM approaches as applied to the Brazilian Amazon.

Finally, at this point, we may reformulate the main questions to be answered in this study: How do we identify local actors' social actions and practices that localise policy and project processes of sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon? How can we understand the interaction between practices and landscape? Is the current understanding of agency enough for the researcher to analyse landscape changes in the Amazon? What are the problems of current sustainable development discourses and practices when applied to the Amazon?

The present study builds on case studies based on observation of local settlers' practices in the settlement of Novo Paraíso in the southeast of Pará introduced in the last chapter. In the case studies, I specifically try to understand the history and experiences of Amazonian settlers in relation to economic development, sustainable development policy processes and project applications. Settlers' experiences are observed in the context of social arrangements through which their individual and collective actions in relation to surrounding forests and lands are identified. Indeed, the settlers' socio-economic organisations present various forms (including, in parallel with the politico-administrative reorganisations), and they are far less 'purposeful' or 'community-oriented' than experts' currently assume when developing sustainable development policies and NRM strategies. The flexibility and multiplicity of organisations in the settlement are closely linked to how diverse physical and social spaces are created in the process of landscape change and

to how individual actors identify their experiences in reference to these new spaces. This study tries to deepen our understanding of links between actions, spaces and people's experiences, given that these elements are often oversimplified in sustainable development project processes.

Notes

¹ Hajer (1997 [1995]: 24) writes that '1972 is often taken as the starting-point for the wave of environmental politics' for being the year in which *The Limits to Growth* (a Club of Rome report) was published and the United Nations Conference on Human Environment was held in Stockholm, Sweden. Adams (1990: 42-56) emphasises the importance of the World Conservation Strategy published by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in 1980, which mentioned the concept of sustainable development. In 1980, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Wildlife Fund were created, and the concept of ecodevelopment was established as an early basis for sustainable development (Lélé 1991). I start this review from 1987 simply because it was when the concept of sustainable development was normalised (rather than being proposed as an alternative). For example, a financial institution like the World Bank installed the Department of Environment in 1987.

² Here, the Report defines sustainable development as a type of development that 'meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (*ibid*: 8).

³ Amazonian nations include: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname and Venezuela. They had formed the Amazon Cooperation Treaty since 1978, which was reorganised as the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation (ACTO) in 2002.

⁴ PPG7 was previously conceived in 1990 whose initial USD 300 million were supplied by G7 countries (Germany, France, the UK, Italy, Japan, the US, Canada) plus the Netherlands, EU and Brazil.

⁵ I have consulted the following review articles to organise the discussion in this section: On community development, Oakeley (1998); on community development and sustainable livelihoods, Brocklesby and Fisher (2003), Arce (2003a); on community participation, Midgley (1986); on rural livelihoods, Ellis (1998); on rural development, Ellis and Biggs (2001); on planned rural development, Long and Ploeg (1989 and 1995); and on social development, Booth (1994) and Midgley (2003).

⁶ Apthorpe and Ortiz avoid the use of the term community in their studies and propose the use of 'social organisation' and 'human behaviour' as the central concepts in social planning.

⁷ According to Adams (1990: 23), 'ecological managerialism' is rooted in '[t]he science of ecology developed at the end of the nineteenth century in Europe and the USA... Among many other attributes, ecology has at different times seemed to offer new, value-free and apolitical ways of not only understanding but also managing the environment'. In the post world wars period, the African 'natural environment...relatively little affected by people' was 'discovered' to be effectively managed in the new nation building processes.

⁸ The initial conceptual thinking that led to Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches came out of researchers based in International Development Study Centre (IDS) of the University of Sussex, who extensively drew on the work of Amartya Sen on participatory development, environmentalism and vulnerability. The Approaches were mainly advocated by British development agencies like the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the UK based international NGOs like CARE and Oxfam (Brocklesby and Fisher 2003) (though it was also taken up by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) in the late-1990s). Therefore, the main discussions on these approaches introduced in this section were presented by scholars based in the academic institutions in the UK: IDS (Chambers 1988, Chambers and Conway 1991, Scoones 1998); International Institute of Environment and Development (Chambers and Conway 1991); Overseas Development Institute (Farrington et al. 2001; Conway et al. 2002) and DFID (Carney 1998); and the University of East Anglia (Ellis 1998). According to de Haan and Zoomers (2005: 30-31), the trend was consolidated in the UK as the New Labour government was elected in 1997.

⁹ Household livelihood has been a significant conceptual element in social anthropology. In the context of development, the concept retained its importance with the rise of political economy and economic anthropology in the 1970s, which discussed the family cycle of peasantries in relation to capitalist expansion, following the theory of peasant economy developed by Chayanov (see Durrenberger 1984). According to Wallman (1984: 22-23), in social anthropology, '[l]ivelihood is never just a matter of finding or making shelter, transacting money, and preparing food to put on the table of exchange in the market place. It is equally a matter of the ownership and circulation of information, the management of relationships, the affirmation of personal significance and group identity, and the interrelation of each of those tasks to the other. All these productive tasks together constitute the work of livelihood'.

¹⁰ Ellis (1998: 30, footnote 3) suggests that 'an important branch of enquiry' in livelihoods diversification is 'the interrelationship of diversification strategies with natural resource management and the environment'.

¹¹ The agencies include: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, Swedish International Development Agency, the Department for International Development in the UK (DFID) and CARE UK.

¹² Interestingly, the term 'sustainable development' appeared in the UN Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 but was deleted in the revised Declaration in 1966: 'Article 9 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights (1948-66) states that all people "should promote sustainable development all over the world to assure dignity, freedom, security and justice"' (Mayhew 2004).

¹³ See Kapoor (2002) for a criticism of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method proposed by Chambers (1994), which can also be applied to Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches whose 'empiricist orientation' has resulted in the insufficient theorisation and politicisation. Here, it may be adequate to quote from Moser (2005: 29) the importance of 'politicisation' of development: 'If the primary emphasis of development policy for the past thirty years has been economic in nature, with the new millennium has come a fundamental shift in focus: the political dimension of development is increasingly identified as the predominant concern in and of itself, and in relation to poverty reduction. Since politics are essentially about power relations, the links between power and poverty are finally on the agenda of international development institutions'.

¹⁴In this sense, the concept of social capital applied to NRM has worked to 'repoliticise' development rather than 'depoliticise' it (cf. Cleaver 2000, Harriss 2002[2001]). Nevertheless, Harriss's (2002[2001]) criticism of the concept of social capital taken up by the World Bank is very convincing since he clearly shows how the concept has facilitated the elimination of issues of power, structure, and the state's responsibility in the international development agenda (see also Ferguson 1994[1990]). In the Rights-Based Approach and NRM studies, the depoliticising effect of social capital has to be further examined since it can also be the renewed bond between the depoliticised development practices and the state as the duty bearer. See Evans (1996) for the relationship between social capital and 'good government' (who largely draws on case studies of Brazil in Tandler 1997).

¹⁵ Note that others have also used the concept of 'entitlements' to discuss sustainable development. Helmore and Singh (2001) include entitlements as 'safety nets' in people's livelihoods organisations, and Conway et al. (2002) define (formal) rights as 'wider entitlements'. Sen's original definition of the entitlement of a person 'stands for the set of different alternative commodity bundles that the person can acquire through the use of the various legal channels of acquirement open to someone in his position' (Sen 1990: 191).

¹⁶ Social actors are individual persons, collective groups, organisations, or 'macro' actors like a national government, church, etc. (Long 2001: 241). However, 'one should not assume that organisations or collectivities such as social movements act in unison or with one voice' since they are 'coalitions of actors' and 'interlocking actor projects' (*ibid*: 241). Therefore, while the social actor can indicate a non-individual entity, the core of the analysis is the individual who is socially constructed or situated in the social world (cf. Knorr-Cetina 1981: 17; Ortner 1984: 149). See Chapter 3 for a discussion on differences between the individual and the social actor.

¹⁷ Nevertheless, we should not underestimate the significance of the corporations' philanthropic activities to financial and political mobilisations (see Chapter 7).

¹⁸ Evans writes: 'Linking mobilized citizens to public agencies can enhance the efficacy of government...Better understanding of the nature of synergistic relations between state and society and the conditions under which such relations can most easily be constructed should become a component of future theories of development' (*ibid*: 1130).

¹⁹ Note that this overview focuses on an understanding of the recent application of sustainable development thinking to development in the Brazilian Amazon. Previous literature on the contemporary history of the Brazilian Amazon has mainly focused on the political economy of frontier development and analysed Amazonian development history as the history of the expansion of capitalism (e.g. Foweraker 1981; Schmink and Wood 1984; Becker et al. 1990; see also Cleary 1993 for an overview).

²⁰ The designation of Legal Amazon was completed in 1960, the year of the inauguration of Brasília. It includes the following states: Amazonas; Pará; northern part of Mato Grosso; western part of Maranhão; Rondônia; Acre; Tocantins (separated from Goiás in 1988); Roraima; and Amapá. The Amazon is also often referred to as North Region (*Região Norte*), which does not include Maranhão (Northeast) and Mato Grosso (Centre-west).

²¹ In Brazil, *interior* means non-city areas. As all the main cities in Brazil had been situated along the coast (except some mining cities developed in colonial times), anywhere that was 'interior' of the country has been called *interior*. At a micro level, from the city dwellers' view, *interior* indicates outside the city including rural towns whereas in rural towns, people refer to interior for forest areas or remote islands.

²² Belém was a fort built in 1616 on an estuary of the Amazon River by Portuguese colonisers seeking to repel European competitors like France, Britain and Holland. From 1626 to 1775, Belém thrived as the state capital of Grão Pará since '[c]ontact with Lisbon was easier [from Belém] than from Salvador (in the northeastern state of Bahía, then the centre of coastal colonisation by Portugal)' (Dickenson 1982: 36). Brazil declared its independence firstly as the Brazilian Empire in 1822 with the son of King João of Portugal on the throne before constituting the 'modern nation state' in 1889 (Loveman 2005).

²³ The federal programmes included: the Amazon Operation Programme (*Operação Amazônia* 1966), which transformed SPVEA to Superintendency for the Development of the Amazon (SUDAM); the National Programme for Integration (PIN 1970); the Transamazon Highway (inaugurated in 1972); the Polamazonia (*Programa de Pólos Agropecuários e Agromineais da Amazônia* 1974); the Plan for the Development of the Amazon (PDA I 1972-1975, PDA II 1975-1979); and the Grande Carajás Programme (1980); the National Plan for Agrarian Reform (PNRA 1985-1989).

²⁴ The Brazilian polity is a federal republic consisting of 5,561 municipalities in 26 states and the Federal District (DF) (2005).

²⁵ This slogan actually has its origin in the worst drought that hit the northeast (semi-arid, drier and poorer region in Brazil) in the mid-1960s when thousands of small farmers became landless and moved to the southeast of Brazil (e.g. to São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro) and to the centre-west. Many of them, or their children, later entered and settled in the Amazon at the end of the 1970s and through the 1980s. See Chapter 4.

²⁶ The *internacionalização* discourse still persists. For example, in June 2003, when activists from Greenpeace, an international environmental NGO, campaigned to stop illegal logging in a ship named 'Amazon Guardian', angry sawmill owners and their employees blocked the port of Belém to prevent the activists from landing. At the same time, an association representing local loggers and timber traders put up signboards all over the city, which read: *Amazônia é nosso!* (Amazon is ours!). In an article titled: To internationalise or to nationalise: dilemma, Pinto (2005) writes: 'Today, the phrase (*integrar para não entregar*) sounds like *destruir* (destroy) *para não entregar*. In fact, the Amazon continues to be entirely national. But, it is each time becoming less Amazônia'.

²⁷ According to Sternberg's report, the 'grassification' of the tropics was initially promoted by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) in the 1960s-1970s to increase the world's food production.

²⁸ Chico Mendes (1944-1988) led the rubber tappers' union in the state of Acre in the 1970s-1980s. He became internationally known in 1985 when he asked for extractive reserve protection against cattle ranchers at the US Congress and the World Bank. *Our Common Future* takes up his story as an example of an environmental struggle in developing countries (see also Downing et al. 1992). In 1988, he was murdered by a cattle rancher, and became a symbol of environmentalism in the Amazon. His biography became an international bestseller (*The Burning Season: The murder of Chico Mendes and the fight for the Amazon rainforest* written by Andrew Revkin 1994), which was made into the 1996 Warner film of the same name.

²⁹ See Schmink and Wood (1987) for the early use of 'sustainability' in the context of the Brazilian Amazon; and see Slater (2003) for a detailed analysis of media images and their influence over representation of the Brazilian Amazon at an international level.

³⁰ Fearnside (1990: 180) writes that figures estimating the extent of the deforested area vary between 6% and 17% of the Legal Amazon. A recent study presented by the World Research Institute and AMAZON concludes that 53% of the Brazilian Amazon is today 'under human pressure' (WRI/AMAZON 2006). In any case, deforestation is proceeding in the Amazon as the latest report published by the Ministry of Environment has shown (Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Floresta 2005). See Chapter 4.

³¹ Although it is not the central theme of the present study, it is important to note that there is an interesting field of study on scientists' role in making 'sustainable development of the biosphere' a 'credible' subject that typically omits people (see Douglas 1992). Also, on how environment movements emerged in developed regions that needed scientific evidence and expertise, see Yearly (1992).

³² Environmentalism in Brazil emerged in the 1970s to draw political attention to pollution in cities like São Paulo and to destruction of the Atlantic Forest (*Mata Atlântica*). The Atlantic Forest once abutted the Amazon but was deforested throughout Brazilian colonial and republican history. Today, there is only a patch left (5% of its original size) in and around the state of Rio de Janeiro. Deforestation in the Amazon is often compared to the destruction of the Atlantic Forest (Dean 1995).

³³ The main institutions founded by outside experts around this period included: Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia (AMAZON 1990); Instituto Rede Brasileira Agroflorestral (Rebraf based in Rio de Janeiro, 1990); Programa Pobreza e Meio Ambiente na Amazônia (POEMA 1992); Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM 1995).

³⁴ Like other conceptual English terms, such as 'grassroots' and 'household', the term 'livelihood' is difficult to translate into Portuguese, sometimes leading to misinterpretation. For example, in a research project funded by DFID in which I participated in 2002, one Brazilian expert translated 'household livelihood' to 'life strategy for family agriculture' (*estratégia da vida para agricultura familiar*) without noticing that the translation significantly reduced the conceptual richness of 'livelihood' as a descriptive concept to a prescriptive one.

³⁵ Brazilian (or Amazonian) intellectuals saw the promotion of sustainable development as a neo-liberal trend that transformed natural resource management into a commercial venture (Dutra 2003).

³⁶ The idea of 'zoning' is originally proposed by the federal government in the beginning of the 1990s as 'the most important policy instrument for territorial management through the regulation of the dynamics of land use, according to the concept of sustainability' (Braga et al. 1999: 41). In April 2006, the World Bank approved the 'Pará Integrated Development Project', which lends USD 60 million to the state government, to partly support the implementation of zoning plan.

³⁷ Note that the word 'extractivism', presumably derived from *extrativismo* in Portuguese, is also often used in literature on the Amazon written in English (see for example, Mori 1992; Cleary 1993, Nugent 2003).

³⁸ Conservation units are classified into seven categories according to the state of the forest and its inhabitants who are supposed to 'sustainably' use their unit. According to Braga et al. (1999), approximately 25% of the Amazonian territory has been designated as conservation units since the 1990s.

³⁹ In the 1990s, the actor-oriented approach to development developed by the scholars affiliated with the so-called Wageningen School (see Chapter 3) made significant contributions to the understanding of human agency, practice and the social space in development studies.

In fact, Leach et al. (1999) also draws on the actor-oriented approach to introduce the concept of human agency to NRM.

⁴⁰ Note that in the floodplain in the northern part of Pará, 'established communities' exist in which the customary laws mainly based on kinship relations have been effective to manage fishery resources or palm trees for fruit and nut extractions. Also, in the extractive reserves designated by government agencies, relatively homogenous communities usually have their organisations to manage forest resources with the support from outside. Here, we are mainly trying to understand the landscape change that extensively take place in settlement areas in the dry land, and we are not considering those so-called 'extractivist communities'.

⁴¹ According to Escobar (1995: 193), 'the concept of sustainable development attempts to bring the "new construction of the social" into place'. Though an important point, his formulation falls short since what he actually means by 'the social' here is simply the opposite of 'nature', and his notion of 'the new construction of the social' is confined to a social space created through the conceptual 'death of nature' in which 'environmental managerialism' prevails.

⁴² 'Practice theory' in fact covers the vast research fields in philosophy, anthropology and sociology. As the focus of this chapter is not placed on refining the theoretical argument but on searching for an effective analytical framework to understand the concept of human agency, I briefly illustrate some essences in the theories of Giddens and Bourdieu. The previous studies that have explicitly recognised Giddens and Bourdieu as representative practice theorists include: Ortner (1984); Sewell (1992); and Schatzki (1996). For a concise overview of practice theory, see Schatzki (2001).

⁴³ For a detailed criticism of structuration theory, see Archer (1982). Though Giddens is the most recognised social theorist regarding the structure-agency indispensability, she notes that 'the most detailed argument for the indispensability of both structure and action appeared in the late 1960s' in the study of Percy S. Cohen (1968). Cohen's study summarises 'modern social theory' as consisting of 'two approaches to social reality', namely 'holistic' (functionalism) and 'atomistic' (theory of action and interaction) approaches. However, unlike Giddens, he does not provide a theoretical alternative to the structure-agency dualism, apart from calling for the need of a 'theory of social change' in sociology.

⁴⁴ Structural Marxists vigorously criticised Parsonian (and Durkheimian) notion of 'the social as the "base" of the system' in the 1960s, but they merely proposed more a 'real and objective "base"' in an attempt to 'discover more important functions for the "superstructure"' (Ortner 1984: 141). As a result, they abolished agency just like the functionalists.

⁴⁵ In an interview in 1985, Bourdieu said that he wanted 'to reintroduce agents that Lévi-Strauss and the structuralists, among others Althusser, tended to abolish, making them into simple epiphenomena of structure...And I mean agents, not subjects. Action is not the mere carrying out of a rule, or obedience to a rule' (Bourdieu 1992: 9). Thus, although I present here Bourdieu's theory as a means to overcome structural Marxism, it is important to note that his theory is also meant to be a critique of the Lévi-Straussian structuralist establishment in anthropology.

⁴⁶ Giddens (1984:xxvi) writes that: "'Society" has a useful double meaning, which I have relied upon - signifying a bounded system, and social association in general'. In this study, I understand 'society' as an analytical concept that indicates 'social association in general' which is often represented as 'a bounded system' for particular purposes. In Brazil, *sociedade* (society) is used only in a very abstract way (e.g. in politicians' speeches or in the sentence such as 'we are poor because of our society').

⁴⁷ Gore (1993) also suggests the possibility of applying structuration theory to Sen's original entitlements framework in order to elaborate an 'extended entitlements framework'.

⁴⁸ In the South Asian context, Agrawal and Sivaramakrishnan (2000: 1) emphasise the importance of conceptualising 'agrarian environments' as 'changing hybrid landscapes' in order to 'draw attention to the blurred boundaries between an autonomous nature that supposedly stands outside of human endeavour, and a human agency that is presumed to construct all landscapes'. In the Amazonian context, the nature has been considered largely as 'autonomous' while a human agency has been understood as the source of 'management' or 'destruction'. Thus, here, although I do not discard the possibility of considering the Amazon as an autonomous ecosystem, I would specifically emphasise the need to refine an understanding of human agency in the Brazilian Amazon and the ordering process of the landscape.

⁴⁹ Nugent (2003: 202) rather superficially introduces habitus and agency to an analysis of the 'Amazonian peasantry'. He describes the settlers at the focus of this study as those who 'do not even have a culturally integral agency'.

Methodological Issues and Reflections

As explained in previous chapters, this study examines 'non-established' community situations within the Brazilian Amazon in which people construct and identify themselves in relation to different social forms during the course of their lives. In order to deal with such situations, I have undertaken social situational analysis by using the 'extended case study method' (e.g. Velsen 1967; Garbett 1970; Mitchell 1983; and see also Evens and Handelman 2006 for the latest overview). This chapter firstly introduces my research encounters in Pará to illustrate the significance of focusing on social situations as well as the importance of 'being there' among research subjects not only to observe but also to sense the intangible elements that are crucial to an understanding of what settlers and development experts do and how they make sense of what they do in Pará.

The chapter secondly overviews the extended case study method and its methodological implications for fieldwork, and for the assembly and description of cases and presentation of the thesis. In this context, I introduce an actor-oriented approach to development studies mainly developed by scholars of Wageningen School in the Netherlands in order to situate the extended case study method within social research on development processes. The overview of the actor-oriented approach and the method touches upon the issue of how to reconstruct and contextualise a researcher's ethnographic experiences within a wider setting of development theory and practice.

Finally, the chapter presents some working definitions of basic concepts used in this study - individual, social actor, organisation and collective - in order to clarify how they are used in the following chapters.

Research Encounters

The NGO, which I introduced in Chapter 1, became the base for my research and practical experiences in Pará and as a consequence a significant subject of this study. In this study, I call the NGO 'Actions for Sustainable Development in the Amazon' (ASDA). Experiences at ASDA led me to question the method of community-based sustainable development and to search for a relevant methodology to understand the apparent gap between the logic of the NGO and local realities. In the research process, however, I also realised that the presence of the NGO and its development practices constituted a part of the local reality of its intended 'beneficiaries'. Thus I needed to understand the 'relationship' (rather than the gap) between the way the NGO practiced sustainable development and local peoples' everyday existence and practices.

I was a development practitioner at ASDA, intermittently between 2000 and 2004. My experience as a practitioner was intertwined with my experience of anthropological field research among settlers in Novo Paraíso, and this thesis has been reflexively written as I wished to reconstruct these experiences and to comprehend meanings of the global call for sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon. In the reconstruction process, I began to identify myself as 'a social researcher of development' (cf. Grillo 1997: 2-3) who would focus on the social analysis of development intervention processes in which I myself participated as an observer and practitioner. The contexts of my participation in these processes would become important for analysis and I cared, for example, to note the presence of *técnicos* (agricultural extensionists) who accompanied me during the fieldwork process in order to clarify the specific contexts of intervention through which I observed local situations.¹

The reconstruction process has involved, at the same time, a deconstruction of the images and understanding of sustainable development that I derived from training in sociology and environment sciences in Japan and from initial experiences at ASDA in Pará. When I began to work at ASDA in 2000, I only had a superficial (or biased) image of deforestation, violence, poverty and efforts for sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon. Thus, I blindly believed the NGO workers' explanations that 'small producers' in Pará (i.e. their main beneficiaries) were disorganised, and therefore they needed to empower the producers to manage their 'community organisations' to pursue sustainable development.² It took me some time to doubt this 'knowledge claim' of my colleagues.

The community survey and development practice

When I asked one of the coordinators of ASDA if I could do my fieldwork in Novo Paraíso, he told me that it was a 'frontier community' and I needed to contact 'the community leader' as well as responsible *técnicos* of ASDA's projects in the community. I told them that I was a sociology student and wanted to do fieldwork in the community to write a master's thesis about socio-economic activities of people on the Amazonian frontier, and they enthusiastically responded to the request by saying that they would gladly support my 'survey' (*levantamento*) in Novo Paraíso. Consequently, I made a household questionnaire with some help from other researchers who worked in ASDA, drew a map of Novo Paraíso with the *técnicos* and the community leader, counted houses in the village, and selected 107 households and 25 farms in surrounding areas based on the map. I visited the selected households and farms to interview the members in order to delineate a socio-economic profile of the population (Otsuki 2001, 2003). During this initial fieldwork experience, I noticed that it was not as simple as I had thought to draw a 'community boundary' of Novo Paraíso or clear boundaries of 'surrounding areas' since most informants had different ideas about their 'community' and where they thought they belonged. Nevertheless, at that time, I put aside their 'different ideas' and strived to develop a 'general picture' or 'community profile' through the demographic and occupational data obtained from the interviews and questionnaire.

After the survey was finished, I took the opportunity to work at ASDA as a project coordinator, as I hoped to understand the nature of sustainable development in practice. Then, I began to realise that when *técnicos* and coordinators talked about 'a community' actually this indicated 'an entity of beneficiaries' that could be effectively represented by benefactors and by the beneficiaries themselves. It also seemed that 'a community' was defined through negotiations between different actors including the *técnicos*, coordinators, local authorities and beneficiaries rather than through an 'objective' assessment. Surveys (often called 'socio-economic diagnoses') were always carried out after the practical boundaries of a 'target community' were drawn on the map for project implementation. Therefore, the 'community of Novo Paraíso', which I had surveyed, could have been a community that NGO workers and community leaders arbitrarily constructed. It was only 'after' this process that the researcher would generate sociological explanations.

This reflection bothered me because it meant that the 'community profile' of Novo Paraíso, which I had created, did not, after all, reflect local realities as experienced by people of the locale. Instead the information reflected a 'representation' of the locale by others who were interested in objectifying the place for their purposes. It also meant that defining a community boundary or a 'counterpart organisation' was a highly situational act. At the same time, the defining process testified that one of the principle tasks of local NGO workers was precisely that of making a representation of their beneficiaries and 'the reality' framed in the context of a project (Mosse 2006; see also Chapter 7). In this sense, 'community' was one of the 'social prerequisites' that development planners needed to carry out their projects and programmes (Apthorpe 1976), and the 'community survey' was nothing but a confirmation of such prerequisites.

At this point I turned to the notes and diaries that I had scribbled during the survey activity in Novo Paraíso. They contained observations and notes of conversations with everyone whom I met on the street or in houses and farms (both 'officially' and 'unofficially' visited). They included migration histories, gossip, settlers' behaviour which I found 'strange', my behaviour which settlers found 'strange', rows between some settlers and *técnicos*, settlers' movements, weather, food, religious practices etc. None of this information could be used as a source of information to elaborate on the 'community profile' of Novo Paraíso in 2000.

Micro-events and macro-statements

An analysis of physician-patient interviews and medical histories in Cicourel (1981) offers an explanation of my consequent encounter with social research on development following the survey experience. He writes: 'The physician is "programmed" to look for certain patterns, symptoms, and associations that can provide a quick diagnosis and which also signify an underlying causal network he or she can specify with reference to categories that are explicitly linked to biological concepts. The physician wants to link his or her history to existent disease classes so that others who are trained in a similar way can interpret the history with relative ease' (Cicourel 1981: 71). As a result, the physician does not need to reveal the 'richness of actual interviews and interactions' (*ibid*: 71) which others can freely interpret. In a similar fashion, neither the development practitioner nor the sociologist reveals the richness of

conversations or interview data when writing project or research reports. In my previous research, I did not give any importance to revealing my field material because I was busy categorising patterns of settlers' activities and their migration histories in order to make a general statement about the 'community'.

In principle, the social researcher who investigates development processes does not aim to make a quick diagnosis or an operational theoretical framework (though some social researchers vigorously object to this standpoint, see Edwards 1994). Instead, she is interested in understanding 'diversity in development' (Booth 1994: 3) and 'multiple realities' that are shaped by different actors in development intervention processes, often including the researcher (Long and Long 1992). Social research on development specialises in looking at the 'social' (i.e. the way how individuals and collectives coexist, see below) whose patterns cannot be assumed or related to ready-made categories. These patterns can only be fully grasped through descriptions of social associations among people whom the researcher has observed and interacted with in the field (cf. Latour 1986). This is why social research on development has increasingly adopted ethnographic case-study methods in order to describe 'how social actors...are locked into a series of intertwined battles over resources, meanings and institutional legitimacy and control' in development intervention processes (Long 2001: 1).

Social researchers try to recover the richness of local interactions and struggles in actors' social development contexts instead of literally taking 'knowledge claims' made by officials and development workers (cf. Moore 2005: 4).³ In the first research encounter, therefore, I should have asked: What exactly does the coordinator of ASDA mean by 'frontier community'? Why do settlers have different ideas about their 'community' and how do they think of different claims made by the leaders and also the NGO coordinator of their 'frontier community'? The information in my field notes could have illuminated the settlers' interactions and struggles 'over resources, meanings and institutional legitimacy and control' since what they practically showed were 'micro-events' (Cicourel 1981) that shaped something which looked like the established community of Novo Paraíso. In short, a social researcher needs to observe, describe and 'be explicit about the significance of' every detail of the everyday lives of her subjects in order to 'create a coherent perspectival view' from their 'vantage point, while seeking to embed this view

in the larger organizational and institutional context of their lives' (Cicourel 1981: 71).

In order to undertake this type of research, I had to significantly 'defamiliarise' myself with the development practices of ASDA (cf. Mosse 2006). This process enabled me to turn to micro-events and to critically reflect on 'macro-statements' that development practitioners in general have made. In regard to the definition of 'community' with reference to Novo Paraíso, I started to examine the field notes I had made in order to elaborate on micro-events and understand how particular 'collectives' have been shaped and identified by the settlers, which might have presented the characteristics of their understanding of the 'community'. Back in ASDA, I began to pay attention to micro-events that are shaped in the field of NGO activities, as well as carefully listen to macro-statements made by my colleagues so that I might be able to grasp situational representations of particular collectives in project processes.

As Moore (2005: 3) writes, '[o]bserving a moving, changing, social field (see Chapter 4), with multiple influences touching on it, and trying to make judgments about causality, about meanings, is difficult affair'. At least, a social researcher can start with carrying out both levels of analysis - micro-events and macro-statements - to see if policy and project claims can be taken literally by referring them to concrete cases on the ground.

Fieldwork

I started to occasionally go back to Novo Paraíso in the mid-2002 while working at ASDA in Belém as a development practitioner. The initial field notes this time helped me to identify 'causal networks' (Cicourel 1981, see above), which the settlers specified when I followed their activities and asked them about changes they had experienced since the end of 2000. All the settlers whom I met before remembered me (as few foreigners reach the settlement) and I could update information in my old notes. I also strongly felt the change myself since I saw a remarkable number of new people, as well as new shops and vehicles at the village centre of Novo Paraíso, and I also missed many of my old informants who had already left the settlement. New areas of forest had been continuously 'opened' and muddy roads had been extended to previously unknown areas in which new settlements had been formed (see Chapters 4, 5 and 6). People - both men and women⁴ - were

busy and the settlement looked livelier than before, whereas the *técnicos* from ASDA were no longer there and their 'sustainable and participatory project' no longer operated. I remembered the coordinator's weary face when I told him that I was visiting Novo Paraíso again (see Chapter 6).

These observations were simultaneously forming my 'ethnographic experience' in the field as I started to follow settlers around without trying to categorise them from the beginning. Instead, I mainly tried to listen to individual stories about how they worked, lived and planned their life projects so that the 'different ideas' could be heard and described as 'data' which illustrated how they had thought about their 'community'. I also needed to specify the situations and contexts in which the stories were told in order to understand how their knowledge processes, social practices and changing patterns of action were shaped and reshaped in their routines (which were not always consciously verbalised by the actors). Then, finally, I had to reflect upon these apparent 'facts' which I had constructed through my own experience and understanding of the situations in which people acted and arranged their actions in relation to others and the landscape.

As Cohen (1978: 2) puts it, 'method must vary with empirical circumstances' because local realities are far more complex, subtle and unpredictable than any plot that the researcher could elaborate, as well as because the researcher herself varies her ways of looking at or sensing the social world in the course of her research. I had to share my experience with the experiences of the settlers and the workers of ASDA in order to grasp and describe the subtleties inherent in the everyday existence of the people. It was not only observation, therefore, that had been crucial for my fieldwork process, but also my entire experience and reflection on that experience were indispensable to this study. In general, I think, only through experience, may a social researcher or more specifically an ethnographer be able to understand what shape 'macro-structures' (Cicourel 1981) which are represented in the 'macro-statements' of development policy and project processes.

Ethnographic Case Study Methods

An empirical approach to development research, which aims to reveal the 'micro-foundations of the macro-framework' (Long and Ploeg 1994; Booth 1994) has been established as an 'actor-oriented approach' to rural development by sociologists and anthropologists at Wageningen in the

Netherlands who used methods of social research, especially ethnographic case-study methods (see Long 1997, 2001 for a detailed overview of the approach; see also Grillo 1997 and Oliver de Sardan 2005). The approach drew on the structuration theory established by Giddens (see Chapter 2) and significantly introduced human agency to the analysis of macro-formulations of development planning and policy processes in order to elucidate 'heterogeneous' processes of development intervention (Long and Ploeg 1994). Here, I briefly introduce an outline of the approach, particularly with regard to its methodological importance, and proceed to discuss the extended case-study method and situational analysis that have been adopted for the present study.

Actor-oriented approach to development

The popularisation of the actor-oriented approach to development can be understood in the context of an academic 'impasse' experienced by social researchers in development studies in the 1980s (Booth 1994). These researchers had been trapped in a polarised theoretical debate on the dualism of structure and agency (see Chapter 2). The world of development practice had appeared to be utterly 'structuralist' as modernisation policies in the 1950s - 1960s was followed by neo-liberal 'structural adjustment' in the 1970s-1980s, which drew extensive (post)Marxist criticism. These previous views on development were undergirded by an assumption that development had entailed 'structural change', and they largely neglected standpoints and perspectives of the people who were to be 'developed'. When sustainable development was established as a new norm in international development at the end of the 1980s, new types of political economy were consecutively presented, including political ecology (e.g. Peet and Watts 1993) and theories of new social movements including resource mobilisation and environmental movements (Canel 1997; Edelman 2001). To some extent this marked the 'return of the actor' (Touraine 1988).

The theorisation of new social movements significantly brought 'people' and the 'social' back into the picture of development (cf. Cernea 1985), which had become 'economic' during the previous decades. The renewed focus on the 'social' popularised the idea of local actors' participation in development processes (cf. 'community participation', see Chapter 2) although it practically suggested a continuation of development intervention at the grassroots level. Actors analytically 'returned' to development studies and practice and yet they

were supposed to participate and be mobilised in development programmes rather than to be 'real' agents of their own social change (e.g. Long and Ploeg 1995). In other words, both analytical and empirical understandings of human agency and its relation to social change within 'bottom-up' approaches remained insufficient.

The actor-oriented approach was formulated in this historical context.⁵ It significantly retained human agency within an analysis of development by taking a 'social constructionist' position, which regarded social relations as being 'constructed within development arenas and shaped by the interlocking of actors' projects, resources and multiple discourses' (Long and Ploeg 1995: 66, see also Long 2001: especially 13-19, 244 for 'social constructionism'). Since then, the approach has significantly helped social researchers look into issues of power, action and meaning, shaped and reshaped in social spaces created through development intervention processes (see Chapter 4 for the concepts of 'social domain' and 'arena' introduced by the approach).

In the actors' social spaces, 'emergent social forms' that actors shape and configure can be observed, and can appear as 'emergent structures' of social life in development (Long 1989). Methodologically, this approach takes interactionist and phenomenological types of social analysis and methods, namely 'ethnographic case-study methods', which allow the researcher's ethnographic experience to be included in the analysis as valuable data. Thus, my research encounters themselves become a part of the data that can be used to contextualise a series of events that shape development 'interface' situations (Arce 1989; Long 1989; see Chapter 6) through which the various actors' 'multiple realities' and 'lifeworlds' can be observed (Schutz 1964, see Long and Long 1992).

Extended case studies

The researcher who takes an actor-oriented view of development may start to realise that it is highly possible that the previously 'imagined community' analytically turns out to be an insufficient or even flawed construction as a solid unit of analysis. Therefore, in the research process, I opted for observing and recounting social situations and the local actors' interactions in development processes in Novo Paraíso over a period of time. These observations are used to reconstruct narratives of micro-events, which eventually indicate the nature of a collectivity, which are labelled a

'community'.⁶ Furthermore, I make an inquiry into the policy process that takes place outside the settlement as a continuation of the research in the settlement to reveal the logic that exists behind the knowledge claims made by the *técnicos* and development experts that 'we need community sustainable development' for the Brazilian Amazon.

Following Mitchell (1983), social situations are understood to be cases that consist of social events in which a subjects' sociality can be observed. They compose 'a field of relationships, institutions, resources and events, which is heuristically bounded and from which events, assumed to have significant interconnections, are abstracted to constitute a system for analysis' (Garbett 1970: 217). The researcher thus needs to elaborate ethnographically and reconstruct cases from which she may infer a generalised understanding of social processes, 'which most nearly comprehends the understanding its members (i.e. actors) have of it' (Cohen 1978: 4). This involves the process of contextualisation of 'fragmentary' ethnographic evidences (i.e. selected items from field notes and diaries) (Strathern 1988), which leads to a modest theorisation based on the ethnographic experiences and choice of theories to explain particular situations. Outcomes of these procedures can be presented as 'extended case studies' (Velsen 1967), which 'enable one to observe how meanings are constructed in practice and how social relations are reshaped or confirmed in the process' (Hilhorst 2001: 26). As 'extended case studies' do not necessarily embrace geographically demarcated units of analysis, cases are also 'extended' to various sites of inquiry and become the basis of a 'multi-sited' analysis in a globalised world (Marcus 1995; see also Burawoy 1998) where international development practice continuously generates different political discourses.

Ethnography: description and contextualisation

In using the extended case study method, the researcher herself becomes the central tool of investigation since, as an ethnographer, she is the only one who can transcend different situations and 'multi-sites' (cf. Cohen 1978: 5-6). As Tyler (1986: 135) suggests, ethnographic experience directly means the process of 'restructuring' the ethnographer's experience in the field through elaboration of ethnography.⁷

Malinowski established the 'tradition' of ethnography written by the fieldworker in the 1920s (Strathern 1987; see also Kuper 1992).⁸ Since then,

the researcher has been required to master the local language and familiarise herself with her subjects in local contexts where social actions and interactions take place. Indeed, 'actions' have remained the principal source of information for the researcher to follow social situations, as they both explicitly and implicitly express different social forms and their configuration processes, from which the researcher can further accrue data, though 'partial', to understand the local reality (Kapferer 2006).

Such 'partial' understandings of reality had been considered neither methodologically nor theoretically valid in social sciences before the extended case study method was proposed in the 1960s. Traditional ethnographers demarcated *a priori* each unit of analysis (a 'community' or a 'tribe') as a 'whole' structure. On the contrary, being an ethnographer who applies the extended case-study method to conduct her research suggests that the researcher can only generate partial understandings of the reality since she does not analytically assume the existence of a 'whole'. Instead, she follows the process in which her subjects identify with their immediate collectives revealed through social situations (cf. Strathern 1992; see also Leeds 1964 for an early discussion on importance of a similar methodological strategy to reveal the structure of Brazilian society.).

A life-history approach to actors and subsequent mapping of their relationships with friends and family members can help the researcher to illustrate such identification processes and particular social patterns (e.g. Plummer 1983). By using the approach, the researcher follows the personal relationships and networks of some key actors to identify social events in the study area, which are 'heuristically bounded' instead of being geographically, administratively or customarily bounded. Of course, there are also formal organisations that could be easily approached and observed. However, these organisations can better be understood as emergent social forms that significantly vary in function in relation to the members' life histories, which happen to be formally organised in particular historical contexts (see below).

Mitchell (1983) strongly argues that without theoretical arguments, the extended case-study method is a short-hand to say something meaningful about a social process because of the inherently partial nature of the field material through which the researcher reconstructs her experience with reference to contingent social situations. By the same token, if the researcher can construct a theoretical argument that is grounded in concrete cases, even a small case or an event becomes analytically significant (see Kapferer 2006). In

this line of thinking, conflicts, for example, are no longer considered as 'individual deviations from the [social] pattern' but as 'essential elements of social action' that the researcher should examine and describe as 'cases'. These cases enable the researcher to analyse the relationship between the individual and immediate society (Mitchell 1969: 9, see also Simmel 1964[1955]; Velsen 1967).

Therefore, while 'ethnographic description...must...tap the cognitive world of the individuals concerned' (Arce and Long 1992: 212), contextualisation of fragmented field evidence involves the researcher's 'intrusion' in ways that suggest the researcher's views and theoretical standpoint will be reflected in the description (Plummer 1983).⁹ As it is not possible for an ethnographer to physically follow the entire flow of social life in the field, it is inevitable that she ties her cases to a particular moment of theoretical continuity in order to make inference from these cases and to say something 'meaningful' to the audience of her discipline.

This suggests that extended case studies neither lead to elaboration of an operational framework that would directly contribute to development practice, nor immediately represent 'voices of the poor' and oppressed people even if this is desired by the researcher. Nevertheless case studies demonstrate the possibility of deconstructing the discursive construction of 'problems', as elaborated by intellectuals and development experts (for example, 'deforestation'), which often misrepresents the social realities as experienced by the people. In other words, case studies reveal the fact that the continuously evolving world that actors and social forms inhabit never shows the 'whole' picture of their 'society' and its 'problems' (cf. Moore 2000[1978]: 29-30).

Social relations in the field and ethnographic verities

In sum, the social researcher of development who uses an extended-case study method cannot present 'objective truth' but can only show 'ethnographic verities'. For example, Strathern (1987: 278) writes:

On internal evidence it would not appear that truth need rest on the close rendering of what people say, on making explicit one's premises, on distinguishing evaluations as a special type of proposition, or on giving reasons for generalisations – all procedures which I hope I would adopt in establishing ethnographic verities.

In other words, the task of the researcher is 'to be aware of, describe publicly and suggest how...[collected evidences in the field]...have assembled a specific "truth"' (Plummer 1983: 104) by 'mak[ing] its own contextual grounding part of the question' (Tyler 1986: 139). Thus, if the researcher is critical enough about the entire procedure of the research, ethnographic verities may indicate a kind of 'subjective truth'.

This 'subjective truth', however, may create a serious rupture between the researcher and the field, especially when the researcher has started her research as a practitioner. As Mosse (2006) shows, ethnographic verities can significantly alter previous social relations in the field as the researcher may reach a conclusion that may not be accepted by her colleagues in the field (i.e. development professionals in this case). The fact that the research results do not lead to a quick diagnosis and an operational framework can also become a nuisance for activists and practitioners.

For instance, at one meeting promoting a sustainable business programme in the Amazon, in which ASDA participated (in August 2004, see Chapter 7), a Brazilian coordinator exclaimed that she had a *raiva santa* (holy anger) because a lot of money had been spent on research but this had not solved any urgent problems of poverty and deforestation in the Amazon. "*Chega!* (Enough!)", she went on, "what we really need are actual actions and investment to create more opportunities for our people!" When I told her that I had been making an inquiry into the programme as a part of my 'actor-oriented' PhD research, she literally rolled her eyes and said: "Do you just want to add one more book in our library?" She later asked me if I could carry out 'market research' for the programme since she thought that the type of research which I had been undertaking was practically useless or even harmful to their actions. I could not properly refute this accusation as I realised that our standpoints had become completely different.

This kind of rupture that the pursuit of ethnographic verities can create between social research and 'actual action' provides a dilemma for applied anthropologists and social researchers who wish to take part in or directly contribute to development action. However, as Mosse (2006: 951) aptly puts it: 'Anthropologists have the power to represent; and their informants have different capacities to object'. Because social researchers of development closely interact with or even become a part of a group of development practitioners who turn out to be their informants, they have to anticipate

objections, which may also become a case that illustrates the nature of development practice.

The Social Actor, Individual, Organisation and Collective: Working Definitions

Finally, I need to present working definitions of some crucial concepts that are used in this study, namely: 'social actor', 'individual', 'organisation' and 'collective'. These concepts are central to the field of social research, where they have been imbued with a range of theoretical meanings. Therefore it is necessary to clarify how I use these terms in order to return to the issue of human agency in relation to conceptualisations of 'community' and 'community organisations' within sustainable development.

As I have discussed in this chapter, through social situations observed in the field, I have followed the actions and interactions of people in order to observe different social forms. Analytically, people are understood as 'social actors' who are embedded in various social relations, through which they take and arrange actions and shape practices (see note 16 in Chapter 2 for a definition of the social actor in the actor-oriented approach).

In essence, social actors are 'thinking agents, capable of strategising and finding space for manoeuvre in the situations they face and manipulating resources and constraints' (Villarreal 1992: 248). At the same time, the social actor may be able to take a wider range of actions than 'strategising' actions, which can be intentional and unintentional, interactive and un-interactive, or pragmatic and symbolic (see Chapter 5). Thus analytically, a social actor's actions can be understood as socially constructed, cognitively and strategically arranged, and habitually or physiologically repeated.

Therefore, the social actor is not a synonym of the 'individual', that is, 'a simple, elementary unit of social action' (Knorr-Cetina 1981: 17). For example, Long (1989: 225) writes: 'The strategies and cultural constructions employed by individuals do not arise out of the blue but are drawn from a stock of available discourses...that are to some degree shared with other individuals, contemporaries and even predecessors. It is at this point that the individual is, as it were, transmuted metaphorically into the social actor'. In other words, the social actor is principally a socially constructed individual who never exists as an isolated human being without having 'the practical consciousness that...[the]...actions manifest' (Villarreal 1992: 249; see also Arce 1989).

This means that even when we listen to the life history of an individual person, we should not assume that it indicates his own story. The story inherently points to his 'stock of available discourses' and experiences, which cannot be separated from his internalised social world. What we need to know then is to what extent the individual's life history manifests his individuality and how this is different from the individualities of other members of his social world. How do individualities affect the social forms and emergent organisation observed in each social situation?

The question is a genuine one. Social theory has been grappling with the problem of the relation between the individual and the collective for many years (see Knorr-Cetina 1981: 21; see also Chapter 2). The Cartesian philosophical tradition has largely led to conceptualisations of the individual as being detached from a social context, and incorporated within this tradition are strands of thinking in which the individual has been 'over socialised' (Wrong 1961), representing only certain functions or roles in society (see Chapter 6).¹⁰ Thus, the methodological challenge for the researcher can be expressed as: How can the researcher identify a degree of the individual actor's 'latitude and manoeuvrability' vis-à-vis his immediate collective commitments?¹¹ By asking this question, we may come to imagine that people in Pará in general and the settlers in Novo Paraíso in particular are often labelled 'disorganised' because they maintain a high degree of 'latitude' in taking their collective action, which is configured by their individualities shaped through their personal experiences with one another.

In general, 'organisation' connotes an actual (or perhaps ideal) entity shaped through collective action that aims to achieve a common interest and purpose (see Badsue 2006: 169-171 for a concise review of the term 'collective action').¹² It can have an 'organisational principle' and a clear setting of goals, which should be shared by its members. Thus, it carries a normative or prescriptive tone often undergirded by 'a strong belief in formal bureaucratic organisation and rationality that runs through institutional models for development' (Nuijten 1992: 202). Of course, people organise themselves to achieve a particular goal by themselves (i.e. self-organisation) that can be observed through their 'organising practices' (*ibid.*). The 'socio-economic organisations' in the Brazilian Amazon introduced in the last chapter suggest that these organising practices are strategically carried out in order to deal with 'rationality that runs through' bureaucracy and institutional models for development. Very often actors have to organise themselves to claim their

benefits (such as a land title, credit, pension or access to a development project) or to 'pull down services' to themselves (Röling1988: 146) simply because the benefactors usually require 'local organisations' for their 'bureaucratic' reasons.

At this point, we may need further to pay attention to how flexible social forms emerge from social actors' organising and individualising practices if we are to understand how these actors flexibly shape their informal groupings. These informal groupings may or may not have common goals or strategies to directly obtain particular benefits. As mentioned earlier (see Chapter 2), socio-economic organisations in the Brazilian Amazon, for example, are short-lived unless they acquire firm political positions in the process of geographical reorganisations because their organisational goals often last only temporarily in relation to landscape change (see also Chapter 4). Nevertheless, even if their strategic organisations dissolve, actors are still embedded in different social relations and areas of social life so that they can make various groupings and use networks that extend outside the particular geographical setting. In this context, it may be useful to bring out the concept of 'collective', which 'may take several forms, ranging from a formal organisation to mere observations of a set of rights and responsibilities' (Badsue 2006: 170) including informal groupings and less structured personal networks.

A collective is essentially 'a coalition of actors who, at least at a given moment, share some common definition of the situation...and who agree, tacitly or explicitly, to pursue certain courses of social action' (Long 1997: 9).¹³ Here, understanding of 'a given moment' becomes crucial for the researcher to grasp how actors 'tacitly or explicitly' identify a possible moment for arranging their individual actions in a particular situational context and landscape. At the same time, in any given moment, a collective can be interpreted or even deliberately represented by others or by actors involved in the collective as 'endowed with generalised modes of agency' (Long 1997: 10). In the process, the collective becomes an objectual construct.¹⁴ Such a generalisation of the particular collective can ignore the possibility of recognising the various interpretations that may be given to a collective by different actors, as manifest in the course of their social arrangements. The 'difference' that naturally exists between individual social actors is often too simply expressed as a 'problem' associated with individualism or the disorganisation of a particular category of people such as the Amazonian settlers.

In this study, I try to elucidate these different moments in which actors shape their collectives and the particular collective is represented by others and

actors themselves. These moments are identified through social events and interactions in which actors' life histories and the wider historical context intertwine with each other. In the process, various collectives as flexible social forms continuously appear and disappear. By observing and describing these moments, we may come closer to an understanding of how an individual actor maintains individuality to make his own identification with a collective that may be further represented by others for different purposes.

Notes

¹ See Dilley (1999) for an overview of the problem of 'context' in ethnographic writing.

² My early training in sociology had affected this image of 'disorganisation is a social problem'. See Merrill (1948) for an early discussion of the association between 'disorganisation' and 'social problem' in sociology.

³ In the introduction to a reader in legal anthropology, Moore (2005: 4) writes: 'Formal law, a very self-conscious, self-defining field of activity, is chock full of explanations of itself. Anthropology asks, "How literally should such knowledge claims be taken?"'

⁴ In this study, in general, I refer to settler as 'he' simply because most key actors who had led formal organisations and different types of collectives, which I investigate here, were men. For an important contribution to the study of women in pioneer settlements in Latin America, see Townsend (1995).

⁵ Actor-oriented approach was firstly formulated by Norman Long as 'an actor-oriented perspective to development and social change' in his 1977 book (*An Introduction to the Sociology of Rural Development*, London: Tavistock). It came to be well known and widely accepted (and criticised) following his inaugural lecture at Wageningen (*Creating Space for Change*, 1984) and *Battlefields of Knowledge* (Long and Long 1992). Ellis and Biggs (2001) note that the actor-oriented approach to rural development was born in the 1980s and developed in the 1990s. Later, Jan Douwe van der Ploeg (1996, 2003) further developed the approach to analyse agrarian development (especially in the context of Europe) in relation to 'styles of farming' and issues of 'heterogeneity' in farming practices in opposition to the standardising modernisation project (see also Long and Ploeg 1994). Also, Alberto Arce (1989, 2003b; and also Arce and Long 1992, 1994) emphasised the significance of knowledge and knowledge interfaces in actor-oriented research for elucidating how people make sense of their own lifeworlds, including how they generate organisations and interact with institutions (see Chapter 6 for some cases of knowledge interfaces). In 2001, Long published a detailed overview of the theory and methods of actor-oriented analysis based on his collaborative work with a series of researchers (*Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*).

⁶ As Knorr-Cetina (1981: 18-19) puts it: 'If there is today a social 'unit' emerging from micro-sociological research, which is considered relevant to macro-social phenomena, it is the *episode* of situated interaction (including routine) which will have to be considered as a candidate' (original emphasis).

⁷ Here, Tyler is talking about 'post-modern ethnography' that is 'an object of meditation that provokes a rupture with the commonsense world and evokes an aesthetic integration whose therapeutic effect is worked out in the restoration of the commonsense world' (*ibid*: 134).

⁸ Before Malinowski, ethnography was mainly written by 'arm-chair' anthropologists like James Frazer who assembled and analysed materials obtained from missionaries, colonial administrators, adventurers and fieldworkers. See Gluckman (1965) for an overview of works by early ethnographers and a discussion on Malinowski's 'revolution' in social anthropology.

⁹ As Geertz (1973: 19) asserts, ethnography is a bundle of 'written texts' that are essentially a product of the researcher in which events are turned into social accounts and discourses.

¹⁰ Methodologically, the Cartesian conceptualisation of the individual has led to methodological individualism; and the functionalist conceptualisation of the individual has presented methodological holism. However, as the functionalist conceptualisation assumed that the individual would 'rationally (or morally)' take actions to serve for the societal interest (which in turn represented his own interest), methodological holism has been also considered as a type of methodological individualism (see Schatzki 2005).

¹¹ I use 'latitude and manoeuvrability' as suggested by Norman Long through personal communication. See Parkin (1995) for more discussions on latitude.

¹² Recently, 'new social movement' theorists have developed a deeper understanding of collective action in relation to the 'individuated personal life' (Antonio Melucci quoted in Delanty 2003: 122). See Edelman (2001) for a concise overview.

¹³ I use 'collective', instead of 'collectivity', to indicate a social unit. According to *Collins English Dictionary* (the eighth edition, 2006), 'collectivity' implies 'the quality or state of being collective; a collective whole; and people regarded as a whole', and may be too abstract to reify various social forms. For example, Turner and Killian (1972[1957]: 5) write: 'Collective behaviour refers to the action of collectivities' which is not guided 'in a straight forward fashion by the culture of the society' unlike 'organisational' or 'institutional' behaviour. Here, a 'collectivity' is synonym of the 'crowd', and the analysis is directed to a structural explanation of group behaviour (such as mass hysteria, see also Brown and Goldin 1973). Due to this previous use in sociology, I think that 'collective' better represents temporary groupings and social embeddedness of individual actions. In this study, I use 'collectivity' to suggest the quality of being collective, especially in contrast to 'individuality'.

¹⁴ According to translator's comments in Honneth and Joas (1988), 'objectual' means 'having to do with, relating to an object or objects...[I]t can also mean "relating to or being an object for a subject, for consciousness"'. Knorr-Cetina (2001) uses the term to explain the 'epistemic practice' of scientists that entails the objectification of a subject. See Arce (2003b) for more discussions on the relations between knowledge and objects.

A Reading of Landscape Change in Pará

Inside 'Deforestation'

This chapter introduces a reading of landscape change in the southeast of Pará, where the study was conducted. By considering the rainforest and cleared land as the 'medium and outcome' of actors' actions and practices, the chapter sets the rainforest in the study area as landscape and situates Amazonian settlers' agency and social practices conceptually in relation to sustainable development policy processes. The discussion seeks to outline how one might understand the interactions between human agency and government policies, which have shaped the current landscape in the study area.

The chapter starts with a sketch of my trip to Novo Paraíso, the central village (called *núcleo*) of Grotão dos Caboclos (hereafter, Grotão). Grotão was established as a settlement project of the National Institute of Colonisation and Agrarian Reform (INCRA) in 1988.¹ The sketch provides a social overview of the study area along the state highway PA-150 and 'inside' (*dentro*) the forest where Grotão is located.

Grotão is a settlement, which previous studies have categorised as a 'spontaneous (pioneer) settlement' on the agrarian frontier (e.g. Foweraker 1981; Schmink and Wood 1984, 1992; Lisansky 1990; Ozório de Almeida and Campari 1995; Schneider 1995; in the contexts of Central America see Jones 1990; and of Southeast Asia see Manshard and Morgan 1988). Emergence of spontaneous settlements usually indicates a lack or failure of government planning to effectively control territorial reorganisation processes. In the Brazilian Amazon, a spontaneous settlement is usually legally recognised as a settlement project after a group of individual settlers invade, occupy or colonise a piece of forest and agricultural land to claim their entitlements and formal rights. Individual settlers arrive in Pará on an *ad hoc* basis from different parts of Brazil and form collectives to demonstrate a shared interest in establishing a settlement to government officials. This process involves an

opening of new socio-political spaces in which individual occupiers can negotiate with the state in reference to their planning and management of 'life projects' (see below).

These socio-political spaces can be analytically understood in relation to the 'semi-autonomous social field' that extends 'between the body politic and the individual' to which the individual temporarily belongs (Moore 2000[1973]: 56). In this social field, actors' self-regulating processes take place vis-à-vis statutory law enforcement, which shows different patterns of compliance and non-compliance.² According to Moore (2000 [1978]: 58), any 'innovative legislation or other attempts to direct change often fail to achieve their intended purposes...because new laws are thrust upon ongoing social arrangements in which there are complexes of binding obligations already in existence'. In other words, when we identify a social field in which 'semi-autonomous' social arrangements take place, we may grasp how settlers' practices and government regulations lead to change in landscape and the making of the settlement. Grotão, as a spontaneous settlement, can be conceptualised as one such social field, which generates its own 'rules and symbols internally' while is 'simultaneously set in a larger social matrix' (Moore 2000[1978]: 55-56). Grotão is a product of interactions between internal and external regulation processes and, by looking at these processes, we should be able to situate human agency and people's practices in the context of Amazon development and 'deforestation'.

The chapter examines how different laws and regulations on land tenure and forest use and the people's interpretations of them have come together and led to the demarcation of Grotão. First it follows the history of the brazil nut extraction economy. The brazil nut economy shaped the local societal context in the southeast of Pará, and eventually the social field of Grotão because it established certain local rules and norms vis-à-vis statutory law enforcement. An overview of the history of brazil nut extraction in the region provides a social background to the presence of *posseiros*, immigrant settlers who claimed the demarcation of Grotão.

This historical overview indicates a need for a further analytical formulation of the social space in which *posseiros'* individual actions are socially arranged to form the particular social field of Grotão. In general, *posseiros* (and also other settlers) in the study area have been through several territorial and socio-economic reorganisation processes, and the accumulated experience of these *posseiros* serves to flexibly localise state regulations in

accordance with their individual life projects. We need to know how actors identify the social field to which they relate in order to understand their organising and individualising practices in relation to the landscape.

Therefore, second, the chapter illustrates episodes that show processes in which individual *posseiros'* actions are spontaneously arranged within the social field of Grotão. Here, I draw on the actor-oriented approach's conceptualisation of 'social domain' and 'arena' within which individual actors are able to identify themselves as belonging to a particular social field (following Long 2001: 58-60). Specific social domains represent actors' past experiences with other persons and with the natural environment, which are inherently linked to certain fields of meaning and action that emerge to shape the social field.

I then provide some ethnographic sketches of *posseiros'* activities in Grotão in order to look into their specific social domains. In the semi-autonomous social field, official and personal contexts intertwine, and a certain situational context emerges (Wallman 1984) to renew each social domain and to reshape the patterns of *posseiros'* actions and practices. In each situational context, the social form taken by collectives and organisations, together with the 'rationalities' which they are associated with, serves to co-ordinate the *posseiros'* action and to vary the way that they deal with their natural resources. The *posseiros* continuously try (consciously and unconsciously) to identify themselves with the new social field shaped in the course of landscape change and negotiations with government agencies in Pará. Some episodes are introduced here to illustrate the identification processes of *posseiros* which are often (mis)interpreted as 'disorganisation' processes by government officials, development workers and researchers (e.g. Emmi and Marin 1997; CEAS 2003[1975]; see also the Coelho's account below), especially in contrast to the well-known (and 'well-organised') landless rural workers (*sem terras*).

Lastly, the chapter considers the impact of *posseiros'* incursions and subsequent government regulations on the brazil nut forest. In the late 1980s, the study area began to be called a cemetery of brazil nut trees by development experts and intellectuals who worked in the area since the brazil nut forest in and around Grotão was extensively burned. The Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Resources (IBAMA) successively introduced regulations over the settlers' use of forest and land to minimise the forest burning and land clearing. At this point, I will overview the current debate

on natural resource management (NRM), in order to discuss the logic and theoretical background of these forest regulations and institutionalisations of the settlers' resource uses. Then, I will illustrate the case of Fazenda Bamerindus. In the late 1990s, groups of *posseiros* in Grotão started to invade brazil nut forests in the Fazenda as they expanded their social field. The Bamerindus case illuminates shortcomings of the current NRM debate that largely focuses on 'institutional arrangements' in a locale delimited by community boundaries. When we want to understand the nature of the social fields and domains of 'mobile' people who are not constrained by physical, administrative or customary boundaries, the institutional arrangements must be analytically linked to their flexible identification with the locality, resources and new regulations. The flexible identification continuously changes the delimitation of symbolic boundaries and the characteristics of institutions in the study area.

Highway PA-150

In May 2000, a *técnico* from Pará state's Secretariat of Agriculture (SAGRI) called Goro took me in his small Fiat car from Belém to the village of Novo Paraíso, which stood on the border between the municipalities of Eldorado do Carajás and São Geraldo do Araguaia (hereafter, Eldorado and São Geraldo).³ At that time, Goro, a Japanese-Brazilian agronomist, was dispatched to ASDA, the Brazilian NGO where I was working. I already knew him from my first visit to Pará in 1999. He was a short, chubby, dark-skinned, middle-aged man with thick glasses (he was diabetic), and was constantly smoking national brand cigarettes. He became my 'tour guide' as he had helped students to carry out fieldwork in rural communities in Pará including Novo Paraíso, and had even compiled a book on family-based agriculture and product commercialisation in Pará (Nagaishi et al. 1999). He naturally volunteered to take me to Novo Paraíso as he had lived there for some years and said that he quite liked the area.

On my first trip the area intrigued me; this was partly due to the way people seemed to be flexibly organising their practices, but also because the 'devastated' landscape was simply overwhelming. I wanted to understand why the landscape had become like this. Huge tree trunks (sometimes reaching two diameters in girth⁴) were lying around, and those left standing were bleached from burning. They had not disappeared from sight and

therefore vividly showed the incursions of human intervention into the rainforest.

Most literature published in the 1980s alerted readers to the extensive nature of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon by referring to the study area as being situated at the frontline of 'frontier expansion' (e.g. Moran 1981; Foweraker 1981; Schmink and Wood 1984; Bunker 1985; Hecht and Cockburn 1989; Hall 1989; for recent contributions, see Alston et al. 1999; Little 2001). These studies mainly take a political economy approach to situate frontier expansion in Pará as part of macro economic or demographic phenomena and as a process of capitalist expansion into the 'periphery' (see Cleary 1993 for an overview).⁵ While some literature provides ethnographic case-studies of the settlers' lifeworlds on the frontier (e.g. Moran 1981; Lisansky 1990), landscape devastation has not been discussed sufficiently in relation to the particularities of the lifeworlds of the settlers who have established their households and organised their livelihoods in this environment. Therefore, I wanted to understand how people lived and took action in their lifeworlds in the devastated brazil nut forest in the area.

In the beginning of 2000, I asked a coordinator of ASDA to allow me to accompany *técnicos* who worked in Novo Paraíso in order to conduct initial interviews with the settlers, and the coordinator assigned Goro to take care of me. Usually, *técnicos* in Belém travelled in the early morning to get to Barcarena, the gateway to highway PA-150. PA-150 is one of the major highways in Pará that extends for 775 km (SETRAN 2003) and directly connects Barcarena to Eldorado (approximately 550 km from Belém), the town nearest to the settlement areas in which Novo Paraíso is situated. According to Goro, we had to leave early in the morning because "driving down PA-150 after dark would be too dangerous" due to assaults and robberies that regularly took place on the highway.⁶

Therefore, we took the ferryboat at seven o'clock from Belém to cross the river and reach Barcarena in the morning. On the boat, Goro bought the first can of beer of the day, and asked me what I studied. I replied "sociology and economics". He seemed to be glad with my answer: "I don't know anything about economics but sociology sounds interesting. I worked with Limirio and Kito and other producers in Novo Paraíso and told them to make an association...maybe they could have made it into a cooperative...but, anyway, it was good and important to talk and work with the producers. I think that it

is what sociology does, no? I mean...to organise people (*organisar o povo*)? I liked the work. I thought it was good”.

Goro had worked extensively with producers and their organisations as a ‘*técnico* (or in his case, *engenheiro*) *agrônomo* (agronomist)’⁷ of SAGRI and ASDA. He told me that he had lived in Novo Paraíso for two years in the early period of its establishment (the village area was officially demarcated in 1992). He helped to found the first small farmers’ association in Grotão in 1993, which is called the Small Farmers’ Association of Novo Paraíso in this study (hereafter, the Association), in order to organise the settlers who were mostly immigrant *posseiros*. The Association was created principally for these *posseiros* to obtain rural credit from the state bank (privatised in 1997) known as the Amazon Bank.

In 1995, Goro went back to Belém, but he continued working with the Association until 1997 when it installed a rice processing plant and a fruit factory to process and add value to fruit such as banana (*banana comprida* or *pacovan* – *Musa spp.*) and *cupuaçu* (*Theobroma grandiflora*).⁸ This was based on financial and technical support from the Subprogram for Demonstrative Projects for the Amazon (known as PDA) obtained through ASDA (see Chapter 6 for details). Goro was no longer the ‘official’ *técnico* of ASDA after 1998 since his contract was not renewed and he was going back to SAGRI to work on SAGRI projects. In 2000, when we travelled to Novo Paraíso together, he was working part-time for some ASDA projects in Pará.

At ASDA he had a trainee under his supervision called João who had studied forestry engineering in Pará Agricultural University and who succeeded Goro’s work at the Association in Grotão in 1997. They worked together whenever Goro visited the settlement but, after 1997, João practically represented ASDA in Grotão since it was he who developed the PDA project of the rice processing plant and fruit factory with the Association. João left Grotão in 2001, as he became the Municipal Secretary of Agriculture and Environment of São Geraldo in the 2000 general election (see Chapter 5). I got to know João after I started to stay in Novo Paraíso.

In order to get to Eldorado, we first needed to reach the city of Marabá, the largest city centre in the southeast of Pará. As we drove PA-150 between Barcarena and Marabá I saw that the landscape was extensive *fazenda* (privately owned pasture). As we drove down south, towns with restaurants (*churrascarias*), churches, bars, bus stops, gas stations, rural extension service offices, small shops and supermarkets occasionally appeared. Huge steel

towers carrying electricity from Tucuruí Dam (situated in the west of Marabá) had been erected across the landscape. Getting close to Marabá, occupation camps (*acampamentos*) of the landless rural workers movement (MST) could be seen along the highway, together with indigenous people's reserves. The forest had been left to grow in and around the reserves.

Marabá is the second largest city in Pará after Belém, which extends around the crossing point of PA-150, the Transamazon Highway (BR-230) and Carajás Railway. As we will discuss below, Marabá was at the centre of the brazil nut extraction economy until the 1980s. After collapse of the extraction economy, the city continued to be politically and economically important for Pará, due to the way that it embraced the world's largest iron mining operation, the Great Carajás Programme, in 1985.⁹ The Programme signalled the end of brazil nut extraction, but started to generate 60% of the state revenue of Pará (see Hall 1989 for an earlier study on the Great Carajás Programme).

Goro said that he had lived in Marabá for a year to work at SAGRI's local office.¹⁰ He said that he liked working in "this part of Pará" as he also had a project in the municipality of Dom Eliseu near Marabá. "I like working with people in this part of Pará. Everything is a bit messy (*meio bagunçado*) but more dynamic (*mais dinâmica*)".

I heard the word *bagunça* (mess) in various places during my research in 'this part of Pará', often symbolically known as *Sul do Pará* (South of Pará).¹¹ The region was often dubbed *terra sem lei* (lawless land) in national and international media because of land conflicts, assaults on the highways and occasional killings and fights among settlers, police and social workers backed by churches.¹² For a *técnico* like Goro, the efforts to organise people in the region were directed towards creating an order out of this mess, and such situation gave him a challenging work. As we will see in the following chapters, however, these efforts could generate different types of mess and conflicts by involving new actors including *técnicos* or NGOs themselves.

Eldorado is situated exactly 100 km south of Marabá. Just before entering the town centre of Eldorado, there is a curve called *Curva do S* (S Curve), and on one side of the curve, nineteen burnt brazil nut tree trunks were erected as if they indicated the entrance to our destination. In fact, the trunks marked the graves of nineteen MST members who had participated in a MST's demonstration to demand land reform from INCRA and the state government. On 17 April 1996, as MST members' marched towards Marabá from Eldorado and blocked PA-150 around the S Curve, the state government sent the military

police to remove them. Those nineteen members were killed by the police during the confrontation at the S Curve on that day.¹³

In the Amazon, the killing of landless farmers or 'poor' demonstrators by the military police is not unusual.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the incident of Eldorado drew national and international attention, since the police fired at unarmed MST members and the death toll was large. Furthermore, it happened as recently as 1996, under the civil and intellectual President of Republic Fernando Cardoso, more than a decade after significant international human rights appeals were made to the military regime between 1964 and 1985. The incident is now well known as the Massacre of Eldorado.¹⁵ In order to reach the settlement area where Novo Paraíso is situated, we had to turn left at the MST members' graveyard, leave PA-150 behind, take the unpaved dirt road, and *vai para dentro* ('go inside') as local people often put it.

"Go more to the inside"

The unpaved road stretched for about 120 km through the interior from the S Curve to BR-153¹⁶ that connects Marabá to the town of São Geraldo. The road had numerous *ramais* (sideways) that were connected to private roads owned by landowners. These sideways that spread through the interior clearly showed the tracks of settlers who entered the forest by opening their paths, mostly together with local loggers who had vehicles. "*Vai mais para dentro* (go further to the inside)" from here or there was a common phrase used by local people to indicate where they lived or were heading.

The unpaved road had been partly 'machined' (i.e. smoothed) by INCRA, but Goro's small Fiat car fell into holes on the surface made during the rainy season (called 'winter'), which were drying up because it was the beginning of 'summer'.¹⁷ The road's surface was extremely bumpy, and a lorry that carried three huge tree trunks had sunk in one of the holes at the side of the road. Goro said: "We were lucky that we could pass. If they get stuck in the middle, sometimes it takes a day or two to get them out and we would just have to wait. Especially in the *epoca da lama*". As the unpaved road was the only route that connected the 'inside' to the 'outside' (i.e. highways), people often refer to the rainy season as *epoca da lama* (season of mud) when the traffic becomes *atoleirado*, meaning 'stuck in the puddle'. Conversely the dry season is called *epoca da poeira* to indicate the season of 'dust'.

Goro said that all the trunks that the lorry was carrying were “*castanheiras*” as the brazil nut trees are commonly called.¹⁸ “They (i.e. IBAMA) prohibited the felling of *castanheiras* but Almir cut everything”. The landscape of the ‘inside’ was the extensive cemetery of *castanheiras*, which could not be properly detected from PA-150, as the felling of trees is officially allowed along highways (for 100 metres on both sides) and no ‘burnt’ trees are left. According to Goro, the settlers ‘knew’ about the IBAMA’s regulations over the felling of brazil nut trees, and that was why they ‘burned’ the forest (see below) whereas a logger like Almir could practically carry on his business as usual because “he’s got money” and by implication influence.

The names that Goro mentioned in his comments during the travel, like Limirio, Kito and Almir turned out to be the key actors who influenced the politico-administrative reorganisations and shaped socio-economic organisations in and around Grotão. By following and observing their activities, I could grasp what was behind the settlers’ organisations and landscape change in the ‘inside’. Around these key actors, the settlers configured social arrangements vis-à-vis government and non-government interventions and shaped their social field in the forest (see Chapter 5 for details).

Grotão as a Social Field

To analytically establish Grotão as a social field, we have to situate it within a historical frame of reference to introduce the wider societal context that exists in the study area. A general frame of our subject is needed because historical continuity in Pará state is often ignored in the current policy debate, which emphasises the ‘problem of deforestation’ by depicting the region as if it were suddenly discovered in the national integration process started in the 1960s. As we saw in Chapter 2, the Amazon region has a rich history and complex society, not only of the indigenous people but also of the people who were involved in the systematised commercial extraction economy. The ‘virgin forest’ (or ‘land without men’) was a myth because forest tenure had been already institutionalised in the extraction economy from the beginning of the twentieth century, and people had been already making their political and social arrangements in the forest (see Weinstein 1983; Bunker 1985; Dean 1987; Little 2001).

Here, we will start with an overview of brazil nut extraction in the region, which shaped the first political background of institutionalising the brazil nut forest as *castanhais* (brazil nut extraction concessions, the singular form is *castanhal*). Looking into the history of *castanhais* allows us to observe how the *castanhais'* demarcation processes informed the settlers' social practices in the 1980s. Below, I will briefly describe the nature of *castanhais*, and the subsequent establishment of cattle ranches and INCRA's settlement projects, which delimited the social field for the settlers to claim the political demarcation of Grotão dos Caboclos. The demarcation momentarily established a settlement community, which was soon to be reconfigured by the settlers themselves, as we will see in detail in the following sections.

Origin: castanhais, owners and nut collectors

Originally, *castanhais* were leaseholds (*arrendados*) for the brazil nut forest assigned to the leaseholders by state governments in the Amazon at harvest time (the rainy season). In 1955, in order to enhance brazil nut production, the Pará state government turned leaseholds into granted concessions (*aforamentos*), sized between 2,000 and 9,000 hectares, to let the leaseholders 'own' *castanhais*.¹⁹ Consequently, the leaseholders became owners (*donos*) who generally headed commercial, mostly family-based, enterprises, which managed the entire brazil nut production chain in Marabá and Belém.

Owners of *castanhais* in Marabá usually owned ships to transport nuts and oil to Belém through the Tocantins River and, from Belém, the products were exported to Europe and North America. The exporters were also often the owners' family members. In the 1960s, the so-called '*donos dos castanhais*' (owners of *castanhais*) formed a business oligarchy of brazil nuts in Pará as the state government effected tax exemptions over the export of brazil nut products.

The most influential owners were the Mutran Family who owned more than 80% of the *castanhais* in the southeast of Pará in the 1960s (which covered about 45,000 hectares) (Emmi 1999 [1987]).²⁰ In the 1970s, brazil nut production in the region was at its peak (an average of 15,000 tonnes (with shells) per year), which represented over 40% of national production (Homma 2004). Until the mid-1980s, the total area of *castanhais* had continuously expanded (Kitamura and Müller 1986), and the Mutrans had led the oligarchy of *castanhais* even at the national level (see Table 1).

When the federal government launched the National Plan for Agrarian Reform and implemented INCRA in 1970, the Mutrans could significantly insert the economic influence into politics by negotiating their *castanhais* with both the state and federal governments. In the 1980s, when the governments successively introduced road construction, pasture creation, mining and agrarian reform projects to the region, the Mutrans started to occupy significant political positions. In 1982, the owner of Castanhal Pau Preto (see below), Aziz Mutran was a state deputy. Nagib Mutran Neto, Aziz's son became a state deputy in 1986 and the mayor of Marabá in 1988. His uncle, Guido Mutran, was elected a town councillor of Marabá in 1988 and Guido's father Vavá Mutran became a state deputy in 1990²¹ (Petit 2003).

Table 1 Appropriation of *castanhais* by major owners in Marabá (1960-1980)

Foreiro	1960		1965		1970		1975		1980	
	Ha	%	Ha	%	Ha	%	Ha	%	Ha	%
Mutran	45,135	80.7	78,5998	58.0	108,800	50.9	127,732	39.1	131,332	39.4
Bamerindus	-	-	-	-	-	-	51,561	15.8	55,161	16.5
CIB	-	-	3,600	2.7	14,400	6.7	52,800	16.2	49,200	14.8
Almeida	3,600	6.4	35,200	26.0	61,740	28.9	47,300	14.5	47,340	14.2
Azevedo	-	-	7,200	5.3	14,400	6.7	28,800	8.8	28,800	8.6
Moraes	7,200	12.9	10,800	8.0	14,514	6.8	18,114	5.6	21,714	6.5
Total	55,935	100.00	135,399	100.00	213,854	100.00	326,347	100.00	333,547	100.00

Source: ITERPA – Section of Extraction in Emmi (1999 [1987]: 113)

Owners hired *castanheiros*, brazil nut collectors, many of whom were from the north-eastern state of Maranhão (for historical records of *castanheiros* in Marabá, see Monteiro 2001). Until *aforamentos* became common, nut collectors had been independent seasonal workers so they could freely enter any *castanhais* that offered harvest and processing jobs.²² In the mid-1950s, when owners started to own *castanhais*, the Mutrans introduced the *aviamento* system to their *castanhais*, which had mainly been used in the previous natural rubber extraction business in the region.²³ The collectors were supplied with

money called *aviação*, which could only be used at shops inside *castanhais* controlled by the owners. As the Mutrans linked their business to politics, the exploitative labour relations were justified and consolidated, and became a component of the 'semi-autonomous social field' in which certain local rules were established.

While owners institutionalised their brazil nut forests and labour force, the federal government transformed the former SPVEA (see Chapter 2) to Superintendency for the Development of the Amazon (SUDAM) in 1966 to promote further economic development in the region. SUDAM introduced a model of pasture development in the Amazon, based on a 'growth' model developed in the south of Brazil that had resulted in an 'economic miracle' in the 1960s Brazil. With the strong political intervention of SUDAM, whose superintendent was the former governor of Pará, the state government started to persuade owners to turn their *castanhais* into *fazendas* (pasture) in the 1970s and 1980s.²⁴

Consequently, owners started to use nut collectors, who had become their bonded labourers, as loggers and pasture planters. Meanwhile, in 1970, Pará became the only state in Brazil to be allocated two superintendencies of INCRA (in Belém and Marabá), and subsequent road construction and official demarcation of land plots attracted many immigrant farmers to the southeast of Pará. These farmers came from the northeast and centre-west of Brazil, and as they moved in they started to invade *castanhais* and to encounter the 'ex-nut collectors'. The immigrant farmers and ex-nut collectors began to form syndicate movements and to squat on *castanhais* to claim entitlements over pieces of lands from owners (see an interview with an ex-nut collector who became a leader of the Rural Workers' Syndicate of São João do Araguaia quoted in IDESP 1987a: 29-31).

In order to counter such squatting, owners started to reorganise their armed guards (called *jagunços*) and hired gunmen known as *pistoleiros*. While the principal function of *jagunços* had been the prevention of smuggling of brazil nuts and valuable timber (like mahogany), *pistoleiros* were expected to be 'hit-men' who guarded owners' properties against squatters. This was how the so-called 'land conflicts' started in the region.

As we will discuss below, around this time, *castanhais* presented an 'arena' (Moore 2000[1978]; Long 2001) in which local actors contested with each other and with government interventions over the physical transformation of the forest and meanings attached to it. On the one hand, owners and their

employees like *pistoleiros* and foremen did not see the transformation of *castanhais* into *fazendas* as a process of change in their social field. On the other hand, ex-nut collectors and immigrant farmers interpreted the transformation as a process in which new opportunities could be found to claim land plots to the state and (re)shape their social fields. Syndicate movements that spread across the *castanhais* embodied the mobilisation of new social relations among 'squatters' from different social backgrounds who began to share common goals on a temporary basis in the process of making claims to the land.

The conflicts in *castanhais* intensified in the 1980s. Then, the owners who had been in local politics started to admit that the conflicts were becoming problematic. This led them to negotiate with the state and federal governments to demarcate their *castanhais* at a minimal level in order to avoid further conflicts and to protect their new cattle businesses.

The owners initially proposed the delimitation of an area named *Polígono dos Castanhais* (the Brazil Nut Polygon) at the National Brazil Nut Symposium in 1982, in order to deal with what they called 'land invasions' by the squatters.²⁵ In 1984, SUDAM and the Research Institute of Socioeconomic Development of Pará (IDESP) elaborated a map of the area that covered nearly 100,000 hectares to conduct 'land regularisation' to settle land conflicts, to pursue a policy of pasture implementation, and to boost regional economy. In 1986, representatives of both state and federal agencies formed the Working Group on delimitation of the area. They included IDESP, the Land Institute of Pará (ITERPA), the Executive Group of Land in Araguaia-Tocantins (GETAT),²⁶ INCRA, the Brazilian Institute of Forestry Development (IBDF), the General Procurator of Pará, the Association of Brazil Nut Exporters and the Rural Workers' Syndicate in Marabá.

Official delimitation of the area of the Brazil Nut Polygon did not take place due to national regime change in 1989. Nevertheless, in 1987 two basic agreements of the Working Group influenced the expropriation process of *castanhais* that started a year later. First, *castanhais* already occupied by *posseiros* (here, roughly understood as squatters in general) were given priority in the land expropriation process, with owners following the Group's decisions. Second, it was decided that *castanhais* that remained unoccupied should be intact and protected against the entrance of *posseiros* in order to 'control' further forest clearings (Emmi, Marin and Bentes 1987).

The latter agreement actually worked to the advantage of owners to secure huge tracts of forest inside their *fazendas* in the name of 'protecting forest

reserves' from the squatters. Thus, as Emmi (1999 [1987]: 13) aptly points out, turning *castanhais* into *fazendas* did not modify the 'extractive latifúndio', which was maintained as the 'new latifúndio' paradoxically established in the process of agrarian reform. Nevertheless, the former agreement led to the expropriation of some *castanhais* by the federal government.

Demarcation of Grotão

Between 1985 (the end of the military regime) and 1989 (when the new constitution was brought into law), there was temporarily political disarray in the study area. This was mainly due to the institutional reorganisation that took place among the government agencies responsible for agrarian reform (see footnote 26; see also Homma 2000a, 2000b). The semi-autonomous social field of the squatters in relation to the conflicts developed at this time, since the lack of clear state law enforcement increased their autonomy.

Nineteen eighty seven was a year of conflict in many *castanhais* due to clashes between *posseiros* and ex-nut collectors in syndicate movements and *pistoleiros* hired by owners. For example, the significant 'damage caused by successive invasions of *posseiros*' was reported in *castanhais* around São Félix do Centro and Santa Cruz de Tona, which were owned by the Industrial Company of Brazil (CIB, see Table 1). Conflict arose after the military police tried to evict 50 families of *posseiros*. Similar *ocorrências* (occurrences) were registered throughout the area of Brazil Nut Polygon, which showed more than 30 deaths of both *posseiros* and *pistoleiros* in the first six months in 1987 (IDESP 1987a).²⁷

In order to 'minimise the damage' (Homma 2000a: 64), owners and the federal government negotiated the expropriation of *castanhais* in 1988. The Ministry of Agrarian Reform and Development (MIRAD)²⁸ expropriated 61 *castanhais* in the area in 1988 to install nine settlement projects. One of the nine projects was Grotão dos Caboclos composed of six of these *castanhais* that covered 32.888 hectares in total, which were initially divided into 671 *parcelas* (plots) (INCRA/UASGA 2000). Grotão was later classified as one of 42 settlement projects monitored by the INCRA's Advanced Unit of São Geraldo do Araguaia (UASGA) (INCRA 2002).²⁹ The six *castanhais* that formed Grotão were: São Félix do Centro, São José do Centro, Santa Cruz de Tona, São Pedro do Centro, Castanheira, all of which had belonged to the Industrial Company of Brazil (CIB), and Pau Preto, an ex-property of Aziz Mutran. The average

size of the CIB's *castanhais* was about 3,600 hectares and the Aziz Mutran's Castanhal Pau Preto amounted to 8,681 hectares (IDESP 1987a).

These six *castanhais* were said to be the areas acquired through a 'friendly agreement' (*composição amigável*) between MIRAD and the owners (i.e. the Mutrans and CIB which had Mutrans as associates) (Emmi and Marin 1997: 266).³⁰ However, as we will see in detail in Chapter 5, *posseiros* who had occupied these *castanhais* were not just waiting for the federal government and the owners to agree with each other to demarcate Grotão and minimise their 'damages'. In fact, the *posseiros* had already formed different collectives in the process of occupation and the confrontations with owners and *pistoleiros*; eventually they persuaded MIRAD to negotiate with the owners.

In this sense, *posseiros* were not passive subjects oppressed by owners and authorities. They were rather active and pragmatic agents who used conflict and tragedy to construct their immediate social field. They had their own reasons and means to achieve the political demarcation of their settlements.

Posseiros' Social Domains

At this point, we need to understand general characteristics of *posseiros* and how they deal with conflict situations to open up flexible social and political spaces in the forest. To understand the nature of such spaces and their semi-autonomous modes of practice, I will introduce 'social domain' and 'arena' as analytical units important to an actor-oriented approach. Understanding social domains and arenas will assist us to locate *posseiros* as social actors who delimit their social field in relation to development intervention and government regulations.

This leads to a specification of organisations and representations of *posseiros* by examining processes of colonisation and agrarian reform promoted by INCRA in Pará (which substantially differ from those of the south of Brazil. See, for example, Norder 2004 for a case in São Paulo.). An overview of settlement policies will show how *posseiros* deal with official regulations and arrange their actions by configuring their social field in order to invade forest and to claim the settlement demarcation. Here, in order to delineate the *posseiros'* use of regulations and organisations, I briefly compare their organisational tactics with those of *sem terras* in the Amazon.

An overall understanding of *posseiros'* characteristics raises further questions about the quality of their agency in respect to how they shape their life projects in their immediate social field and how they occasionally coordinate their action to achieve temporary goals. In principle, in developing their life projects, the *posseiros* accumulate different experiences in their social domains that become deposits of potential resources for them to take individual actions and reshape practices in different situations. They configure and identify with various collectives in this process, which can be both formally organised and further reconfigured to diversify the repertoire of individual and collective actions.

Social domains and arenas

According to Long (2001: 58-59), social domains are essentially 'organised by reference to a central core of cluster of values which, even if they are not perceived in exactly the same way by all those involved, are nevertheless recognised as a locus of certain rules, norms and values implying a degree of social commitment'. An individual actor naturally belongs to different social domains at the same time (e.g. family, market, state, religious organisations etc.) in his 'lifeworld' in which he is able to construct his 'life project' that makes his 'ordinary life possible' (see Schutz 1964; Garfinkel 1984 [1967]).

In planning and managing life projects, individual actors become embedded in 'socio-technical networks' which endogenously structure their actions (Ploeg 2003: 15-19). Social domains may represent such networks, and the involved actors order material resources and practices to 'create and defend social and symbolic boundaries' as they define them. In the course of accumulating experiences, actors continuously reconfigure and move those boundaries (Long 2001: 59) in order to identify further possibilities for taking different types of action, which do not necessarily lead to self-organising practices or neatly delimited organisations.³¹

In other words, social domains loosely indicate the social location of fields of action and meaning in which the actors do not always cognitively or strategically coordinate their actions to form their collectives. Long (1968: 9) explains the field of action (or here he calls it 'field of activity') as heuristically bounded by 'highly interconnected relationships that exist within a social field', which affect relationship in others. The notion of 'field' is wider than 'structure' as it 'refers not only to those institutional arrangements specifically

designed to attain certain economic or political ends, but also takes account of other kinds of relationships and values that may be utilised for the same purpose' (*ibid*: 9).

This means that the actors' social and symbolic boundaries analytically have nothing to do with the geographical or ideological boundaries that are often imposed by outsiders including the state and NGOs. In the study area, areas of 'conflict' (such as *castanhais*) have continuously emerged because the involved actors tacitly draw different boundaries and identify with the emergent social domains so that they can 'mobilise social relations and deploy discursive and other cultural means for the attainment of specific ends' (Long 2001: 59). The actor-oriented approach analytically delimits such areas of conflict and contestation as 'arenas'.³²

In the arenas, actors 'contest over issues, resources, values, and representations' (Long 2001: 59). Often, in these arenas, individual actors arrange their actions and practices to form collectives in order to 'win' negotiations over the contenders. At the same time, the arenas also work to reshape social domains and eventually redefine the actors' social field. *Posseiros* in the study area belong to these different social spaces that shape and reshape their lifeworlds and life projects.

'Disorganised' posseiros

At this point, we may need to examine representations of *posseiros* in the agrarian reform process, which often disregards the *posseiros*' multiple belongings to different social domains and arenas, which are inherently changeable over time. In order to do so, it is useful for us to compare their representations with those of *sem terras*, landless rural workers who have extensively deployed their land occupation movements as members of MST in the study area.

In the context of agrarian reform in the Amazon, INCRA was initially responsible for planned colonisation along the Transamazon Highway, as inaugurated in 1972.³³ The human populations of cities like Marabá and Altamira³⁴ and surrounding municipalities grew rapidly from settlements of construction workers employed to build the Highway and from planned colonies called *agrovilas*. Previous literature on development in the Amazon emphasises the impact of the Highway and colonisation plans on the 'modernisation' of the Amazon and often points out that INCRA failed to

achieve the 'planned number' of colonists (*colonos*) to be settled in *agrovilas* because it had not provide adequate technical assistances to the colonists who were selected from farmers in the northeast of Brazil (e.g. Moran 1981; Bunker 1985; Nugent 1993).³⁵

In other words, planned colonisation along the Transamazon Highway turned out to be a failure. However, highway construction in the southeast of Pará at this time (including PA-150) attracted a large number of immigrant farmers who entered the southeast of Pará in an uncoordinated fashion. According to Hammond (1999: 480), 'only 10% of the settlements are considered "agrarian reform" *assentamentos* (i.e. planned settlements)' and 90% are initially unplanned colonisation projects in the Amazon. Here, he uses the term 'agrarian reform settlements' to indicate areas influenced by MST, and 'colonisation projects' to indicate spontaneous settlements of the *posseiros* (e.g. Grotão). The figures suggest that the failure of planned projects by INCRA in the 1970s mainly resulted in 'unplanned' colonisation in the 1980s and 1990s.

MST was originally organised in the south of Brazil (in the state of Rio Grande do Sul) in 1978 and since then, it has largely influenced the politics of agrarian reform in Brazil. It is now internationally known for its reasonable 'success' in politically mobilising poor, landless farmers (Hammond 1999, Branford and Rocha 2002).³⁶ However, in the Amazon, it is still considered a relatively new movement, as the first organised MST occupation in Pará took place in 1990.

According to Coelho, a Brazilian sociologist based in the Federal University of Pará:

Many members of the MST...[in Pará]...are old *posseiros* but there is a great deal of rivalry between the *sem terra* and the *posseiro*...The MST is a new-style movement, imported, with an impressive know-how about organising land occupations. This makes it totally different from the *posseiros*, a movement that invades the land, leaves the land, enters again, but always in a disorganised fashion (quoted in Branford and Rocha 2002: 134).

Such a view that characterises the *posseiros* as 'disorganised' is widely shared by government officials and extensionists who strive to organise the *posseiros* by "eliminating the individualism" (according to João, the Goro's successor, see Chapter 6).

Posseiros, however, have their own explanation of what they do and why they do it in reference to their lifeworlds and social domains. One *posseiro* in Grotão summarised the difference between the *sem terra* and the *posseiro* as: “The *sem terra* goes for unproductive pasture (*pasto improdutivo*) and the *posseiro* goes for forest (*mato*³⁷)”. This explanation concisely elucidates their distinct organisational tactics and interpretations of ‘productive’ spaces in the Amazon.

On the one hand, *sem terras*, as MST members, build their camps on pasture owned by large landowners (such as owners of *castanhais*) and try to provoke INCRA to conduct *vistoria da terra* (land inspection) to certify whether the pasture is productive or unproductive. If INCRA decides that the pasture is unproductive, it expropriates the area to demarcate an official settlement project and the *sem terras* can become the clients of INCRA. If the pasture is certified as productive, the *sem terras* must leave, and the camp is often forcibly removed. Either result, however, provides MST with some positive effects since the former result indicates their ‘success’ while the latter can be symbolised in the media as ‘oppression from above’.³⁸ The ‘impressive know-how’ that Coelho commented on above gives an indication of such organisational tactics.

On the other hand, according to the above mentioned *posseiro* in Grotão, the *posseiros* aim for the forest precisely because it has ‘traditionally’ been considered unproductive as agricultural land, and therefore it is easier to get INCRA to begin the demarcation process without making too much ‘fuss’ as is the case with the *sem terras*. To confirm this, an INCRA’s criterion asserts that productivity of land is measured by the degree of ‘work’ on the plot (according to an inspector from INCRA/UASGA). If the *posseiro* cuts and burns the forest and plants rice, maize, cassava, etc. as the means of initial subsistence, INCRA usually considers the plot as being properly worked and, thus, productive. In other words, INCRA easily expropriates the ‘deforested’ plot as a productive agricultural plot. A group of *posseiros* who do the same in the same geographical location can shape a collective ‘consequently’ to claim their settlement project to INCRA.

For many *posseiros*, the *sem terras* are not ‘real rural producers’ but political figures who are busy asking the government for benefits by staging conflicts (according to Kito in Grotão, see Chapter 5). The *posseiros* tend to consider ‘conflicts’ as a part of their land acquisition process rather than a source for generating a larger political movement (though at the individual level, the *posseiro* can also use conflict to attain personal political goals, as

described in Chapter 5). *Posseiros* are generally more concerned with their household strategies and livelihood organisations and, thus, are often viewed as individualistic.

Identification and organisation processes

The *posseiro* usually belongs to a rural workers' syndicate (*Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais*, hereafter STR) of the municipality nearest to his plot. STRs are coordinated through the Agricultural Workers' Federation (FETAGRI) of Pará, and its militant and hierarchical organisation (and red flag) resembles that of the MST.³⁹ However, unlike the *sem terras*, the *posseiros* seldom identify themselves as STR members or *sindicalistas*. For example, the *posseiros* in Grotão belong to STR in either Eldorado or São Geraldo (depending on where they were registered⁴⁰) but they only occasionally used STR to get paperwork done for activating pensions or applying for rural credit (in 1996, FETAGRI boasted its achievement on pressing the Amazon Bank to establish new credit lines for family-based agriculture).

In other words, the '*posseiro*' does not assume an 'identity' that works to fix an arena of negotiations (unlike the '*sem terra*' which is used as an identity for the landless farmer to participate in a political movement or in 'class struggle'). The notion of '*posseiro*' is closely linked to a judicial process in the land property relations (a *posseiro* literally indicates a person who works on a *posse*, a small land plot) that should eventually guarantee the status of land proprietor (*proprietário*). Therefore, the *posseiro* may also identify himself with other non-judicial agrarian figures such as the farmer (*lavrador*), the small producer (*pequeno produtor*), or the rural worker (*trabalhador rural*)⁴¹ (for an overview of the judicial status of the *posseiro*, see Miranda 1988). For example, if you ask a settler what his occupation is, he will usually reply: "*Eu sou um lavrador* (I am a small farmer)" but if you ask about his land title situation, he will say: "*Eu sou um posseiro* (I am a *posseiro*)".

To be precise, the 'real' *posseiros* are those who cultivate their plots with occupation licences while they wait for definitive land titles. However, as we see in the following chapters, the majority of *posseiros* tend to diversify their activities during the period of waiting; a settler will say that he is a *posseiro* if he has a plot undergoing the titling process, while he may at the same time be a shop owner in the village and pay for rural workers to take care of his land. In this respect, settlers' identifications are flexible and contextual, but whoever

owns plots without definitive land titles will likely claim that they are *posseiros*, in order to distinguish themselves from *sem terras*.

According to João, the Association in Grotão was created because of the “decadency and conformism that plagued” STR-São Geraldo in the beginning of the 1990s, following the initial wave of occupations and land claim movements had settled down. The syndicate movement facilitated the opening up of political space for claim making by *posseiros* in the 1980s, but it rapidly lost its social relevance when individual titling was realised by each member. This shows that the *posseiros* form an organisational movement based on their individual goals in constructing and managing their life projects (especially in respect to rural credit as applied to each household through farmers’ associations, see Chapter 5). They have organisational logics in terms of their individual understandings of specific situations.

Posseiros’ organisational logics are also closely linked to the process of landscape change as they identify their arena in the forest and then, through the act of forest felling, they start to shape and configure their social field. In the initial arena, they struggle and negotiate with INCRA as well as with other inhabitants in the forest and start to identify the proper social domains from which they can derive meanings and understandings of their immediate situation. The process through which their experiences are enriched further facilitates the *posseiros* to reshape and reconfigure their social field in order to claim the new settlement. However, even after the settlement is demarcated, their everyday activities continue to accompany the forest clearing and physical spatial changes, which continuously reshape their social domains and fields of action.

Cemeteries of Brazil Nuts

At the end of the 1990s, the environmental consequences of the *posseiros’* occupation practices in the forest and individual land titling policies by INCRA began to draw researcher’s attention to the southeast of Pará (e.g. Homma et al. 2002; Brandão and Souza 2006). Brazil nut production in the study area had fallen to approximately 1,500 tonnes per year by the end of the 1980s.⁴² Emmi and Bentes, Brazilian sociologists who have conducted extensive research on *castanhais* in the study area, started to refer to the landscape of the southeast of Pará and the north of Tocantins as the *Cemetério das Castanheiras* (Cemetery of Brazil Nuts) by the end of the 1980s (according to Homma 2004). The

researchers from the Brazilian Agricultural Research Cooperation (Embrapa) in Belém started to monitor the deforestation in the area and concluded that, by 1997, nearly 70% of the original brazil nut forest in the region had been cleared due to the settlement demarcation and expansion of pasture (Sampaio et al. 2000). These scholars expressed concern about the way in which extensive deforestation inevitably accompanied agrarian reform in the Amazon. Nevertheless, the deforestation rate in the Amazon in general and in Pará in particular has continued to be high into the 2000s (Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Floresta 2005).⁴³

In fact, the brazil nut trees are legally protected by Brazil's forestry code (Law 4771) introduced in 1965. Therefore, the trees have been left standing in pastures though the logging was taking place extensively in the study area after the 1980s as we saw above (see Fearnside 2001: 1370 for a discussion on existing forestry regulation in Marabá). In 1989, the new constitution reorganised the Brazilian Institute of Forestry Development (IBDF) and installed IBAMA. With this, former private primary forests left in (former) *castanhais* were put under the control of IBAMA (though INCRA continued to settle *posseiros* in *castanhais* based on the principle of forest clearing⁴⁴). In 1994, a Presidential Decree was announced to implement the Brazilian Biological Diversity Programme, which partly aimed to strengthen the prohibition of brazil nut felling.

These regulations did not act as a deterrent for *posseiros* who continued to clear the forest, in effect establishing semi-autonomous social fields in which they could reconfigure property demarcations carried out by the state. As the federal government promoted privatisation policy processes in 1997-1998⁴⁵ and the state-backed property ownership of *castanhais* finally collapsed, the *posseiros* living in the study area started to trade land and forest with each other and with newly arriving land speculators. With reference to national political and economic changes, they crafted their own rules and social arrangements to own properties and 'manage' forest and land resources in the course of developing their life projects. These internal rules encountered and reconfigured government regulations imposed over the forest use in the study area.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the concept of sustainable development normalised by international development and environmental discourses at the end of the 1980s popularised natural resource management (NRM) approaches that generally required well-planned systems of agriculture and extraction in the Brazilian Amazon. Currently, the NRM debate is directed towards

'getting institutions right' for natural resource management in order to incorporate social actors' established patterns of natural resource use into 'planning' (Cleaver 2000: 362). A number of recent contributions are focusing on social embeddedness of institutions and social action and practices, in order to incorporate diversity of institutions (Ostrom 2005), changeability and flexibility of institutions (Berry 1997; Leach et al. 1999; Cleaver 2002) and uncertainty (Mehta et al. 1999) into NRM approaches.

Yet, NRM approaches in general are still struggling to grasp changeable social field of the actors who may identify institutions with reference to their multiple social domains, arenas, and landscape change. Below, we will briefly overview the current NRM debate in order to understand the characteristics of the *posseiros'* institutions in regard to the forest in the study area. Then, we will turn to the case of Fazenda Bamerindus to describe the 'second' movement of forest invasions led by the settlers of Grotão.

Community-based natural resource management and institutions

NRM studies have roughly shifted the focus of analysis from the individual to the collective (or often simply the 'community') and institutional. In the early stage, NRM studies were concerned with '(economically) rational individuals' who destroy 'commons' for their own interests (Hardin 1968; see Acheson 2006 for a recent overview). In principle, these studies assumed that natural resource depletion was caused by individuals' 'ego-centred' economic activities in 'open-access' situations (Ostrom 1990). This assumption justified the privatisation of public lands and forests and the enforcement of individual property rights in the 1970s-1980s since, with the right enforcement, each individual was expected to 'rationally' manage his property.⁴⁶

In the late 1980s, counter arguments to this rational individual model led to the establishment of a new research field of 'community-based resource management (CBNRM)' (or common property management) (e.g. Korten 1987; Ostrom 1990; Li 1996; Mosse 1997; Brosius et al. 1998; Leach et al. 1999; Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Cleaver 2000). As we discussed in Chapter 2, the 'return' of community to development planning was closely linked to the consequence of sustainable development in practice and the popularisation of participatory approaches, which worked to (re)discover 'traditional' knowledge and the cultural background of the people's behaviour that defined their resource use. In CBNRM, natural resources were firmly embedded in

people's lives and had been managed endogenously (and often 'sustainably') under customary laws. Therefore, natural resource depletion was mainly caused by development intervention by the state, large corporations (such as oil companies) or international organisations, which disrupt the traditional order of resource management (e.g. Dove 1993). CBNRM essentially encouraged 'community members' to take collective action to carry out 'sustainable resource management' and strongly promoted the idea of 'empowerment' (Singh and Titi 1995).

Consequently CBNRM inevitably encountered the issue of rights and entitlements of community members to their resources, and by the end of the 1990s, the concept of institution became central (Leach et al. 1999; Klooster 2000; Cleaver 2000; Barrett et al. 2005). International organisations started to stress the importance of 'forest governance' and regulation of local natural resource use (e.g. Pimbert 2004; Chomitz 2007). These new concerns on institutions focus on 'social (or political) actors' (rather than community members) who negotiate with the state and development agencies.

For example, according to Agrawal and Gibson (1999: 640), '[institutions]...are under constant contestation and (re)formation through the performances and negotiations of actors'. The social actor is currently recognised as a proper unit of analysis, and institutions for resource management are considered social processes (e.g. Berry 1997; Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Leach et al. 1999; Mehta et al. 1999; Nygren 2000; Cleaver 2002). As Cleaver (2002: 28) suggests, the actors craft institutions, and 'processes of bricolage will ensure...redundancy or adaptation...[of new institutions]...to create more socially embedded arrangements'. The NRM planning, therefore, must take the 'plasticity' (*ibid*: 28) and unpredictability, complexity, and creativity of institutions into account (Berry 1997: 1228).

Meanwhile, the question of how an individual actor's experience in relation to different institutions can affect the overall boundary of a community vis-à-vis the landscape (not necessarily equal to 'natural resources' for management) remains. When CBNRM does not work, it may be because it does not offer an analytical framework to understand how the natural environment is understood by individual actors who belong to different social domains and shape social field through constant contestations with others. The social domains may or may not represent institutions in the community, and the institutions' embeddedness in individual actors' lifeworlds varies. This is especially the case in the non-established community situations

observed in newly created settlement projects in Pará. We also need to pay attention to how these institutions affect and are affected by radical landscape change and individual actors' interpretations of the change.

Fazenda Bamerindus

The case of Fazenda Bamerindus pushes us rethink the meaning of community, institutions, and individual actions that affect the (in)capacities of the state (cf. Moore 1998) in the study area. Fazenda Bamerindus had been known for being *Quartel Geral*, an operation base for the military police to evict *posseiros* and syndicate activists who were partly linked to the leftist guerrilla movement (called *Guerrilha do Araguaia*) (see Chapter 5). The area demarcated as Grotão was adjacent to the Fazenda and many *posseiros* who participated in the demarcation of Grotão in 1988 had confronted the police and *pistoleiros* in the Fazenda that covered nearly 80,000 hectares of *castanhais* in total.

The Fazenda's owner was called Bamerindus Bank, a commercial bank heavily subsidised by the state. It filed for bankruptcy in 1997 when it was completely privatised. Consequently, the Bank abandoned the Fazenda, and it became temporarily 'owner-less'.⁴⁷ The Fazenda offered an 'open-access' situation to the *posseiros* and *ex-posseiros* (who had already become proprietors in Grotão) to multiply their properties, and a massive forest invasion started in its former *castanhais* (according to the Director of INCRA/UASGA, approximately 2,000 families entered the area, but the exact figure is unavailable).

INCRA's land statute prohibits trade in forest or land plots that are undergoing the titling process (see CEAS 2003 [1975]). Nevertheless, land grabbers (called *grileiros*) who disguise themselves as *posseiros* could easily clear the forest to trade land plots by falsifying land registration documents. They traded plots with 'real' *posseiros* and proprietors as well as with shop owners or drivers who lived in Novo Paraíso. The *posseiros* or proprietors also imitated the practice and started to illegally trade their plots with *grileiros* with the help of people called *laranjas* (who specialise in forging documents).⁴⁸ The expansion of illegal land transactions in the Fazenda practically paralysed the land demarcation and registration activities carried out by INCRA.

The Director of INCRA/UASGA referred to the 'post-1997' situation in Bamerindus as a 'war' (see also *O Liberal* 19 June 2002), saying: "Bamerindus is *uma bomba* (a bomb)...[the situation is]...worse than Afghanistan. We are

asking for the military to intervene because a war operation will be necessary to get rid of everyone...[from Bamerindus]...and settle them again" (12 September 2001 in São Geraldo). This testimony by a government official confirms the increased autonomy of settlers in the region, including those from Grotão who started to reshape their social field in relation to the activities in Bamerindus and the government's inability to control the situation.

In order to counter the settlers' emergent autonomy, INCRA began to demarcate settlement projects in and around Bamerindus to legalise the illegal land trade by officially titling the cleared plots⁴⁹: In 1997, *ex-castanhal* Pau Ferrado was demarcated as PA Pau Ferrado between Grotão and Bamerindus; in 1998, MST entered a part of the pasture in Bamerindus, and INCRA demarcated PA Oziel Pereira (named after an MST member killed in the Massacre of Eldorado) and PA Barreira Branca; in 1999, PA Vale do Mucura was demarcated for the *posseiros* led by Kito in Novo Paraíso (see Chapter 5); and in 2000, PA Progresso was put on a demarcation process.

These settlement project demarcations, however, worked to fix neither *posseiros* nor *sem terras* on their plots in Bamerindus. One INCRA field officer in São Geraldo lamented: "What can we do with all these people who don't stay? We issue an occupation license to a guy (*um cara*) and next year when we go back, another one (*outro cara*) is on the plot and demands that we should rewrite the name on the license he had bought!" To my question: "But can they sell their plots with provisional titles? Just like that?" he replied, "oh, they can't. It's on paper. But they do. So what? Everyone does. Besides, we are only two...[inspectors from UASGA]...How can we monitor those about a thousand families...[in Bamerindus to make sure]...if they stay until they get officially titled?"

In fact, the two officers from UASGA had to monitor another 39 settlement projects in which nearly 5,000 households had been officially settled (June 2002 in Marabá). It was physically impossible for the officers to keep tracks of all the settlers who continuously moved around and made various land claim-makings with different names and forged documents. In turn, the lack of monitoring gave opportunities to the settlers who continuously accumulated experiences in their immediate social field. In the process they transformed the social domains and shaped various arenas from which they derived different meanings and attached these meanings to their actions in the forest. Loggers were indispensable in facilitating the entire process.

Loggers' roles in the social field

Local loggers usually enabled settlers to grab land in a ubiquitous fashion because they opened paths into the forest and cut and bought trees from the settlers. In Grotão and Bamerindus, the most influential logger was called Almir, the founder of the Novo Paraíso Sawmill. The Sawmill employed about 200 workers and was unquestionably the largest industry in the area (see Chapter 5). Occasionally, the *posseiros* themselves also worked as independent loggers called *motoqueiros* or *motoserras* (literally, chainsaws). In the study area, houses, furniture and corrals were made of brazil nut planks, and the remaining brazil nut trees in Bamerindus were rapidly extracted for timber production as the population grew.⁵⁰

According to Goro, IBAMA had prohibited the felling of brazil nut trees; but in fact, they prohibited the felling of only those that were 'alive' (*castanheira verde*, green brazil nut). Therefore, the settlers burned the forest first to 'kill' the trees to officially cut them later. That was how the landscape of cemeteries was created.

A decree (*Portaria* 108) announced by IBAMA in 1997 confirms this information. Article 1 of the decree says: 'It is permitted, in a pilot and experimental manner, to utilise, process and commercialise dead or inactivated brazil nut trees (*Bertholletia excelsa*) for any purpose but export in the municipalities of Eldorado dos Carajás and São Geraldo do Araguaia in the state of Pará. It should be understood that a dead brazil nut or a brazil nut without any vital functions should present dry branches and trunks with no leaves. An inactivated brazil nut or a brazil nut with vital but paralysed functions should show the process towards death as a consequence of human aggressions'.

With this decree, IBAMA legalised the burning and felling of brazil nut trees in the study area without establishing any measure of monitoring (Homma 2000a).⁵¹ The loggers cut brazil nut trees both dead and alive, together with other species. The sawn timbers were commercialised not only for the planks used by the settlers themselves but also for charcoal production, which had become one of the main activities of local loggers. They installed rows of furnaces in their properties and sold the charcoal to metallurgy companies in Marabá.⁵² In other words, local loggers as well as other settlers knew how to use IBAMA's regulations to reorganise their livelihoods around brazil nut timber production and consumption.

In the social field of the settlers, timber consumption and land clearing are socially accepted. The settlers never say that they live in the area of cemeteries of brazil nuts. It is an expression widely used by *técnicos*, intellectuals or government officials who look at the landscape from outside. The settlers arrange their actions in a fashion that is 'right' according to their life projects by involving both loggers and government officials in defining their social field. In this process, the landscape of cemeteries has actually worked to show the settlers the possible field of action and different social domains in which they can refer to their past experiences to reshape forest clearing or land grabbing practices.

In other words, the cemeteries have embodied a process of creation of physical and social spaces for settlers to rearrange their actions around a historical shift in state regulations over the forest and land. In this sense, it is understandable that IBAMA tried to get rid of the cemeteries in the study area by authorising felling of burnt brazil nut trees, in order to erase the spaces that had enabled settlers to continuously reshape their social field.

At the same time, the flexible resource arrangements around the production and consumption of timber that shape the social field of the settlers suggest that their institutions over the resource use cannot be properly 'mapped' based on a shared sense of resource use between 'community members' (cf. Leach et al. 1999). The settlers arrange their actions and shape their practices with reference to landscape change without always aiming to institutionalise their resource use. For them, forest and land resources present sources for labouring and opportunities for taking different types of action, which may or may not be collectively arranged.

Conclusions

This chapter has provided a general reading of landscape change in the study area of Grotão by depicting it as a type of semi-autonomous social field. In order to understand how the social field was formed and identified by the *posseiros* who generally had different social backgrounds, the chapter further introduced the concepts of social domain and arena. In their social domains and arenas, the individual *posseiros* identify fields of action to shape practices of forest invasion, land clearing and title claiming to land in their immediate social field. These practices show how the settlers manage their 'semi-autonomy' in relation to statutory law enforcements and landscape

change and, by discussing the social field of Grotão (and Bamerindus) shaped in the landscape of cemeteries of brazil nuts, we could, to some extent, turn around the analysis of 'deforestation' to the analysis of social process of the settlers.

In essence, the settlers' social process showed flexible delimitations of social domains and fields that can change in accordance with wider political as well as landscape change. Wallman (1984: 4) writes that different processes of change can be revealed through 'historical, personal and situational perspectives'. While political and landscape change reflect 'historical perspectives', the settlers' social process reflects 'personal perspectives' undergirded by different cognitive understandings of time and space in their domestic cycle. As historical and personal perspectives continuously intertwine, situational perspectives are internalised by the actors who identify their personal life processes in the emergent social contexts. In this process, the social field is reshaped and social domains are further reconfigured, and the reconfigurations continuously change meanings attached to their fields of action and also to statutory law enforcements.

In the social field of the settlers, 'institutions' are also highly situational, and can be observed as 'a characteristic style of...[local]...response' (Wallman 1984: 6) to government policy processes. In this sense, landscape change in the study area can also be read as an embodiment of changing local styles of development, which must be understood through the accumulation of time and 'experienced' social and physical spaces of the social actors in dealing with institutional regulations and constructing their life projects and social field.

Settlers' experiences in Grotão can exhibit social realities that form different styles of resource use in the course of constant landscape change. Therefore, natural resource management in this region must include a consideration of local responses to the new political (and intellectual) concerns for forest conservation and regulations. As Cleaver (2002: 28) points out, '[w]here natural resource management requires strengthening, we need interventions based on an understanding of the content, underlying principles and social effects of institutions, not merely their visible form'. In this regard the lack of 'organisation' by the *posseiros* should be looked at with reference to their 'rationalities'. The rationalities are accepted in the immediate social field interactively formed within the course of landscape change. The social field may temporarily show some 'established community' aspects that NRM approaches tend to institutionalise but, as we discussed above, 'community' in

the study area indicates the existence of multiple and changing social domains that reshape the settlers' fields of meaning and action and eventually transform the characteristic of the community institution itself.

In the following chapters, we look more closely into the changeable social field and domains of the settlers in Grotão.

Notes

¹ INCRA's settlement project is called *Projeto de Assentamento* and usually abbreviated as PA. Therefore, according to INCRA's documents, the official name of Grotão is 'PA Grotão dos Caboclos'. In a recent study, 88% of 1,354 settlement projects created in the Legal Amazon (between 1970 and 2002) were established after 1995 (Brandão and Souza 2006). As Grotão was demarcated in 1988, it is often categorised as an 'early' settlement. Grotão dos Caboclos is the name of a locality, which existed before demarcation: *Grotão* indicates a type of topography, which forms a valley; and *Caboclo* has various definitions in English, which can be roughly summarised as a typical Amazonian 'backwoods' man (a woman is called *cabocla*) whose origin is in a mixture of the indigenous population and Europeans (see Chapter 7 for details).

² I take Moore's conceptualisation of semi-autonomous social field rather than the notion of social field developed by Bourdieu (see Chapter 2) in order to focus on the process of social arrangements in contrast to the logics of formal law enforcements and government regulations in this chapter. Bourdieu's conceptualisation of social field may be 'too structurally oriented' (Long 2001: 58) for our understanding of the settlement of Grotão where the settlers' 'positions and dispositions' continuously change and are flexibly arranged in relation to social and natural environmental changes.

³ In the geographic language of Brazil, Novo Paraíso is typically classified as *vila*, which indicates small town status, usually with a population size between 10,000 - 25,000. This reference is, however, not quite clear as there are other commonly used words like *distrito* (district - though mostly used in an urban setting), *povoado*, *localidade*, etc. which indicate the same thing. To avoid confusion, I use the term 'city' only for large cities (more than 100,000 inhabitants) like Belém or Marabá and 'town' for interior municipal centre (*sede do município*) where basic urban infrastructure is established. In this classification, Novo Paraíso is a *localidade* situated between two towns of Eldorado and São Geraldo and, in this study, I simply call it 'village'.

⁴ For a brazil nut tree to be two diameters, it is said to be about 200 years old (e.g. Mendes 2005).

⁵ There is a large body of work on 'frontiers' all over the world. See Wendl and Röster (1999) for a concise overview from an anthropological perspective. I thank Eleanor Fisher for suggesting me the reference and telling me about similar situations in Africa.

⁶ In order to ease traffic accidents and speeding on the highways, the federal police has installed *lombadas* (lumps) near towns to slow the traffic speed. Consequently, armed bandits started to hide themselves around the lumps and when cars slowed down, they attacked the

drivers. Sometimes, they even made *lombadas* themselves with tree trunks, blocked the traffic, and attacked in groups.

⁷ In Brazil, agricultural extensionists (who are normally called simply *técnicos*) are titled as '*engenheiro agrônomo*' (university graduate) or '*técnico agrícola*' (from agricultural vocational schools).

⁸ *Cupuaçu* belongs to the same family as cacao and is widely cultivated by Amazonian farmers for juice pulp production. It has been increasingly promoted in the agro-forestry system as it is not suited for monoculture and can be marketed as 'Amazonian'.

⁹ To be precise, the Carajás Programme belongs to the municipality of Parauapebas, about 200 km west of Marabá, but the entire southeast of Pará is under the influence of the Programme (for a map see Reis 2001). Because of its economic advantage, politicians in Marabá have been generating a discourse of establishing the Carajás State (with Marabá as its capital) to become independent from Pará (e.g. AMAT 1996).

¹⁰ Marabá has three districts today: Marabá Pioneira, Nova Marabá, and Cidade Nova. In Cidade Nova, the newest district, there is a compound of rural extension offices of all administrative levels such as Municipal Secretariat of Agriculture in Marabá, Pará State Secretariat of Agriculture (SAGRI), Pará State Institute of Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (EMATER), the Brazilian Agricultural Research Cooperation (Embrapa, closed in 2004), IBAMA, and INCRA.

¹¹ *Sul do Pará* is nationally and internationally known for its land conflicts and violence, which started to intensify in the 1970s. It roughly refers to the southern half of Pará State's territory including the 'southeast'. However, people in the region of 'real' *sul do Pará*, beyond the municipality of Xinguara to the border between Pará and the state of Mato Grosso, are keen to distinguish between *sul* and *sudeste* (southeast) since they have different characteristics both in vegetations and in occupation histories.

¹² The assassination of an American missionary Dorothy Stang in February 2005 is the most recent and explicit case. Sister Dorothy was honoured with a human rights award from Pará Lawyers Organisation in 2004 for her support for small-scale farmers in a Transamazon town called Anapu in the southeast of Pará to implement a programme named the Sustainable Development Project. In February 2005, a gunman hired by a *fazendeiro*, who was against her activist approach of denouncing large landholders and pressing INCRA to create reserves for small farmers, shot her fatally in Anapu. The assassination raised a public outcry both nationally and internationally, leading to widespread criticisms of the 'culture of impunity' prevailing in Brazil (e.g. Zimmermann 2004).

¹³ Since then, every April, MST mobilises nation-wide campaigns and demonstrations named *Abril Vermelha* (Red April).

¹⁴ In Brazil, there are three police forces: the civil, military, and federal police. The civil and military police are under state governments' control, while the federal police is under federal government's control. The incompetence of the civil police (investigative) and the brutality of the military police (they are 'military' rather than 'police') have continuously raised the issue of police reform in Brazil. See Zimmermann (2004).

¹⁵ In 2004, trials started in Belém of police officers who participated in 'the operation'. More than 150 policemen were indicted while only two generals were convicted. For a detailed account on the 'Massacre in the Amazon', see Branford and Rocha (2002: 129-147).

¹⁶ BR-153 was originally OP-70 (OP stands for Operation Road) constructed at the beginning of the 1970s for military operations in the region. See Chapter 5.

¹⁷ What people in Pará call winter and summer come exactly opposite to those of the rest of Brazil. People in Pará call the rainy season from December to April 'winter' (while the rest of Brazil enjoys its official summer) and the dry season 'summer' since it cools down (a little) in the rainy season. In the Amazon, even in the dry season, it often rains and it never really dries up as one settler from the drier northeast region told me: "Here, we have only two seasons. One is 'rain everyday' (*chuva todo dia*) and the other is 'rain all day' (*chuva o dia todo*)".

¹⁸ In English, brazil nut (*Bertholletia excelsa*) suggests both the tree and nut of this tree. In Portuguese, the tree is called *castanheira* as the nut is commonly called *castanha do para* (nut of Pará).

¹⁹ The practice of *aforamento* originated through the Crown conferring *carta de foro* (letter of freehold) in 12-13th century Portugal; this was later applied to Portuguese colonies governed by the Crown, including Brazil, in the 16 and 17th centuries. Although this arrangement was no longer legally written into the Brazilian Civil Code reconstituted in the 1960s, it survived in the land laws in Pará to be applied to *castanhais* (Emmi, Marin and Bentes 1987). Between 1955 and 1966, 252 *aforamentos* were issued in Pará and 169 of them were directed to the southeast (Emmi 1999 [1987]). In Pará, the owner of a *castanhal* entitled to *aforamento* was also called *foreiro*.

²⁰ Mutran was a Syrian descendant who entered Marabá in the 1920s from the state of Maranhão. The brazil nut trade in Marabá was controlled by Deodoro de Mendonça, and Mutrans expanded the influence by buying out *castanhais* from Mendonça and securing *aforamentos* from the government while working for the brazil nut trading company of Antonio Borges in the 1930s. Mutrans became a part of the oligarchy when Mendonça left Marabá in the 1940s (Emmi 1999 [1987], Mattos 1996). Today, the largest brazil nut trading company in Brazil is still owned by Mutrans (Industria da Benedito Mutran e Companhia Ltda.).

²¹ Vavá Mutran, whose real name is Osvaldo dos Reis Mutran, was arrested in 1992 for murdering an inspector of the Executive Secretariat of Fazenda, and his position as a deputy was immediately suspended. In December 2002, he was arrested again for shooting an eight-year boy who entered his property 'to pick up a ball' (O Liberal 12 April 2003). In spite of those crimes, the Mutrans maintain the influence as *donos* and *fazendeiros* in the local setting (see Monteiro 2001), because of their persistent oligarchic dominations over local politics and economy backed by the 'local rules' of impunity and justification which characterise the pattern of local regulations of the study area. See Chapter 5 for a similar case in Novo Paraíso.

²² Other jobs in *castanhais* have been identified as: *lavador* (washer); *tropeiro* (carrier of nuts on donkeys); *barqueiro* (shipper); *cantineiro* (supplier of commercial goods); and *encarregado* or *empreiteiro* (foreman) (Emmi 1999 [1987]: 71-72).

²³ According to Cleary (1993: 353), '[a]viamento is the general term used to describe the great variety of economic systems in Amazonia which revolve around debt-credit relationships'. In Marabá, the term was usually used in the context of natural rubber extraction started in 1896, with the gathering of *caucho* (*Castilloa elastica*). *Caucho* was soon replaced by *seringa* (*Hevea brasiliensis*) that produced latex of better quality and had a possibility of the domestication. As the latex extraction of *caucho* killed the tree, today in Marabá, *caucho* is extinct (Mattos 1996). For a detailed history of natural rubber production and domestication and its decline in Brazil, see Weinstein (1983) and Dean (1987).

²⁴ In August 2001, the Cardoso Government abolished SUDAM for the corruption allegation made against Jader Barbalho, the former superintendent and governor of Pará. In August 2002, the Lula Government revived SUDAM as the Amazon Development Agency (ADA) to 'plan and promote structured actions that induce equitable and sustainable development of the Amazon in the national and international context of competitive integration' (www.ada.gov.br).

²⁵ Norder (2004) notes that the landless farmers (*sem terras*) prefer using the term 'occupation' to invasion for their organised activities to demand land reform since 'invasion' is typically the landowners' claim against the entrance of the landless farmers to their properties. In the Amazon, both terms seemed to be used interchangeably by landowners and individual *posseiros*.

²⁶ It is not my intension to go into detail about how these institutions were created for geopolitical reasons in the 1980s (see Schmink and Wood 1992 for the most detailed overview). However it is worth noting that the creation of GETAT consolidated the unequal land distribution in the region. GETAT was created under the Extraordinary Minister of Land Matters (MEAF) in 1982 in favour of owners who officially expressed their disappointment with the inability of INCRA to settle the conflicts in their *castanhais*. The president of GETAT was appointed to the ex-president of ITERPA, who had been politically close to the owners and, thus, GETAT did not make any agrarian reform policy proposals to effect the land redistribution (Emmi, Marin, and Bentes 1987: 16). In 1985, MEAF was integrated to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform and Development (MIRAD) and GETAT was abolished in 1987. The uncoordinated settlement policies and personal interests of the politicians in those state and federal government agencies made the later demarcation process of *castanhais* more conflictive and ineffective (Agência Ver Editora 1999: 49-50) while opening large social and physical spaces in which squatters could arrange their actions.

²⁷ Data of conflicts are usually derived from *ocorrências* issued by the military police. Therefore, more unrecorded incidents could have 'occurred' but they were not counted as *ocorrências*.

²⁸ In 1985, GETAT and INCRA were transferred to MIRAD under its minister Jader Barbalho, the ex-superintendent of SUDAM. GETAT was abolished in 1987 (see note 26) and INCRA was re-installed as a part of the renewed Ministry of Agrarian Development in 1989.

²⁹ UASGA was created in 1974 in São Geraldo as a sub-unit of INCRA's superintendency in Marabá. Currently, it is one of four other Advanced Units in the municipalities of Conceição do Araguaia, São Felix do Xingu, Tucumã, and Tucuruí.

³⁰ According to Emmi and Marin (1997), settlement projects demarcated around this time can be classified into: Group I - areas expropriated as 'unproductive *latifundio*' defined by MIRAD and later INCRA; Group II - areas originated in the former plotting (*loteamento*) of GETAT; and Group III - areas acquired based on the agreements with the owners (like the case of Grotão).

³¹ Layder (1997) proposes the theory of social domains by partly drawing on contributions made by Giddens and Bourdieu (see Chapter 2) and also by developing a social psychological understanding of the individuals' consciousness in these domains. He analyses social domains through two concepts - 'creativity and constraint', which partly elucidates the question of what kind of role individuality can play in actors' shaping of social domains.

³² According to Moore (2001 [1978]: 57), 'an arena in which a number of corporate groups deal with each other may be a semi-autonomous social field'.

³³ The Transamazon Highway extends for 1,254 km between the northeastern states of Pernambuco and the state of Amazonas (2004). According to the initial plan of the Médici Government (1969-1974), the Transamazon Highway was to be extended throughout the Amazon for nearly 6,000 km to reach the border between Peru and the state of Acre. Nevertheless, it was inaugurated when it reached the city of Itupiranga, the west-end municipality of Pará in 1972. The slogan of 'men without land to the land without men' (see Chapter 2) was in fact held up by the Geisel Government (1974-1978), conforming to the opening of the Transamazon Highway.

³⁴ Altamira is located about 500 km west of Marabá along the Xingu River, one of the branches of the Amazon River. It was originally a religious settlement established by Jesuits in the eighteenth century as they settled 'to acculturate' (scholars have recently changed the term to 'deculturate') indigenous groups in the region. With the opening of the Transamazon Highway, the city became the centre of planned colonisation in the 1970s-1980s.

³⁵ Moran (1981) provides the most detailed account of the colonisation plan and practice along the Transamazon Highway. Also there is an interesting observation made by Mattos (1996) who writes that the *agrovilas* along the Transamazon Highway were similar to *burgos agrícolas* (agricultural boroughs) implemented by the Portuguese colonial government in the nineteenth century.

³⁶ Hammond (1999: 469) writes: '[MST]...is unquestionably the most dynamic and influential political movement in Brazil today', which has successfully transformed itself from 'a sectoral 'agrarian reform' social movement to a political movement' (see Petras 1998: 124). See Norder (2004) for a detailed account of land policies in Brazil and the characteristics of MST (in the south of Brazil).

³⁷ In the Portuguese language, *floresta*, *mato*, and *mata* all indicate 'forest'. According to a *técnico* in ASDA, *floresta* connotes untouched forest; *mato* indicates 'forest to be explored and cleared'; and *mata* includes secondary forest.

³⁸ MST has a well elaborated website (www.mst.org.br) that has been translated into seven European languages.

³⁹ While MST is an independent social movement, FETAGRI is affiliated to CONTAG (*Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura*) and CUT (*Central Única dos Trabalhadores*), national farmers and workers' unions.

⁴⁰ The Brazilian citizen must carry an ID-card called *identidade*, which can be issued in 133 municipalities in Pará (that has 146 municipalities in total in 2004). Most settlers have moved their *identidade* registrations to the municipalities where they settled to register their land plots and also to participate in the municipal elections.

⁴¹ Rural workers include the *roçador* (land clearer) and the *plantador de capim* (pasture planter) contracted by both *posseiros* and proprietors mainly on a daily basis for the salary (*diaria*) of R\$ 7-8 in 2000. In 2004, the average daily wage for rural workers increased to R\$ 15 though if we convert it to dollar, the 'increase' was minimal because of the inflation (in 2000, R\$1=USD0.55 (20 July 2000) and in 2004, R\$1=USD0.33 (20 July 2004)).

⁴² According to Kitamura and Müller (1986: 6), brazil nut production in Marabá 'decreased by more than 55% between the 1978-83 period, with productivity dropping from 0.47 hl/ha in 1978 to 0.23 hl/ha in 1983 and the harvest area reduced by around 11% during the same period' (hl indicates hectolitre that equals to 100 litres).

⁴³ The latest report published by the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forest of the Ministry of Environment shows that the deforested area between 2003 and 2004 was the second largest (26,130 km²) in the history of monitoring by National Institute of Space Research (INPE). The deforested area recorded in Pará was the second largest in the Legal Amazon, after Mato Grosso. While the cause of deforestation in Mato Grosso is mainly the expansion of soybean plantations, in Pará, the principal cause of deforestation continues to be the establishment of settlement projects.

⁴⁴ With *Portaria Conjunta* (joint decree) 155 announced in 2002, IBAMA and INCRA agreed to establish an institutional cooperation regarding settlement projects and, in 2003, it was proposed that the so-called Forest Settlement Project (in *Portaria* 1,141) would include forest management in settlement projects; however it has not been sufficiently implemented.

⁴⁵ For a detailed analysis of neo-liberal policies implemented by the Cardoso Government, see Fleisher (1998). Between 1997 and 1999, most principal state companies such as the Amazon Bank, Companhia Vale do Rio Doce (owner of the Carajás Programme), Celpa (electric company) and Telemar (telephone company) were all privatised in those years in Pará.

⁴⁶ Researchers associated with the World Bank often attribute the cause of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon to individual *posseiros'* 'ego-centred' land occupation activities which regard forests as 'free goods'. See Ozório de Almeida and Campari (1995); Schneider (1995); and Verner (2004) for examples.

⁴⁷ Bamerindus Bank was bought by Hong Kong-Shanghai Banking Cooperation (HSBC) in 1998. The federal government exercised jurisdiction over the Fazenda and planned four settlement projects, but it soon succumbed to uncontrollable (or unplanned) invasions (O Liberal 19 June 2002).

⁴⁸ The etymology of both *grileiro* (which comes from *grilo*, cricket) and *laranja* (orange) is in their practice of falsifying official documents; these practices have existed since the nineteenth century. According to Motta (2001), the *grileiro* used to put crickets in drawers with falsified documents to make them look old and authentic in a short time. Those falsified documents usually looked brownish 'orange'.

⁴⁹ As Holston (1991: 695) writes: 'Land law in Brazil promotes conflict, not resolution, because it sets the terms through which encroachments are reliably legalised'. Thus, it is 'an instrument of calculated disorder by means of which illegal practices produce law and extralegal solutions'.

⁵⁰ Statistically, Pará dominated 55% of timber production in Brazil in 2004 (IBGE 2005).

⁵¹ The Brazilian economist Alfredo Homma has been a researcher at *Embrapa Amazônia Oriental* since the 1970s and has been the main outspoken researcher who rightly pointed out the 'announced death' of brazil nut trees in the southeast of Pará (Homma 2000a, 2000b, 2004) and the fallacy of environmentalism prevailing in the Amazon that has induced the implementation of unrealistic environmental policies. I am greatly indebted to him for the information used in this section.

⁵² At a national level, charcoal production levels in Pará are quite low (more than 70% of charcoal is produced in the state of Minas Gerais). Nevertheless, the impact of charcoal production on deforestation in Pará is considered significant since the entire operation of the Carajás Programme (including those subsidiary metallurgy companies in Marabá) annually requires at least 1,500 km² of forest for pig iron production (Anderson 1990; see also Hall 1989 and Reis 2001).

Social Events and Community Identifications

Identifying Leaders and Collectives

In the last chapter, we overviewed how social and historical processes had led to landscape change and the formation of Grotão as a social field in which *posseiros* could flexibly arrange their actions and shape practices in relation to others, the forest and government interventions. Local responses to statutory law enforcements and development interventions in the settlement area of Pará could be observed through *posseiros'* practices of successive land invasions and livelihood organisations based on timber trade or forest transactions. The chapter redefined the act of 'deforestation' as the embodiment of a style of development characterised by these responses, which served to further open physical, social and political spaces in the Amazon rainforest. These new spaces corresponded to the *posseiros'* social domains and arenas.

In this and the following chapter, we will explore the semi-autonomous-regulation process in the social field of the settlers by examining how individual actors have identified and used particular social domains in the course of developing their life projects, and how these social domains, in turn, have affected meanings attached to the settlers' practices. The settlers' organisations and their deconstruction of the organisations will be described more or less chronologically, so that we can highlight how the style of response to development interventions has been reproduced and changed over time in the settlement of Grotão, the Fazenda Bamerindus and, most recently, the region of Rio Preto. In this chapter, we will firstly look into temporary constructions of 'community' as a social domain visualised by key actors in different situational episodes.

In Grotão, there were initially two key 'community-leaders' who emerged to lead the political negotiations with the Ministry of Agrarian Reform and Development (MIRAD) for their settlement's demarcation in 1988. One was a man called Limirio whose career as a community leader started as a

pastor of the Church of the Assembly of God (hereafter, the Assembly of God) in a nearby settlement of Paraúna (about 15 km from Grotão); and the other was Kito, who had been a syndicate leader in São Geraldo. They were both involved in the establishment of the Small Farmers' Association of Novo Paraíso (hereafter, the Association) backed by the NGO, ASDA, and had been active associates, until Kito left the Association in 1996 when he decided to become a political candidate for the town council in São Geraldo. In 1997, Kito created the Small Farmers' Association of Vale do Mucura in Bamerindus (hereafter, AVM), and the delimitation of the collective boundaries became visible in Grotão, as the Association and AVM configured two political camps in the settlement. From 1997 until Limirio passed away in 2000, the distinction between these two associations could be observed in the village of Novo Paraíso, whose household numbers exceeded 1,000 in 2000, following the opening of Bamerindus in 1997 (see Table 2).

Table 2 Estimated household number in the village of Novo Paraíso

Year	Number of Households
1990	42
1992	53
1993	153
1996	270
1997	800
2000	1014

Source: ASDA (1990, 1992, 1993), the Ministry of Environment (1996) and the Association (1997, 2000)

Besides these two leaders, there was Almir, the owner of the Novo Paraíso Sawmill (hereafter, the Sawmill), who unintentionally led the 'third' movement of the settlers of Grotão (following the second movement to Bamerindus) in the 2000s to the region of Rio Preto (between the municipalities of Marabá and Novo Repartimento) situated about 300 km north of Grotão.

An outline of the events that made these three key actors shape (largely discursively) the 'community' of Novo Paraíso and surrounding areas is summarised in Table 3. The chapter follows these events to extract elements that are significant to understand the social characteristics of the settlers and their organising practices in the social field of Grotão.

Table 3 Key actors in Grotão

Year	Limirio	Kito	Almir
(Origin)	State of Goiás	State of Baía	State of Maranhão
Early 1980s		Joined Rural Workers' Syndicate (STR) - Xinguara in São Geraldo.	Entered Paraúna.
1986	Entered São Geraldo.		
1987	Built the first Church of the Assembly of God in Paraúna. Joined STR-Xinguara.		
1988	Established a camp and named it Novo Paraíso. MIRAD demarcated Grotão. São Geraldo became a municipality. STR-Xinguara in São Geraldo became STR-São Geraldo.	Entered Novo Paraíso.	Entered Novo Paraíso and started a logging operation.
1992	INCRA legalised the village of Novo Paraíso. Limirio became the mayor Lima's representative.		Installed the Sawmill Novo Paraíso.
1993	ASDA's entrance to Novo Paraíso. Goro started to live in the village, and the Association was founded. Limirio became the first president.	Became the treasurer of the Association.	Started to rent out plots in Novo Paraíso for the Sawmill employees.
1995	The first Rice Festival promoted by the Association. Surfacing of the main street by INCRA (30 km). João replaced Goro.		
1996	Limirio's ally Valdir won the general election.	Left the Association. Lost the general election.	
1997	The Association starts to	Founded AVM and was	Supplied gasoline and

1999	restructure. Starting of the PDA-supported 'sustainable and participatory project'.	appointed to the mayor Lima's representative in Novo Paraíso. Demarcation of PA Vale do Mucura in Bamerindus. AVM was in charge of a generator to supply energy in Novo Paraíso.	telephone service.
2000	Banana flour factory was inaugurated. A telephone pole was erected. Limirio was the vice-mayor candidate but died during the campaign (in July). Valdir won the election again and João left Grotão.	Installed two telephones. Kito was the candidate for the town councillor and lost again. The mayor Lima lost the election for the first time.	Installed three sawmills in Rio Preto. Opned Fazenda Macaúba in Rio Preto.

As we can observe from the Table 3, Limirio initially shaped the 'community' of Novo Paraíso through an occupation in Paraúna and by building an evangelical church. As we will see below through his life history, his identification of the 'community' and the leadership was undergirded by his experience as a pastor, which eventually prepared him for involvement in political activities, such as claiming the demarcation of Grotão, founding the Association in cooperation with ASDA, and finally becoming a vice-mayoral candidate in São Geraldo. After 1997, Kito significantly reconfigured the community shaped by Limirio by expanding his political territory to the Fazenda Bamerindus.

The local elections played an important role in this reconfiguration process since the political domains became visible to the settlers, which enabled them to consider how they should take sides. Moreover, the election opened a political space for the settlers to connect themselves to national politics, conferring a sense of political participation in the larger societal and national context. This political participation also served to facilitate the land invasions, and justified Kito's intentions and decision to include Bamerindus in the symbolic community boundary of Novo Paraíso. The community boundary was 'symbolic' because it was discursively delimited in the course of election campaigns.

This chapter will mainly follow Limirio's and Kito's life histories, social events and collectives which temporarily represented their 'communities'. It will further introduce Almir as an influential local actor who was never a political candidate but, through his timber business, maintained an influence over other local actors within his territory. Their stories will illuminate how elusive the community boundary is in the study area as each of them identified 'his' territory – Limirio was concerned with Novo Paraíso and Grotão, Kito added Bamerindus, and Almir expanded this area into Rio Preto. Therefore, as we discussed in the last chapter, we have no choice but to look into the moving social field and social domains of the settlers as they identify them when they choose to be led by these leaders. The ethnographic material follows situational events to mark uniting and disuniting moments for the settlers, which characterise the temporary collectives formed and deconstructed by the actors over time.¹

Life of Limirio

I met Limirio on my first visit to Novo Paraíso in 1999. A coordinator of ASDA had told me that the Association in Novo Paraíso would provide a good opportunity to understand the 'reality of a frontier community' in Pará, as the Association had a 'good leader' called Limirio, whom I could ask for support. Before the Association installed a house for visitors on its property in the village (in February 2000), *técnicos* and visitors were usually accommodated in his house, therefore he provided a window of the village to outsiders. He lived with his wife and a teenage son and visitors would stay with them at his house. In 2000, after the *técnico* Goro went back to Belém, I continued to stay in his house for further research.

His house was situated in the village centre along the main street, opposite the only supermarket in Grotão owned by an ex-brazil nut dealer. The main street was a continuation of the unpaved road that extended through the interior, and it was called *Avenida Castanheira* for about one kilometre inside the village. Limirio often sat on a wooden bench installed in front of his house, as most villagers did, to observe movements in the street and chat with passers-by.

In May 2000, Limirio's wife was often absent because she was doing a training course in São Geraldo to keep her function in the village as a postmistress. According to Goro, Limirio used to be an 'unofficial'

representative of Lima, the mayor of São Geraldo, who entrusted Limirio's wife to operate the post office, initially at the Association's headquarters in 1993. After the 1996 general election, the village had an officially elected town councillor called Valdir who kept alliance with Limirio, and has since then financially supported the post office. In 1997, the mayor's representative switched to Kito, who had cut his alliance with Limirio and with allies like Valdir who turned against the mayor Lima (see below).²

Limirio's house was a typical settler's house made of brazil nut planks, with an entrance that served as a living room equipped with a few plastic chairs, a television, some cheap bric-a-brac and embroidered cloths. Behind the living room, there was a dining room with a gas range and a refrigerator, as well as two bedrooms. The dining room had a back door that connected the house to the backyard (called *quintal*), which had a well,³ a toilet barn that also served as a bathing place, and 'sinks' made of used tyres for washing dishes and cloths. One half of the yard was covered with fruit and palm trees such as mango, coconut, *cupuaçu* and papaya. Among the trees, chickens ran and flew around. Limirio said that he had acquired the seedlings of the fruit trees from João when "he brought productive projects from Belém (i.e. ASDA)" (see Chapter 6 for details on the 'productive projects').

In 2000, electricity in the village was only supplied from six to ten o'clock in the evening, and portable water existed only in the Association's banana factory and the Sawmill. Nevertheless, most of the households already owned televisions and refrigerators, as they expected 'full-energy' to reach the village shortly.⁴

Limirio had a farm (*roça*)⁵ close to the village, in the direction of Eldorado, in the *ex-castanhal* Pau Preto. He was not very interested in expanding his property and becoming a *fazendeiro* (unlike many others) and, therefore, his plot was just over 15 *alqueires* (about 75 hectares⁶), smaller than the original INCRA's titling size in 1988 (between 100 and 500 hectares at that time). He had 15 cows and 13 calves, and said that he was a typical 'small producer' in the region.⁷ Other settlers often assessed Limirio as: '*Se metendo nas políticas* - involved with politics' in a slightly sarcastic way.

The year 2000 was a general election year,⁸ and Limirio was a candidate for vice-mayor of São Geraldo where he was allied with a mayor candidate called Manelão (who used to be Lima's vice-mayor), against the incumbent mayor Lima. In character Limirio was not really a politician type. He was often quiet and thoughtful, and did not give flashy performances like

other candidates. For earlier settlers in particular, he was known for trying to do 'good' for the 'community' by dealing with politics, since they knew Limirio from the time of *conquista* (according to one early settler) of Novo Paraíso and the demarcation of Grotão.

Below, we will overview his life history to understand the characteristics of his leadership, which shows how he entered the region, shared experiences with others in the early stages of forming their social field, named the initial camp Novo Paraíso, and negotiated the demarcation of Grotão. Then, we will turn to review the political importance of his move to shape collective action and represent the 'community' by heading the first and the biggest small producers' association in the region, by using his initial tie with the mayor and taking the opportunity to ally with ASDA.

Origin of Paradise

Limirio was born in 1957 in Gurupi, Goiás (the state of Tocantins since 1988) to the family of a middle-sized *fazendeiro* and rigorous *crentes*, the name given to evangelical church members.⁹ His wife was from Formosa do Araguaia, about 50 km west of Gurupi, and was also from a family of *crentes*. They got married in Gurupi in 1984, and entered Pará through São Geraldo in 1985.

Limirio briefly explained how he decided to come to Pará: "I was married; we were expecting the birth of our son, so I wanted my house and land. It was already too expensive to buy properties around where we lived in Goiás". In 1985, INCRA started a credit programme called Programme of Special Credit for Agrarian Reform (PROCERA) for new settlers as a part of the agrarian reform policy, which helped *posseiros* build houses and start subsistence agriculture. Limirio said that the programme gave hope to those who wanted to head to and settle in Amazônia. He had two elder brothers, and it was known that his father's *fazenda* in Gurupi would be inherited by the eldest brother. Therefore, he and the second eldest brother, Antonio, decided to take the Belém-Brasília Highway, which was inaugurated a decade before. The Highway attracted many people from the south and northeast of Brazil to Araguaína, the northern centre of Goiás, from where an unpaved road extended to Xambioá standing along the Araguaia River. Opposite Xambioá, across the River, was the village of São Geraldo (at that time it was still a part of the municipality of Xinguara), which had grown out of *barracões* (i.e. large

wooden shacks with thatched roofs that accommodate seasonal workers) for miners (*garimpeiros*) and brazil nut collectors built in the 1950s.¹⁰

Limirio said: “Everyone wanted and needed pieces of land and titles. And, we did not have money to buy an area as large as 100 hectares in Goiás without selling our cattle, but here it was possible; therefore many people headed to Pará. There were already projects of INCRA and an active *sindicato* (i.e. STR-Xinguara) and...[the Catholic]...Church that supported us”.¹¹

While Limirio’s brother Antonio stayed in São Geraldo to become a pastor of the Assembly of God, Limirio headed for the interior through an operational road (OP-70) that the military had opened to combat Araguaia Guerrillas in the 1970s. At the end of 1986, Limirio entered Paraúna, an old settlement of brazil nut collectors, about 75 km from São Geraldo, which was already undergoing demarcation.

The Araguaia Guerrillas were formed by outlawed communist party members and banished intellectuals during the military regime of the 1960s. These people allied themselves with *posseiros*, nut collectors and their syndicate movements in the region. In order to disarm the guerrillas, the military constructed operational roads, and the construction workers and loggers started to form villages. The guerrilla movement was almost completely suppressed by the mid-1970s, but the operation roads continued to attract newly arriving *posseiros* like Limirio and Antonio. Limirio said that when they entered Paraúna there were already many people who were forming farms and installing their houses since INCRA had already started the land titling process. Limirio shortly installed a *casa de oração* (worship house) at his temporary house in his farm in Paraúna. However, the military police and *pistoleiros* continued their operations in the area to evict the invaders for the owners of *castanhais*.

In 1987, Limirio was involved in an incident known as the Conflict of Paraúna.¹² At that time, he gave a testimony to the Land Pastoral Commission (CPT) in Xinguara¹³: “My name is Limirio Rodrigues de Amorim. I am 30 years old and a teacher and a protestant pastor of the Assembly of God. Here is my wife Lusimeire Martins Costa Amorim, 23 years old, and my son Elienair Martins Costa Amorim, 4 months old. They (i.e. the military police) came to our house around five in the afternoon and shot at it with a rifle. We live next to the church. They caught my wife and son and took them to the Portão (main gate) of Fazenda Bamerindus, and they passed the night at the Portão, watched by *pistoleiros* and PMs (i.e. military police officers). They

were liberated at 10 the next day (5 February 1987)". The document added: "They stole a flashlight from the house of the pastor and punctured tyres of his bicycle" (*Depoimento Paraúna*, CPT Xinguara 1987).

From this testimony, we can tell that, at that time, Limirio actively identified himself as a pastor, rather than as a *posseiro*, since this was how he recognised his initial social domain formed in the new life situation. By establishing himself as a pastor, he could obtain the trust of other families who were trying to define their social domains in the middle of the forest surrounded by the evicting forces.

After the incident, Limirio and 40 other families from Paraúna decided to move further into the interior, towards the direction of today's Eldorado. About 17 km from Paraúna, some nut collectors had installed their shacks inside the forest within *castanhais* adjacent to Bamerindus (the place was called Grotão dos Caboclos), and loggers, including Almir and his brother, started to enter the area. From the direction of Eldorado, with the paving of PA-150 and the closing of nearby *garimpos* (mines), some families also joined the camp, which Limirio and others from Paraúna had installed. Limirio built a worship house in the camp, which he named Novo Paraíso to attach a biblical connotation. Limirio later told me that twelve "*comapanheiros*" died in the occupation process and their names were remembered as the newly-opened street names of Novo Paraíso.¹⁴

In May 1988, São Geraldo officially became a municipality and split off from Xinguara. Lima, an active *sindicalista*, became the first mayor of São Geraldo, backed by STR-Xinguara led by Kito, who joined the Limirio's camp in the beginning of that year. Consequently, STR-São Geraldo was formed as a new branch of STR-Xinguara, and Limirio and Kito asked for an *audiência* (hearing) of MIRAD in Marabá as the members of STR-São Geraldo. As we saw in the last chapter, MIRAD officially expropriated six *castanhais* in the area and demarcated Grotão in the same year. The area of Novo Paraíso was officially titled in 1992 by INCRA as the urban centre of Grotão. At the same time, some regions inside Grotão, like Santa Inês and Lagoa do Ouro, which had been centres of brazil nut collection (called *Pontos dos Castanhais*), were also legally recognised, though some settlers told me that previous occupiers and ex-nut collectors had already left the region because of the delayed demarcations.

For Limirio, the often-dramatised conflict seemed to be an anecdote, which was a natural part of the land acquisition process ("*faz parte*", he said,

literally meaning 'make part'). However, Limirio's wife said: "I really wanted to go back home. I could not stand it and was very afraid. I cried all the time and prayed a lot". Many early settlers said that they were scared of *pistoleiros* and unknown animals living in the forest.¹⁵ She continued: "But thank God, we have a nice life now. Paraíso is not perfect but this is where I live. We knew that we had to start from the Church, so that our God would help us. Limirio first built a house with a room for prayers. Then, he started to baptise other families. We dug a well in our backyard, and others came, like the family of Sanchu (ex-nut collector from Maranhão) and the...[first]...wife of Kito. Almir and his brothers were working with some chainsaws and some people at first, and made planks for us...[to build houses]".

The Assembly of God

As we may detect from comments made by Limirio's wife, the initial influence of the Assembly of God was significant. It continued to be the only religious unit in Grotão until the Catholic Church was built at the village centre in 1995 when the region was included within the archdiocese of Conceição do Araguaia¹⁶ (to which the Catholic Church of São Geraldo also belonged). In 2000, there were 27 worship houses of the Assembly of God in Grotão, and four other protestant churches were active at the village centre.¹⁷

The Assembly of God is a denomination of Pentecostalism that grew in the nineteenth century United States and was introduced to Belém by Swedish missionaries in 1911. From this time the church's influence rapidly expanded through Pará and Brazil more widely; today, Brazil has the largest number of believers of the Assembly of God in the world (see Chestnut 1997: 25-48 for the history of Pentecostalism in Brazil). As the 'mother church' was built in Belém, for many believers (i.e. *crentes*), Pará represents the centre of the Assembly of God in Brazil.¹⁸

Goro once playfully explained that because settlers in the region had to confront *pistoleiros* and the military police, they became quite religious. As the police were not to be trusted, the church became a place of security, which embodied the settlers' sense of justice.¹⁹ Also, as the teaching of the Assembly of God was strictly against drinking, smoking, decorating houses, going to festivals and dressing up, the number of followers grew in the settlement since they could 'religiously' bear the hardship, while accumulating 'savings' for

further investment in farms and cattle. The rigorous *crentes* gathered almost every night for *cultos* (worship services), holding bibles in their hands.²⁰

Although not all the settlers were *crentes*, the thrust of the Assembly of God made Grotão distinct from other settlements that were influenced by the Catholic Church (headed by priests sent from outside) or that did not have any religious connotations as uniting elements among the newly arriving settlers. Limirio shaped the initial community of Novo Paraíso through the church and his occupational history, which made it easier for those who were already *crentes* to decide to settle in Novo Paraíso. At the same time as the church presented a locus of values for believers, their sense of belonging to the 'community of Novo Paraíso' was seemingly weak because the Assembly of God represented the wider religious community and social domain of the believers gathered from different locations.

The first association and the beginning of ASDA intervention

The settlers needed land titles principally because they guaranteed initial rural credit for them to build houses and to start subsistence plantations. Once they became the clients of INCRA, they could also collectively ask for improvement to the roads and social infrastructure, such as the school and health post. Consequently, the settlement projects attracted many non-*posseiro* migrants, such as merchants and construction workers.

Limirio became the representative of Lima in Novo Paraíso when INCRA officially titled the village area in 1992 as a district of the municipality of São Geraldo.²¹ The mayor appointed Limirio as the official 'community leader', partly to consolidate his own influence over every territorial corner of the municipality. In 1993, ASDA entered São Geraldo to promote a clean water supply. By that time, most settlers had obtained their land titles and initial credit under PROCERA, and they started to demand basic and social infrastructure as well as the technical and financial support to further develop production activities.

Goro said that the settlers who came to the meeting organised by ASDA and the municipal government of São Geraldo were mostly from Grotão, and they were enthusiastic about getting information on different credit opportunities. At that time, STR-São Geraldo stopped giving information or support to the settlers. Limirio, as the representative of the mayor in Novo Paraíso, led the discussions with the fellow settlers and ASDA to form the

Association, principally because an application to the special rural credit line for family-based agriculture (called FNO - the Constitutional Fund of the Finance of North Region established in the Amazon Bank in 1989²²) required the applicants to be collectively organised.²³

In October 1993, the Association was officially constituted with about 360 associates from all over Grotão. It was one of the first and the largest association of 'small producers (*pequenos produtores*)' in the region, as they called themselves. The Association obtained three plots inside the village, and one of them became the headquarters where a small office was installed and meetings held. Limirio was elected as the president, and Kito became the treasurer. Goro started to live in the village to work with the Association, and they initiated an elementary school on their own in the village in 1993. In 1994, 33 FNO projects were approved for the associates. In 1995, the municipal government installed an official elementary school and a health post in the village, as the population started to grow.

At that time, the main products among the associates were rice, beans and maize. Goro proposed the idea of a rice festival to promote the Association and 'community solidarity' among newcomers through the celebration of the agricultural harvest.²⁴ The first festival took place in August in 1995. Limirio tightened his relationship with ASDA as he started to participate in the events and training courses held in Belém for local leadership and capacity building (see Chapter 7).

Around this time, Limirio's role as pastor of the Assembly of God in the village became less significant since his means of mobilising collective action centred on the Association and its political activities.²⁵ Followers of the Assembly of God built its main church at the village centre in October 1995, and a full-time pastor from Araguaína (northern centre of the state of Tocantins) was appointed. Consequently, Limirio closed his room for prayer and stopped preaching or baptising others. It was a contextual change for his career since he became busy with 'community projects' that would directly mobilise financial and material resources. When I met him for the first time in 1999, he introduced himself to me as the President of the Association and did not mention that he was a pastor. It was Goro who first told me that Limirio was a pastor, and that was why he never went for beer with him.

At the beginning of 1996, Goro left the village, and João replaced him. Compared to Goro, João was more 'project oriented' in the sense that he followed a manual of how to organise and manage an association and

community development (see Chapter 6 for details). Goro sometimes criticised João as not having enough *papo*, 'chat', with the associates to see what they wanted or how they wanted to satisfy their needs and wants. In Brazilian Portuguese, *bater o papo* indicates 'just to chat *besteiras* (stupid things)' or gossip, and a serious *técnico* like João did not take it seriously (though he liked making *piadas*, jokes²⁶). However, for Goro, *papo*, as well as sharing beer, was the best means of communication that allowed him to make friends with his 'beneficiaries' and to assess insiders' views. In other words, they helped him grasp his beneficiaries' lifeworlds. It was understandable that Goro was also sometimes critical of Limirio for having a "*cabeça dura*" ('hard head').

By the same token, Limirio seemed to have got along better with João than with Goro once João started to 'bring' project ideas and modules from ASDA to the Association. Through the projects, Limirio started to embody the possibility of his community's future 'improvement', which could be visualised in the following local election processes.

The first election and the opening of internal political spaces

In October 1996, the first general election in which people of Grotão could officially participate as residents was held. It was a significant event for the settlers since it indicated that they were not isolated from the national political context. In order to participate in the election, the settlers had to register in São Geraldo (or in Eldorado), which made many of them feel that they were part of the administrative unit of the municipality.

The importance of the election was recognised by would-be leaders like Kito, who left the Association and started to openly criticise Limirio and João. The election provided an opportunity for him to justify his actions, as he became a candidate for town councillor in São Geraldo. Limirio, who was not entirely ready to be a 'politician', did not stand for the election, but his ally and friend called Valdir, a proprietor of the region of Pau Ferrado and a founding member of the Association, stood against Kito.

When the result was declared, it turned out that Valdir had won and Kito lost. Thus Valdir became the first and only town councillor from Novo Paraíso.²⁷ Valdir and Limirio worked together to negotiate with INCRA to improve the condition of the main road for 30 km. The surfacing of the principal road was essential, Valdir later said, since they could ask for a bus line from Araguaína to come to Novo Paraíso (the service started in 1999).

After this election, Valdir officially became a representative of the municipal government in Novo Paraíso and started to criticise Lima, the mayor, for “doing nothing” for Novo Paraíso.

The election defined the political domains in Grotão and forced settlers to take sides (since voting is compulsory in Brazil). In this process, the former social domains shaped by the activity fields of church and the Association under Limirio’s leadership were significantly reshaped since new political domains became visible through the election and affected the settlers’ initial social field.

In sum, until 1996, Limirio kept exercising his leadership over the settlers’ organisation, mainly through the church and the Association, as well as his ties with the mayor. In this respect he was able to facilitate others in choosing how they wanted to lead their lives by taking a particular course of action in his life project. In essence this started with his move to Pará and continued through his fighting with the *pistoleiros*, building a camp, preaching and baptising neighbours, and negotiating with the government and allying with the NGO. His personal situation and ambitions were thus interconnected with the societal and historical context of the settlement and formed a certain social context upon which other settlers could reflect on their own life projects. Local political participation stimulated the settlers to mobilise and visualise other possible influences, which affected the primacy of Limirio’s leadership. Below, we will examine how ‘other possible influences’ were configured in relation to the existing nature of the social field of Grotão.

Reconfigurations: Kito’s Political Move and Limirio’s Death

After losing the 1996 general election, Kito needed to create his own political space to maintain his political influence against the Association-based alliance of Valdir and Limirio. The ‘opening’ of Fazenda Bamerindus in 1997 gave him the perfect opportunity to do so. He initially approached to settlers in Grotão who had held plots in Bamerindus and, since they knew that the headquarters of Bamerindus had become empty, they formed the Small Producers’ Association of Vale do Mucura (AVM) to demand from INCRA the demarcation of an area in Bamerindus called Vale do Mucura. This alliance with the *posseiros* who were entering Bamerindus was supported by Lima, the mayor of São Geraldo. Lima and Kito had known each other through the syndicate movement in the 1980s and, because Lima sensed the ‘betrayal’ of

Limirio through his alliance with Valdir and Manelão, he officially appointed Kito to be 'his' representative in Novo Paraíso.

In the same year, the Association started a project entitled 'Coordination of the Integrated Process for the Sustainable and Participatory Development of Grotão dos Caboclos' through the Subprogram for Demonstrative Projects of the Amazon (PDA), a part of the PPG7 funding obtained by ASDA (see Chapter 6 for details). João became the *técnico* responsible for the project, which installed a rice processing plant (also supported by INCRA) and a banana flour factory in the Association's headquarters; it also financed a 12-ton truck, a tractor and a pick-up. The Association had to contract a driver from Palmas in Tocantins for the 12-ton truck, which required a special license. With the salaries paid to 14 factory workers and drivers, the small farmers' association started to resemble a specialised 'firm'.

Therefore, in 1997, two distinct collectives – in this case, formal organisations established as the Association and AVM – were institutionalised in the settlement.²⁸ However, this 'two-collective-era' did not last for long, as it ended in 2000 when Limirio suddenly died during the election campaign, and the Association lost its strong leadership. At the same time, both Kito and his 'patron' Lima lost the 2000 election, and AVM's political validity was practically lost. As a consequence, the settlement entered a 'collective-less' era as we will see in detail in the next chapter.

Below, we will consider Kito's life projects in relation to Limirio's to look at the process of differentiation observed in the 'community' of Novo Paraíso, which formed two associations. Then, I will describe Limirio's death, his funeral, and the first Rice Festival without him, in order to illustrate how the other settlers understood his influence and how their loosely formed social domains were reconfigured after his death. The reconfigured social domains worked further to reshape the settlers' social field and identification processes of 'community' in Grotão.

AVM and the differentiation of community

Kito was living two blocks down from Limirio along the main street. His house was made of bricks, cement and a tiled floor instead of brazil nut planks. In 2000, only Almir and the owner of the supermarket (who was Almir's son-in-law) had houses like Kito's residence. Goro told me that Kito was

quite dynamic and a good person to work with when they started the Association but that after he left the Association and became Lima's representative, his activities were too preoccupied with "making money". Goro said: "Kito is trading cattle and looks like trading some plots in Bamerindus and doing some stuff for Lima. Lima gives him R\$1,000...[per month]...to be his representative". Kito was said to own 40 *alqueires* of forest in Bamerindus though he never admitted this. According to an inspector from INCRA's Advanced Unit of São Geraldo, Kito was illegally buying areas of forest from "his associates" and "making trouble" even with the police as he sometimes had fights with neighbouring land grabbers.

Kito was as old as Limirio. He was *baiano*, a man from Baía State in the northeast. Kito said that he was called Kito because he went to Quito in Ecuador when the federal government recruited miners (*garimpeiros*) to send to Guyana, Columbia and Ecuador during the drought in the northeast in the 1960s: "My brother and a bunch of people went. I was about 15, still a *moleque* (a boy)".²⁹

In the 1970s, when the construction of the Transamazon Highway and *agrovilas* was at its peak, Kito went to Altamira with colonists and workers, hoping to get a better job than mining. He said: "In 1976 when I got there, there were many people who worked on the construction of the *Transamazônica*, and many *pau de araras* (literally, 'parrots' perches', i.e. typical trucks that transported cattle and rural workers) were carrying people. In Altamira, I joined the syndicate movement and, later, was invited by other *sindicalistas* to São Geraldo (at that time it was Xinguara), because there were so many conflicts between *posseiros* and *pistoleiros*. So I came here. I became the president of STR-Xinguara, and we pressed the...[state]...government to make São Geraldo a municipality. Lima became the mayor because he led the...[municipal]... movement, and we elected him".

He invited Limirio in São Geraldo to join STR-Xinguara and, then, STR-São Geraldo, a newly created branch of STR-Xinguara. At that time, STR-São Geraldo was the only official organisation through which *posseiros* could negotiate with the Ministry of Agrarian Reform and Development (MIRAD). As a part of the syndicate movement, they fought for the demarcation of Grotão. However, Kito had never been a land owner, and his interest in 'production' in general seemed to be low. At the time of the demarcation of Grotão, he recounted how he had obtained a plot in the region of Lagoa do Ouro, but sold it a few years later because he became "too busy

with the activities in Bamerindus". While his explanation for leaving the Association was mainly due to his disliking of Limirio and João, it also seemed that he simply lost his interest in negotiating credit and other 'productive projects' for the Association.

Kito said: "We (i.e. Kito, Limirio and Goro) worked together in the beginning, I worked a great deal for the Association and, at that time, all the producers in the region were associates. Now, look at them! Everyone left because their administration was chaotic. Goro was a good man but now João, he doesn't work with us. He only works with Limirio. The factory? I do not think it will work. Who wants banana flour? Now there is a different dynamic here. Our association has more than 300 associates, and everyone is working in Vale do Mucura".

While neither Limirio nor João ever mentioned AVM, Kito was eager to differentiate his position from the Association and the early history of Grotão, which newly arrived *posseiros* who aimed at grabbing land plots in Bamerindus, were not aware of. When I asked Kito why he and Limirio had split up, he replied that he and Lima were more 'left' while Limirio had become 'right': "[Limirio's]...party is PSDB (Brazilian Social Democratic Party), the same as our President...[of the Republic, Fernando Cardoso]. Manelão is 'right'.³⁰ Lima is 'left' and I support that. You know PDT (Workers' Democratic Party)? The party for workers. We work for the poor and working people. They work for *capitalistas*". He also differentiated Manelão as "known in the city" while Lima had more support in the forest and rural areas.

The explanation partly shows how Kito used the language of political differences to differentiate 'his domain' from 'theirs'. However, the image and ideology of 'left and right' or 'urban and rural' were not clearly shared by other settlers who needed more concrete examples to understand the merit of such political differences. Kito's 'ideological' (or rhetorical) approach to community differentiation could be one of the reasons why he never won an election. For example, his source of differentiation was also directed to other political movements such as MST.

In 1999, INCRA demarcated the area of Vale do Mucura on paper but, in June 2000, AVM was still negotiating for official recognition of the area. He said: "Yesterday, I was in Marabá to have INCRA approve our request on definitive titles and credits. But it is not easy, you know? MST was occupying INCRA, and they started to accuse us of illegally occupying forest and extracting timber. They are a bunch of drunken men (*bêbados*) who use

up all the money that they get from the government for *cachaça* (sugarcane spirits). They don't work the land. They only talk (*só papo!*) and push to get the nice brick houses that the government builds for them and, when the money ends, they go for another invasion and do the same thing. We are different. We work. We work on land. We cut trees, sell trees, farm (*roçar*) and raise cattle. We work for the economy. But, INCRA listens to them (i.e. MST) because they make all the fuss, and get accommodated. We negotiate but we don't occupy INCRA for weeks just to get money, no!"

"Now, we think we need a technical study to determine the characteristics of the soil. Here, some plants do not 'stand' (i.e. mature). We need *técnicos* who can make a study to know the real possibility of the land. I think Goro is a good person. Bamerindus has two types of land – *pasto* (pasture) and *mata* (forest). So we need two studies. We also need good credit with low interest. The roads are difficult...[to pass]...in winter (i.e. the rainy season) in Bamerindus".

Kito was eloquent. "I have lived here in Novo Paraíso for 11 years. Now, I think Novo Paraíso should become a municipality. It is actually going through an official process at the Administrative Division of the state government. There are about 1,000 families, approximately 4,000 people already living in the village. In Bamerindus, we have more than 500 families. If we combine the entire Grotão and Vale do Mucura, for sure, we will have 10,000 to 12,000 people. It is just estimation, but I think we will have about that number of inhabitants in the municipality of Novo Paraíso. That's already a good reason. Piçarra became a municipality with 8,000 inhabitants.³¹ Manelão does not have an interest in this...[matter]...though we already put in a request with our signatures to the Legislative Assembly of Pará. If we become a municipality, there will be more jobs and budget and I mean our life will be absolutely better".

Later, I heard the same argument from Valdir, the town councillor in Novo Paraíso. The ambitions of the (would-be) councillors to turn 'their localities' into a municipality seemed to reflect the precedent of Lima and other 'founders' of municipalities in the region who became mayors through syndicate movements and land demarcations in the 1980s.³² As the Association stayed on with Limirio and Valdir through continuous ASDA intervention, Kito needed another locality within which he could articulate his leadership. That was why we could say that Bamerindus opened a large political space that allowed him to develop his performance of distinguishing

'his people (expressed as 'us')'³³ from 'them' including the Association, 'capitalists' and MST alike.

This fact indicates that the forest can be a political instrument at the local level since an emergent leader like Kito could use it to craft his political performance by identifying the possibility of INCRA's demarcation of a settlement project. As the demarcation process of Grotão showed, INCRA's settlement demarcation consequently embodied the possibility of turning an elusive community into an official and administrative territory, upon which the leaders could consolidate their influence. In other words, the forest made the physical and symbolic boundaries expand and, consequently, the settlers' social domains became substantially reconfigured in relation to the social field of Grotão.

Two collectives and political domains

In another general election in 2000, Kito was again a candidate for town councillor, allied with Lima, while Limirio stood for vice-mayor of the opposition leader Manelão. As political candidates were prohibited from holding an additional post in legal organisations, the appointed president of AVM was Flavio, a furniture-maker (*marceneiro*) in the village (who had never been a *posseiro* in his life). He said that he was a good friend of Lima from military service days, and the mayor trusted him: "Look, now we have 310 associates, and they are all documented. We got our settlement demarcation in Vale do Mucura last year, but we are still waiting for INCRA to issue the official title to each of our associates".

In 1999, Lima installed a generator in the village centre, and AVM became responsible for electricity in Novo Paraíso. Flavio's wife was in charge of the bills. The electricity charge was eight *reais* per *tomada* (literally, 'per socket'). Considering a minimum salary at the time was 151 *reais* (USD 90 in September 2000), and the average income of villagers was 237.5 *reais* (USD 142) (Otsuki 2001), the energy price sounded expensive. She said that about 100 households along the main street paid, and she allowed payment with *fiado* (on credit). It had nothing to do with the principle of AVM to 'fight for land' in Bamerindus. But, as Kito installed public telephones in front of his house at the end of June 2000, and Limirio subsequently implemented an antenna for cellular phones in the Association's plot, I realised that the associations were being used by these leaders to show their influence over 'their community'

through the exercise of what may be called 'infrastructural power' in the settlement (see below).

The campaign process that officially began in the beginning of July 2000 vividly showed the articulation of two collectives headed by Limirio and Kito that involved the majority of settlers. The candidates provided paint to the supporters who painted their names and candidate numbers on the walls. They also distributed T-shirts and caps with their names and numbers to the settlers. The campaign was extended to Bamerindus, which became the latest community arrangement to be included in the political domain of Grotão.

In this process, the social domains of the settlers in Grotão and also Bamerindus were momentarily institutionalised, as they seemed to overlap with the political domains shaped by these candidates. At the same time, new segments of the 'community' emerged since newcomers were attracted to Novo Paraíso through Bamerindus or family members of the early settlers who started to join. These newcomers did not share the original identification of the settlers' social domains with Limirio or Kito or their respective associations. The settlers' official political participation and the emergence of new social segments of the settlement consisting of newcomers seemingly helped to individualise and reconfigure the initial social domains that had been shaped through the struggle for demarcations, land titles and initial credit. As a consequence, the small farmers' associations significantly changed their characteristics and became discursive instruments through which emergent leaders could make visible their political territories.

Death of Limirio

Limirio died in a car accident on 12 July in 2000.

A week before, he called for a meeting at the Association's headquarters to discuss some issues such as: possible applications for a special credit programme of the Amazon Bank called FNO-PRONAF (National Programme of Strengthening Family-Based Agriculture);³⁴ an appointment of the new president following his candidacy for the coming municipal election; and a proposal to make a new rice storage in the Association's plot.

At the meeting João explained to the gathered associates (twenty-four men and three women) that PRONAF supported family agriculture, especially milk production, and it would be suitable for the associates' cattle businesses. Then, Limirio introduced Silvio as the next president and asked for approval

since Silvio “had learned a lot about the Association from Limirio during the last years” (according to João).³⁵ Silvio was a young man (27 year old at that time) from Tocantins who came to Pará with his parents who obtained 28 *alqueires* in Pau Preto. The associates unenthusiastically approved him since there were no other candidates. Lastly, Silvio and João proposed building a new barn to stock rice, which the Association would buy from the settlers in the region of Rio Preto, about 300 km from Novo Paraíso, where many ex-associates were settling down (see below).

Silvio said that they needed to use the rice processing plant to be able to commercialise refined rice, but there were not enough farmers in Grotão growing rice to fill the refinery’s capacity. Therefore, they needed to buy rice from farmers in Rio Preto. It was an apparently strange logic since the plant was installed with support from INCRA to help the settlers of Grotão to refine and commercialise their rice. At the same time, as there were already three rice processing units in the village, they had to compete with one another to secure rice producers who were rapidly changing their main economic livelihoods from annual crops like rice and beans to cattle (according to João, in 2000, the associates owned an average of 60 cattle per property).³⁶ The present associates were obviously not interested in discussions about the rice processing plant, and they quickly approved the plan without question.

Having freed himself from the Association, Limirio left for São Geraldo after the meeting about the political campaign. He had obtained a *Gol* car from Manelão for his campaign activities, and was becoming increasingly busy travelling around the region. When he crashed his car, he was on his way back from São Geraldo to Novo Paraíso. His son, nephew and two other villagers were in the car, but only Limirio died in the accident, breaking his neck.

Notice of his death came to the Association’s headquarters, where a telephone had been recently installed. When Valdir, Silvio, two *crentes*³⁷ and I arrived at the church of the Assembly of God in São Geraldo on the night of his death, Limirio had already been prepared for the wake prior to the funeral, and his body was laid out in the hall. His wife was lying on a bed at the pastor’s residence at the back of the church, praying and crying for Jesus Christ. The church members from São Geraldo who did not personally know Limirio were preparing the funeral together with the pastor Antonio, Limirio’s brother. Antonio’s wife told us to hang hammocks in another hall at the back of the church as Limirio’s family members and relatives started to arrive, mostly from

Goiás. Valdir said that Limirio's brothers, the *crentes* from Novo Paraíso and he had decided to bury Limirio in the church's cemetery in São Geraldo, instead of taking his body to Novo Paraíso. According to him, it would be too difficult to carry a dead body for nearly 100 km on the unpaved dirt road in the heat.

Early the next morning, Valdir sent a bus to Novo Paraíso for the villagers to attend the funeral and burial. Kito did not appear at the funeral though he was in São Geraldo, and someone commented: "Shame on him". Among the supporters of Lima and Kito, a few *crentes* came by bus, together with the Association members and others who were taking advantage of the 'lift' to visit their relatives in São Geraldo. João who had been back in Belém, and another *técnico* from ASDA, came by plane to attend the funeral.³⁸ Manelão was in front of the church with his campaign car. His name and the number were painted on both sides of the car together with Limirio's name and the number which read: *Vice-prefeito Irmão Limirio* (Vice-mayor Brother Limirio).

The small church was filled with church members, Limirio's family members and a bus-load of villagers from Novo Paraíso. Inside the hall, Antonio, Manelão, Valdir and church members of the Assembly of God of Novo Paraíso took turns to make speeches. João and Silvio made a speech on behalf of the Association. Outside the church, other villagers discussed how 'ugly' one could become in a car accident (since Limirio's face was totally deformed), and started to analyse his death: Some said that it was a 'political death' since the political candidates sometimes killed each other during elections (although this was not the case); others said that the death was 'predestined', as two sisters of Limirio's wife were also widows. An early settler who occupied Grotão before the demarcation with Limirio's family said, if Limirio were not involved in politics, he would not have had to die since "God did not like politics". These different interpretations showed how people identified Limirio with their own social domains that were politically shaped, family related, or represented by the field of the church.

Limirio's coffin was carried by men who made speeches, and women took the role of *choradeiras* (wailers) to pay him their last homage.³⁹ His grave was simple, without a gravestone bearing his name or even a cross.⁴⁰ The family of Limirio's wife arrived and told her to stay for awhile with her sister in Goiás. The villagers left by bus, and João and the other *técnico* from ASDA left by plane for Belém. Antonio said that he was going to send his son to take

care of Limirio's properties, especially his cattle in Novo Paraíso. These arrangements were made quickly after the burial.

The next day the village was in mourning for a day, and the supermarket, shops, bars, restaurants and schools were all closed. Only the Sawmill and brothels owned by a sister of an active Lima supporter carried out business as usual.⁴¹ The Sawmill's siren, indicating the beginning and end of a workday echoed through the otherwise quiet village. The Sawmill's operation was symbolic since the owner, Almir, had been against the Association and its alliance with ASDA, which carried 'environmental conservation' in its slogan (Goro had told me that Almir once threatened him saying he should leave the village if ASDA interfered in his business).

On the same day, a church friend of Limirio (one of the wailers at the funeral) removed the wooden bench from the front of his house as she thought it would be too sad to see it empty. The Association's 12-ton-truck driver who had travelled to Rio Preto to purchase rice passed by Limirio's house and, learning of Limirio's death from the woman, started to sob. He said: "Paraíso without Limirio is...*sem graça* (literally, 'without taste')". The driver was a vigorous member of the Assembly of God and had considered Limirio as his 'mentor'.

Friends' sentiments and the gathering of villagers at the wake and funeral, showed the extent of Limirio's influence since it was the first (and probably the last) time that someone's death united the majority of settlers. However, both a circus from Maranhão, which arrived in Novo Paraíso three days after the funeral, and the intensified election campaign quickly erased expressions of sadness at losing Limirio by 'his community' members. A week after the funeral, Manelão was visiting Valdir with his new vice-mayor candidate, a medical doctor from the state of Minas Gerais. They said: "We really miss Limirio, but we have to win the election, especially to realise Limirio's dream!" After a while, the name of Limirio on the walls was covered by the newly painted name of the doctor.

The Rice Festival

Right after the Limirio's funeral, some active Association members started to discuss whether to have the annual Rice Festival without Limirio, which usually took place in August. João came to Novo Paraíso to have a meeting with the associates at the end of July to discuss the matter, and they decided to

have the Festival in September and to commemorate Limirio's death. By that time, the Festival had become one of the 'principal events' of São Geraldo, promoted by the municipal government, and they agreed that it would not be wise to cancel it. Also, the Festival was considered to be politically important in an election year since candidates from other localities of São Geraldo could come to make their speeches, and could make 'contributions' to the Festival's budget.

In mid-September, the sixth Rice Festival was held in the main street and in one of the restaurants whose owner was a former Association member. The Association put up a booth to exhibit a picture of Limirio and some products from their banana flour factory. Some *técnicos*, including João, came to the Festival to represent ASDA and to help the Association promote the banana products. Silvio, the new president, made a short speech in remembrance of Limirio's life and death on behalf of the community of Novo Paraíso. Then, a *plantador de capim* (pasture planter) called Paulinho read a poem that he had written dedicated to Limirio.⁴²

Few people seemed to pay attention to commemorations for Limirio since many people who attended the Festival simply did not know who he was even though it was only two months since his death. Also, as *crentes* believed that festivals were 'sinful' events, the core supporters of Limirio were not present. In any case, the Festival was filled with events like *cavalgada* (rodeo) and cowboy dancing with music from the northeast and centre-west of Brazil, which served to peripheralise the principles of the Association and an original aim of the Festival to promote rice farming and community agro-industry.

At the time of the Festival, the Association officially had 45 associates, and there were few producers who identified themselves as 'rice farmers' or 'small producers' (see Chapter 6 for details). Reflecting on this fact, the municipal government, the Association, and João had agreed to change the name of the Festival from the Rice Festival to the Festival of Producers so that most participants, both 'big' and 'small' producers, would feel that it was their Festival. In other words, it significantly changed the original characteristic that Goro had intended to introduce and that Limirio had diligently promoted to unite the 'community of small producers'. Since the 'community of small producers' no longer existed in a unified form in the settlement, changing the name was a pragmatic solution to perpetuate the Festival. It seemed that the Limirio's death and the omission of rice or 'small' farmers from the Festival symbolically and practically embodied the end of the initial delimitation of

community that Limirio had intended to make visible through the Association and the Festival.

Right after the Festival, Antonio's son came to sell Limirio's properties, such as his cattle, motorbike, and television, though he left the plots and houses for Limirio's wife. The entire family of Antonio (who left the church in São Geraldo) consequently moved to Bamerindus where they hoped to buy land with the money made from selling Limirio's property.⁴³

When Limirio's wife came back to Novo Paraíso a year later, she stayed for a while at the Assembly of God, which offered her shelter until she found a second husband who had just arrived from Piçarra (who did not know Limirio in person, which according to her, was ideal). He was a pasture planter and also a keen *crente*. The pastor of the church played the role of 'match-maker', as Limirio's wife needed to remarry in order to live in her (i.e. Limirio's) house in the village again (since it was not common for a woman to live alone in the settlement). She said that she wanted to return to Novo Paraíso where she had her friends, her house, and a job as postmistress. After a year of absence, she reopened the post office in her house in June 2002. The passage of Limirio's life and death was almost completely erased.

The Funeral and the Festival: symbolic and pragmatic action by the settlers

At this point, we need to briefly reflect on Limirio's funeral and the Rice Festival turned Festival of Producers as symbolic social events in the settlement, which embodied the end of the small producers' community as articulated by Limirio. These events basically illuminated each settler's loose identification with his 'community' apparent in the social field. The settlers' participation in these events was selective and never 'imperative' (c.f. Gable 2006: 391) because the events had the capacity to generate different meanings attached to each settler's social domains and collectives, which had never been fixed or underpinned by structural backgrounds (such as kinship relations or clear institutions). Following Turner (1975), such social events generated symbolic action (as public events) closely linked to pragmatic action, which settlers would take according to the significance they gave to Limirio's life and death or to their experiences with the Association and the Rice Festival.⁴⁴

The funeral, burial and proceeding day's mourning, showed that Limirio's death was a public event, as his life had represented the making of the 'community' of Novo Paraíso. People gathered at the church throughout

the night of his death and stayed until burial, to pay their respects to his corpse and to sing hymns, to make speeches, to gossip, and to wail. After the burial, the majority of villagers went into mourning. The sequence in which these actions occurred represented certain collective action that linked to or transcended the field of politics, the Association, the church or familial relations. In short, the death of Limirio led to an articulation of collective action; in this respect the tragedy led the settlers to symbolically identify with their social domains, which still showed previous 'boundaries' drawn through their encounters with Limirio.

At the same time, the meanings attached to his death (and subsequent reflections on his life) were soon to be particularised since the event enabled the settlers to further diversify the way they identified with their own political and social domains and notions of 'community' in their social field. In this regard, the continuity of each settler's life in the settlement was confirmed through identification with their social field and through related collective action. Limirio's family members also took part in the particularisation process since they sold part of Limirio's property and moved to Bamerindus to start their new lives, while his wife soon remarried in order to start to live again in Limirio's house. Therefore, his social presence lived on and was reconstituted through the continuity of each settler's life.

In this way, Limirio's death quickly became a history that was linked, not with a single collective identity, but through the memories of each individual settler and through the way in which they identified their 'community'. Thus, his social presence after death occasioned a rearrangement of certain actions and practices pertaining to particular social field (see Chapter 6). The fact that Limirio was a Pentecostal pastor and a strong political leader seemed to affect this rearrangement, since his allies (or followers) needed to replace Limirio as soon as possible in order to maintain the continuity of existing political and social domains.

This rearrangement of collective identification with Limirio's life and death could be clearly observed at the Festival during which Limirio's death was commemorated in a rather improvised way. The collective category of 'small-farmer' was practically excluded from the Festival and justified in the need to embrace the wider category that included all 'the producers in the region'. In this process, 'rice' became a symbolic metaphor identified with the 'small farmers' and the history of the settlement, while the rodeo-style dance and songs embodied the present and future status of the producers' individual

desire to overcome the smallness expressed in the notion of themselves as a 'community of rice farmers'. In short, Limirio used the Rice Festival and the small farmers' association to articulate his idea to build a 'community of small farmers' but after his death, this gradually ceased to exist except in politicians' speeches or NGO project documents.

According to Turner (1975: 159), social events like funerals and festivals are anthropologically considered to be symbolic, in that they 'restore internal integrity' to the individual and give 'order to his community' (see also Turner 1970[1969]: 94-165 for more discussions on *communitas*).⁴⁵ As we will discuss in detail in the next chapter, these aspects of symbolic action that restore internal integrity and order to the social domains of individuals lead to the generation of pragmatic action, as individual actors internalise and reflect on their collectivity and individuality in these events.⁴⁶ An understanding of collectivity and individuality becomes important for actors in grasping moments for either loosening previous collective arrangements or strengthening their arrangements and commitments. In the case of the settlers in Grotão, their pragmatic action could be observed in the symbolic events described above. In this process, Limirio's social existence after the death was distributed and reinterpreted across different social and political domains.

In sum, symbolic events like funerals and festivals do not only work to strengthen collective action in a settlement but they also serve to restore the individuality of each settler who attaches different meanings to these events. As a result, they start to particularise and rearrange collectives (in this case the farmers' associations), which were previously configured by both Limirio and Kito.

After Limirio

Limirio's disappearance did not work to Kito's advantage. At the beginning of November, the election results came out: Manelão and Valdir won, Lima lost his position as the mayor for the first time, and Kito lost again. The new vice-mayoral candidate for Manelão, the doctor from Minas Gerais, became very popular in a short period by emphasising his newness to Pará (just like everyone else in the region) and hailing Limirio's legacy of attracting 'projects' to São Geraldo (although the doctor had never met Limirio). Here, Limirio's death was symbolically used for the election campaign.

Valdir remained the only town councillor from Novo Paraíso and, as Manelão won the election and became the new mayor of São Geraldo, he seemed to have strengthened his political position in the council since they were partly supported by the same parties (Party of Liberal Front - PFL and Green Party - PV). Valdir had promised that he would invite João to be the Municipal Secretary of Agriculture and Environment if he were elected and, since he was elected, João left ASDA and entered the municipal government of São Geraldo.

As soon as he took office in January 2001, Manelão changed the name of the elementary school in the centre of São Geraldo to Limirio Rodrigues de Amorim. However, in Novo Paraíso, Limirio's presence was no longer visible after the election, as the region was attracting a large number of migrants and growing rapidly. The forest patches around the village were almost all cleared, and any trunks lying on the unpaved road were removed.

According to Limirio's wife, João never visited Novo Paraíso after he became the Municipal Secretary. She said that she was disappointed because she had asked João to help her with her pension arrangements following Limirio's death. Later, João simply said to me at his office in São Geraldo that he was too busy with so many 'projects' (as he had to monitor more than 40 associations in São Geraldo). Without Limirio and João, the Association and its 'sustainable and participatory' project were soon facing a fragmentation process, as we will see in detail in the next chapter.

The Old Man and the Sawmill

So far we have described two collectives and their institutionalisation processes as represented by emergent community leaders, such as Limirio and Kito in Novo Paraíso. The description showed the process of configuration of these institutionalised collectives, which were influenced by local elections, population growth, Limirio's death, and withdrawal of the *técnicos*. The configuration process generated a diversification in the settlers' identification with their 'community'. In this sense, Limirio's death was a key event for the community of Novo Paraíso from which individual settlers could derive different meanings and attach these meanings to their renewed social field. In other words, the event highlighted how settlers' drew on their personal experiences to make pragmatic use of situations and previous collective action within different political and social domains in the settlement.

At this point, it is necessary to pay attention to the unchanged or unarticulated social domain that had been present in Grotão and Bamerindus, which influenced every settler's experience and life project. At the end of 2000, the only influential person left in the village was Almir, the owner of the Sawmill who remained uncommitted to local politics and related community arrangements. The Sawmill had penetrated all the social and economic domains in the settlers' social field because it had been closely involved in the livelihoods of individual settlers and in household-level livelihood organisations, either through material arrangements or as a labour market, from the beginning of occupation to the moment when the settlers decided to move on to other regions.

Almir was originally from Maranhão, and had moved to Goiás with his family when he was five years old. He had moved to Araguaína and entered Pará in the mid-1980s through the movement that Limirio led. He was already a logger in Goiânia in Goiás before he reached Pará and established the first sawmill unit in Paraúna. When he entered Novo Paraíso at the end of the 1980s, he put up a small sawmill at the end of what is today's main street (to the direction of São Geraldo) with his brother. In 2000, he was 63 years old, and the settlers called him "*O Velho* (the old)".

Almir's house stood in front of his Sawmill and was the largest in the village. It showed a typical '*fazendeiro* style' with a tiled roof, white walls, and a large tiled patio installed with heavy wooden chairs and a table made of the polished stump of brazil nut tree. Unlike other houses in the village, the house was surrounded by high walls. His son-in-law, the supermarket's owner, lived next door in a similar house, which had a large garage for pick-ups. Almir also owned an apartment in the city of Marabá, a house in Araguaína, and the Fazenda Macaúba in the region of Rio Preto (in Marabá). In 2000, he was mostly to be found in his Fazenda or visiting his mother in Goiânia in Goiás, and was seldom seen in Novo Paraíso.

Almir had virtually handed over the Sawmill to his son who told me that it employed 183 workers, possessed two large European saw machines and a stove and 14 trucks including a water tank truck and charcoal carriers. It also owned three sites of *carvoarias* (charcoal production units), and each site had an average of 40 furnaces in full operation.

According to the settlers, Almir bought a brazil nut trunk for R\$ 20 to 30 and sold the sawn timber for R\$ 180 per cubic metre.⁴⁷ Throughout the region, new settlers needed at least 3 m³ of timber to construct their houses (Homma

2000a) and, therefore, they had to pay R\$ 540 to the Sawmill when they settled. The settlers needed to cut more than 20 brazil nut trees in their plots to make this money.⁴⁸

The Sawmill initially provided basic infrastructure like a telephone and electricity for over 20 houses, which it owned in the village. Gasoline was also sold at the Sawmill until Valdir officially installed a gas station in 2002. Thus before the arrangement of basic infrastructure entered the political domain, the Sawmill represented 'the service provider' for the majority of settlers and was therefore considered essential to the settlement. For example, when I visited secondary school in the village in 2000, the students were making a miniature sawmill to present at the Rice Festival as the most important industry in their region. Although the 'infrastructural power' of the Sawmill waned in the process of political transition leading to the election year of 2000 and beyond, each settler had held contact with it in their life courses. The settlers needed the Sawmill, which was why few people accused Almir of being a 'slave owner' when he was arrested by the federal police in 2004 (see below).

Laws and rules

Almir's position in the settlement was similar to that of the 'traditional *coronel*' in Brazil, who was the embodiment of 'rule' in 'his' territory.⁴⁹ He could threaten environmentalists in general, journalists (like the one who once wrote an article in a local newspaper to denounce the Sawmill's use of child labour⁵⁰) or NGO workers like Goro who tried to promote 'sustainable agriculture' in the settlement. The source of his power and authority came from the forest, which commercially he almost monopolised in the region of Grotão and also Bamerindus. Towards the interior of the region, he did not have a clear competitor, since he was an impressive businessman and wealth-oriented person and seemingly uninterested in political games at election times. He was virtually (though implicitly) the ruler of the semi-autonomous social field of the settlers and was part of the constant negotiations and confrontations with the larger social matrix.

For example, he harshly criticised outside enemies, such as IBAMA's forestry regulations, to emphasise his own understanding of these regulations. As the settlers did not like IBAMA's regulations (many of them complained how it prohibited their practices of hunting⁵¹ and burning their plots for

agriculture and pasture renewal), Almir's rhetoric of accusing IBAMA of damaging his business gained general approval.

In an interview in 2001, he analysed his situation as follows.⁵²

"The biggest problem for the logging industry is that IBAMA does a lot of damage. The second problem is the lack of labour – it's just too weak. The price also is not really compatible. The cost of industrialising all the operations is very high and, when it is time to sell...[the final products], the price is not appropriate.

IBAMA inspects. The only problem we have with IBAMA is that they hurt our logging industry because they charge a 'fee' (here he used the word *propina*, which implies a 'bribe' but for IBAMA it is meant to be a *multa*, or 'fine'). They interfere too much. On the one hand, they are right and on the other, wrong. Sometimes, they act more on the wrong side than the right. Well, it is really difficult to talk about a federal organ like IBAMA to you (so I stopped the recording here for a while)...We want IBAMA to help us instead of muddling us because, if they do not, they are going to destroy things for everyone. When they inspect, they don't even want to know who is right and who is wrong. There are many people working clandestinely. We cannot cite names because there are really many. Some sawmills *ai dentro* (meaning, "over there, inside" i.e. in Bamerindus and Rio Preto where his sawmills operate intensively) are installed without paying taxes and without operation licenses.

I have more than 100 people working for me. I am the largest employer in Novo Paraíso. And, look, we have a programme of reforestation. We have 35,000 seedlings of middle sizes and 10,000 small ones. They are brazil nut, mahogany and cedar. It is little known. For example, we work with Assimec (Logging Industry Association of Eldorado do Carajás) whose president today is Valdir do Campo (ex-mayor of Eldorado).⁵³ The importance of Assimec is that it coordinates and administers the replanting of land where we have extracted timber. Our plantations were supported by Assimec. They came, planted for us, and we took care of them. We started two years ago, but the real work started at the end of last year.

I pay an average of 20 *reais* for every log extracted from the forest. We process it and mostly sell it outside...[the region]. We do not go very far to

extract timber – our distance to extract is short. The farthest is about 20 km and, still around two kilometres, we have timber.

There is a recent a law that prohibits the extraction of some species. We are small producers compared to other large industries. Today, we do not extract mahogany, which is prohibited, so we don't cut it. Only large logging industries cut mahogany. It is exactly what I mean by how IBAMA damages us, the small industries, and leaves the large to fly free. Sometimes, they don't even look at them. I see trucks carrying mahogany all the time. I see large industry cutting even in the area of indigenous tribes. Now, when IBAMA sees the small industry trucks pass, they catch the timber and the guys who carry the logs. *É uma novela!* (It is a big scandal)...For that, we say that we work *na raça e na marra*, as people say.⁵⁴ In the past, it was all much better. Today, loggers do not earn anything. Today, here, we are much damaged also because of the mayor (Manelão). If there were no loggers, people here would not have had anything...Without us, the region would not have had roads for *fazendeiros* nor for *posseiros*".

Once in a while, IBAMA inspectors from Marabá pass through Novo Paraíso and stop at the Sawmill where Almir was said to be paying 'regular tax' (that he described as a bribe) of nearly R\$40,000. In another conversation, he complained about the international market and foreign exporters for keeping timber prices much lower than they used to be. According to his logic, his business continuity was always disrupted by newly created laws and markets 'out there'. He said that he "did not understand" why he had to confront all those regulations since he, more than anyone else, was benefiting everyone in the region by opening roads, buying trees, and providing jobs.

The Sawmill's relations with 'everyone in the region' were mainly material (labour, wages, timber, charcoal, roads, etc.) according to its own rules. The arrangement could only be affected by external laws and regulations, which Almir could no longer entirely ignore but could negotiate because of his 'material power' that had shaped the social life in the settlement. The Sawmill physically opened the way for both *fazendeiros* and *posseiros* and even for the inspectors of INCRA and IBAMA to enter the interior. Roads are major indicators for settlers and land seekers (as well as merchants and other traders) to evaluate levels of accessibility, security, and risk that accompany their life planning. As government agencies (like INCRA) were slow to respond to

people's movements, the Sawmill could easily gain trust from the local population since it demonstrated the possibility that jobs could be available in the interior (or as Almir said, *ai dentro*).⁵⁵ In this sense, the Sawmill functioned as a kind of 'safety-net' for newcomers.

In short, the Sawmill did not have to deliberately manufacture specific organisations, as Limirio and Kito had by discursively evoking a collective identity and action of *posseiros* and 'small producers' in 'the community of Novo Paraíso'. As Almir's attitude of business as usual during the mourning for Limirio showed, he maintained his independence from any fields of symbolic and collective action.

For example, Almir never used the word 'community' but always referred to his territory as 'the region' where he operated and extended his influence. 'The region' represented his identification of the social field in which he showed paths and job opportunities to the settlers in various conditions. His influence and representation of 'the region' as an extended social field became explicit when he set up three other sawmills in Rio Preto where he had established his own *fazenda* in 2000.

Rio Preto

Almir did not own *fazenda* in Grotão since he was not a *posseiro* and could only obtain a large plot in the village of Novo Paraíso for the Sawmill, his house and the houses of his employees. By the time he had become the richest person in the settlement, land plots around Novo Paraíso had already become relatively expensive per hectare (e.g. pasture was traded for about R\$800 per hectare in 2000). In Bamerindus, forestland was still traded for about R\$100 per hectare among *posseiros* and *grileiros* in 2000 (see Chapter 4), but too many people were located there. Therefore, he opened up his Fazenda Macaúba along the new *Estrada do Rio Preto* that connects Marabá to the municipality of Novo Repartimento in the region of Tucuruí, where tracts of forest were said to be traded for R\$50 per hectare. According to one settler who was moving to Rio Preto in 2000, Almir had already begun to operate three sawmills in the region of Rio Preto and bought trees from *posseiros* there.⁵⁶

The fact that Almir deployed his operation in Rio Preto seemed to have encouraged the settlers in Grotão to move into the region, which was still covered with primary forest. Although there are no data on the number of people who left for Rio Preto from Grotão, there were already many empty

houses and pastures around Novo Paraíso in regions like Lagoa do Ouro in May 2004. Some settlers who were leaving the region said that the pasture was not good (i.e. degraded) and had to recover to be sold for a good price (see Manu's case in Chapter 6). After more than a decade of settlement, the pasture had become degraded, and former *posseiros* tended to repeat their experience of moving on.⁵⁷ More importantly, the second generation of settlers had grown old enough to wish to establish their own *fazendas*, and they took the opportunity to arrange a move to Rio Preto with other family members or neighbours to transfer cattle (mostly inherited from their parents) and establish new households.

Almir did not explicitly lead the occupation movement as Kito did in Bamerindus. His interest was not in land demarcation or in making a new community that would open a political space he could use but instead his interest was in making profit from logging and becoming a *fazendeiro*. In a way, he embodied the aspirations of the majority of settlers since, however 'bad' the images attached to the term or position of *fazendeiro*, it was still a profession that many settlers aspired to. 'Insiders', like the settlers in Novo Paraíso or Rio Preto, knew that Almir's business was not always legal, but he could always justify what he did by accusing outsiders of not understanding 'local (or our) realities', and the justification was internally accepted.

The arrest

Almir's illegality (or 'his own rule') became nation-wide news in February 2004 when he was arrested by the federal police for holding 52 'slave labourers'. Since 1995, the *Grupo Móvel de Fiscalização*, under the coordination of the Ministry of Work and Employment and the federal police, operated throughout Brazil to expose and denounce the *fazendeiro* practice of using bonded labourers on their properties. Pará turned out to present the highest number of slavery cases in Brazil, and Almir's case showed 'typical' signs of systematic slavery in a rural setting.⁵⁸ According to one settler in Rio Preto, Almir had paid "only 9 *reais* per day" to his workers when the average daily wage for rural workers had been raised to 15 *reais*. Moreover, "he deducted the cost of food, boots and *foices* (machetes) from the payments and only paid after 60 days".

Workers at the Novo Paraíso Sawmill were all worried about losing their jobs. A foreman of *carvoaria* said that he might have to move to the region of

PA-275 (leading to São Felix do Xingu and 'Terra do Meio', another frontier region in the south of Pará), if Almir was stuck in jail. However, his arrest lasted only two days. He paid R\$ 140,000 indemnification money to his slave workers, and was immediately released from the prison in Marabá.

In Novo Paraíso, some settlers made sympathetic comments to '*velho* (old) Almir'. At one meeting, right after Almir's release, the supermarket owner, Almir's son-in-law, said to a crowd of settlers in a restaurant: "Here in the region, no one carries *carteira assinada* (a workers' license issued by the Ministry of Work, which employers must sign to legally employ workers). And, *pobre velho* (poor old man), more than 50 peons suddenly appeared to claim his money! He told me that he had hired only 18 to clear the pasture". About eight cowboy-looking men around him nodded, knowingly, and other settlers giggled a little.

By this time the settlers in Grotão had become landowners, and they freely contracted rural workers (who were usually also *posseiros* or cattle owners). Therefore, they appeared to identify themselves with Almir rather than with the 'slave workers'.⁵⁹ Of course many of them made critical comments of Almir on moral grounds. Nevertheless, it was almost surprising (for outsiders) to see the settlers' general indifference and sympathetic attitudes towards his crimes. As the foreman of the Sawmill's *carvoaria* commented above, they were worried that their lives would be affected by the weakening of Almir's influence.

The foreman, for example, was originally from Maranhão, was semi-illiterate, and came to Pará as a brazil nut collector before the opening-up of the Amazon. At the *carvoaria*, he worked with other peons who filled the furnaces (mostly women and old men who did not fit into the other 'main' sections of the Sawmill, such as carrying and sawing logs). He had never worked in a situation where there were workers' rights and protection or 'legal arrangements' about anything. Therefore, upon Almir's arrest, he was immediately worried about the possibility that he might have to move to another frontier region where he would hope to find the same type of 'non-legal' situation.

For similar reasons, even though his operation may have been largely illegal, many settlers' followed Almir's move and headed for Rio Preto to open up paths and 'commoditise' the primary forest. Almir embodied the legal-illegal side of a local style of settlement development, which was mostly supported by individual settlers' life projects and their needs, and led them to

collude with the material arrangements of the Sawmill. In other words, in the reproduction process of a settlement style of development, settlers tended to follow social patterns they had gone through in their life courses by affirming their autonomy with reference to (newly imposed) outside regulations.

Almir never tried to institutionalise his social domain in the way Limirio or Kito did. The influence of the Sawmill was maintained as long as it provided settlers with the possibility of reproducing their social domains and opening up the social field in this newly opened physical space. The settlers derived their understandings of situations as they further reorganised resources for their individual (or household) projects. In other words, the Sawmill implicitly indicated choices of action to settlers that simultaneously reproduced a settlement style of development. That is why it remained relevant to the local social context for the settlers, despite all the regulations and the emergence of divergent political spaces.

Conclusions

In conclusion, I want to point out, first, that this overview of social events and the life histories of three key actors in the social field of Grotão help us grasp the nature of settlers' sociality, identification processes with their immediate social and political domains, representations of 'community' and the process of redefining their social field. Each key actor defined and visualised his social and political domain within the settlement area and, by doing so, each of them differentiated his area of influence both symbolically and physically. We could observe the moment of differentiation by following the social events in which these key actors were involved, and portray specific social characteristics of local actors and their identification processes with the emergent domains. Moreover, the accounts given by these key actors and the general observations made by the researcher show that the actors' personal contexts articulated with the larger historical and political context, and these encounters captured the moment in which different social domains were reconfigured and the social field was redefined, in ways that showed a distinct settlement style of development.

Second, although the chapter has demonstrated the significance of formal organisations, including the church, the farmers' associations or political parties, their influence was often defined by a mixture of institutional elements derived from each organisation, which further shaped the fields of

actors' symbolic and pragmatic action. Thus, these organisations could soon lose their viability in the social field and be transformed or dissolved to embody totally different fields of meaning and action. Therefore, here, I have tried to examine the collectives of the settlers, instead of clearly demarcated organisations, in order to understand the influence of informal groupings (such as the initial gathering of the *crentes* in the forest, loose personal networks between *posseiros*, rural workers and loggers) and different functions that these groups could play within formal organisations and institutions.

For example, the initial leadership of Limirio has largely embodied a community and the generation of collective action, which could be observed through events like building the Church of the Assembly of God, farmers' meetings with the *técnicos* from the NGO, political campaigns, or the Rice Festival. Limirio and his leadership personified 'community needs' (as 'endogenous' leadership is expected to do) since the institutionalisation of the Church or the Association were geared to uniting the 'community of Novo Paraíso' as he named it. However, his leadership in the community was soon to be reconfigured by Kito and also by his own death.

Events like Limirio's funeral and the first Rice Festival that took place without him highlighted moments in which the settlers were capable of turning their symbolic action into pragmatic action to develop their individual life projects through symbolic social events. By participating in collective action, the settlers could further particularise their collective remembrance of Limirio's life and death or the history of 'rice farming'. In other words, the settlers flexibly used these unifying moments to deconstruct meanings attached to these events and internalise the knowledge acquired through the experiences (see Chapter 6 for a discussion of the relationship between knowledge and action).

Finally, the chapter showed how important the opening up of physical spaces around Grotão was for configuring the political domain (in the case of Bamerindus) and economic domain (in the case of Rio Preto). In relation to physical environmental change, 'community' was differently identified in the study area in which the settlers flexibly generated and arranged their actions and shaped practices (Schatzki 1996).⁶⁰ In this sense, landscape was an important source of the settlers' arrangements of physical resources (land, forest, etc.) and action rearrangements. By arranging physical resources through the changing landscape, they configured and reconfigured their social domains, which could be represented by particular political or economic

domains. These reconfigured domains eventually renewed the characteristics of social field, as well as worked to reproduce certain styles of social development in the settlement.

In the next chapter, we will examine in detail how settlers began to individualise their notion of collectives within their renewed social field by rearranging their individual and collective action in relation to the reconfigured social and political domains. We do this through focusing on a series of social events and modes of participation connected with the Association's ASDA-supported projects aimed at 'sustainable and participatory' development of the 'community' of Novo Paraíso.

Notes

¹ The methodological strategy used here takes into account what Strathern (1992: 76) proposes: 'Instead of dismantling holistic systems through inappropriate analytical categories, we should strive for a holistic apprehension of the manner in which our subjects dismantle their own constructs'.

² For a detailed study on political patronage in the Amazon, see Hoefle (2000).

³ A well in the Brazilian Amazon is called *poço amazônico*, and is normally built with bricks and equipped with a simple wooden pulley. A ceramic water container is commonly used to filter water for drinking. The digging of wells seemed to be one of the most explicit 'social activities' in the settlement, with some professional 'well diggers' emerging until the official water supply was arranged.

⁴ The settlers could afford expensive electrical equipments because of a prevailing 'credit culture' in Brazil. People bought almost everything *no fiado*, on credit, at nearly every shop and supermarket.

⁵ *Roça* indicates cleared and planted land, which is the closest to the conventional image of 'farm' in English. The property, including agricultural farm, pasture and residential areas, can be described as *fazenda*, *chácara* (small *fazenda*) or *sítio*.

⁶ Normally, people use *alqueire* to measure (agrarian) land size in Brazil. According to Rowlett (2000), "[o]ne *alqueire* equals 2.42 hectares in São Paulo; 4.84 hectares in Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais and Goiás; 9.68 hectares in Bahia, and 2.7225 hectares in the northern part of the country (i.e. the Amazon)". However, Limirio told me that 1 *alqueire* in Pará equalled to 4.8 hectares while 1 *alqueire* in Goiás, where he originated from, equalled to 3.1 hectares. I heard similar explanations from other settlers who had moved from Maranhão and Tocantins. They said that the size of 1 *alqueire* in the southern Pará was about five hectares, while 1 *alqueire* in their home states equalled about three hectares (therefore they thought that Pará was offering much larger land plots). The official land titling of INCRA is based on the hectare, but the settlers were informally trading land plots at a ratio: '1 *alqueire* = 4.8 hectares'. In this study, when necessary, I use the ratio '1 *alqueire* = 5 hectares' to roughly indicate the land size (note

that Rowlett is not entirely mistaken since in the north of Pará, the ratio of '1 *alqueire* = 2.7 hectares' is used in some areas. What he misses is the detail of measurement diversity that exists inside the vast 'northern part of' Brazil.).

⁷ There are various interpretations of 'big' and 'small' among the settlers. Owning 20 *alqueires* of property and/or more than 100 cattle is considered 'not small'. In Brazil in general, a large *fazendeiro* (i.e. *latifundiário*) may own several thousands hectares or more, and the usage of *fazendeiro* in the settlement clearly indicates the ownership of smaller land plots or number of cattle.

⁸ In Brazil there are two types of election year: one is a general election (for mayors and town councillors at the municipal level), every four years; and the other is a presidential election (also for national congressmen and state governors), also every four years. These elections are sequenced at a two year interval after one another (i.e. a general election in 2000, a presidential election in 2002, a general election in 2004, etc.).

⁹ *Crente* literally means 'believer', and it is commonly used to indicate the followers of Pentecostal churches in Brazil, mainly the Assembly of God and the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God.

¹⁰ Xambioá was a crystal mining centre (*garimpo de crystal de rocha*) in the 1940s. For a short period between the 1940s and 1950s, the southeast of Pará was known for diamond and crystal mining (AMAT 1996).

¹¹ Note that the land conflicts had been already intensive throughout the *interior* of Goiás from the 1970s (which was partly why the Land Pastoral Commission (CPT) was founded in Goiânia in Goiás, see below), and many people from Goiás headed to Pará to avoid conflict in Goiás. See Silva (2005) for the history of conflict in Goiás.

¹² In January 1987, an *ocorrência* was registered, which said: In *localidades* Paraúnas (*sic*) and Monte Santo in the municipality of Xinguara, 72 people went to prison and 32 were tortured and evicted and houses were burned and two women were raped – those were the results of the "disarming operation" carried out [by the military police] in the second week of January in the area of so-called "*Polígono dos Castanhais*" (quoted in IDESP 1987a: 47).

¹³ CPT is affiliated with the National Commission of Bishops in Brazil (CNBB) that embraces Liberation Theology. It was founded in 1975 to legally denounce human and land rights abuse by the police and *fazendeiros*. The CPT document about the Conflict contained 36 testimonies including the Limirio's. According to the document, in the Fazenda Barreira Branca (of the Bamerindus Group), '400 families had been already settled by INCRA' but owners of the surrounding *castanhais* and *fazendas* organised *pistoleiros* to evict the settled families. In February 1987, '3 *posseiros* of CIB, 10 of Tona, 9 of Pau Preto, and 2 of Serra Rica (in today's PA Pau Ferrado)' were detained by 90 PMs (the military police officers) in Bamerindus'. See also IDESP (1987b).

¹⁴ There was one stump of burnt brazil nut tree (*castanheira*) in the middle of the village, which had not been removed. Limirio said that it was the first *castanheira* that they felled to install the camp and left it to give homage to those 'martyrs' of the occupation process.

¹⁵ One of the favourite stories told by early settlers was their encounter with *onças*, jaguars that live in the forest.

¹⁶ Conceição do Araguaia is the oldest municipality in the southern half of Pará, which grew out of a catechist settlement established by a French missionary at the end of the nineteenth

century. Until the 1930s it was at the centre of the natural rubber trade in Pará (see Ianni 1981[1978] for the history of Conceição do Araguaia).

¹⁷ They were: the Congregação Cristã do Brasil; the Seventh Day Adventists; the Pentecostal Church 'Deus é Amor'; and the Evangelho Quadrangular.

¹⁸ According to IBGE (2001), 8.4 million people were registered as members of the Assembly of God in 2000. Chestnut (1997: 11) writes that the 'Brazilian Assembly of God' is 'the largest Pentecostal denomination in the Western Hemisphere' and the state of Pará has 'experienced some of the nation's highest Protestant growth rates' as well as 'the highest ratios of Pentecostals to mainline Protestants'.

¹⁹ Although it has nothing to do with the biblical teaching of 'forgiving the sinners', it is common for the settlers to meet out 'justice' themselves through lynching practices. Once, a *crente* woman told me that some men were 'out there' to beat up a man who had stolen a motorbike of a *fazendeiro*. She simply said, "well, if you do something wrong you have to pay the price don't you?"

²⁰ In fact, it was quite easy to distinguish *crentes* from non-*crentes* in the settlement just by looking at how they dressed: men usually wore collared shirts (sometimes with long sleeves) and long trousers (never short pants); while women only wore skirts, never showed shoulders in public, never wore jewellery or make-up and almost invariably had long hair.

²¹ In 1991, Eldorado split off from municipality of Curionópolis (known for the gold mine Serra Pelada) after many construction workers of PA-150 and miners started to live in the area. A part of Grotão was incorporated to Eldorado and, in fact, the municipal document includes Novo Paraíso as its 'principal locality'. Although Eldorado is much closer to Novo Paraíso than São Geraldo, many settlers are registered in São Geraldo because of the migration history, as shown above.

²² FNO's main objective is to 'reduce intra-regional inequality and collaborate for the sustainable development of the Amazon' (BASA 2000 quoted in Arima 2000).

²³ Because of this requirement, the 1990s saw a rapid increase in the number of small farmers' associations (which were almost non-existent in 1990) linked to settlement areas (see Copatiorô 2004).

²⁴ Goro told me that he had taken the idea of the Rice Festival from the Japanese *muramatsuri*, a village festival that celebrates the rice harvest.

²⁵ As we will discuss below, the teachings of the Assembly of God principally defined festivals as sinful events and, by leading the Rice Festival as the Association's president, Limirio was considered to be compromising his religious practices. Nevertheless, in general, there was little hostility between *crentes* and others (mainly Catholics).

²⁶ Jokes and chats are fundamentally different since jokes have to be 'planned' and 'told' while chats are reciprocal and spontaneous, as well as highly situational. For the importance of 'chat' in understanding how a community is shaped, see Bailey (1971).

²⁷ Valdir won a seat in the town council with about 270 votes. He was originally from Arguaína, Tocantins, but most of his family members and relatives had been residing in São Geraldo since the end of the 1980s. Therefore, he could easily obtain support and financial backing through family connections outside Novo Paraíso.

²⁸ Note that between 1996 and 1999 other associations were made and unmade; these included the Association of Residents in Novo Paraíso (for shop keepers on the main street) and the

Women's Association in Novo Paraíso, created by a secondary school teacher. However, these associations were fragile and did not have a significant overall influence in terms of the mobilisation of people and resources.

²⁹ This account of Kito's life is based on an interview conducted on 20th July 2000.

³⁰ Manleão was from the Brazilian Workers' Party (PTB), which was allied with PSDB.

³¹ Piçarra was originally a village for workers constructing an operation road in Bamerindus installed in the 1970s. In 1995, it split off from São Geraldo and became the newest municipality in the region.

³² There were 43 municipalities in the region of south and southeast of Pará in 2000, and 30 of them were instituted after 1988.

³³ In Portuguese, *nós* is formally equivalent to 'we', but commonly, *a gente* (which officially means 'people') is used.

³⁴ PRONAF was installed in 1996 within the framework of FNO-special and presented four lines of rural credit, depending on the farm size of applicants (classified into mini, small, medium, or large farmers). With the PRONAF installation, PROCERA promoted by INCRA was integrated into PRONAF-Grupo A.

³⁵ In fact, the Association had elections every two years, and the same person could not be the president longer than four years. Therefore, although Limirio had been the president for most of the time, an associate called Nilton was a president for one term before.

³⁶ On average, a rice processing unit in Novo Paraíso bought rice from producers for R\$14-15 (per 60 kg with shells) while in Rio Preto, the buying price was still set at R\$10-12 per 60 kg.

³⁷ One was Ismael who was a proprietor in Pau Ferrado and made his car available for our trip to São Geraldo. He was the Association's treasurer at that time and became a candidate for town councillor in the 2004 general election (he lost it). The other was Davi, the first pharmacy owner settled in Novo Paraíso, who also acted as a pastor of the Assembly of God. In 2002, he bought 20 *alqueires* of forest in Bamerindus and quickly sold it as pasture.

³⁸ Later, a coordinator of ASDA who was on summer vacation at that time told me that he authorised the plane tickets between Belém and Marabá to show ASDA's feelings of condolence. He said that Limirio's death was a big loss for the 'community'.

³⁹ In this case, these wailers were not 'professional' ones (as is often the case) but church members who were close followers of Limirio. They cried throughout the funeral and burial to show their 'respect' for the dead (according to one of the women).

⁴⁰ The Assembly of God does not carry the cross or any symbolic icons and objects in order to distance themselves vigorously from the practices of the Catholic Church.

⁴¹ The village was expanding towards both west and northeast. In the northeastern part, one new district with brothels and bars had been established. In the interior settlements, girls who worked in the brothels were usually from outside and had little contact with other settlers (except their clients and patrons).

⁴² Later, I found out that Paulinho was writing hundreds of poems, which he compiled in a clumsy note book entitled: *Salada Mista de Poesias Brasileiras*. Like any would-be poets in the interior of the northeast (Paulinho was from Maranhão), he was a *repentista*, an improviser, who sang poems with a guitar. He sang for Limirio as follows:

From the sky descended a star; descended on the land of Goiás; had a form of a human; I was pleased to know him.

Pará could obtain him with honour and capacity; God and Saint Trinidad; sent him from Paradise to Novo Paraíso; a preacher of the truth.

He served for the community in the name of Jesus Christ; He took care of it with maximum humbleness; the society saw his political force; as he resisted criticism; and the elite people made an invitation to him; to enter the world of politics.

He received an invitation; an exciting invitation to be a vice mayor.

After having accepted the proposal of candidacy; he did everything precise; with humour and care; to sacred Jesus, he fasted and prayed; accepted opinions but took a bitter grail; before delivering the task in his congregation.

He would make a petition before all the brothers; raising his hands with the coming holy spirit; he said: my Dear Jesus, I implore your piety; Oh God of benevolence.

If what I want were useless; please make it useful; at your will.

He waited with confidence and pride; on the day July 12 to Paradise he was fetched; where an angel announced with the loud trumpet; at that moment, the tyres exploded.

Clutching the hands of God; the star went away.

He did not fall in corruption; was born to be loyal; drunk the bitterest gall; but completed his mission.

There must be salvation; for whom completed the role of *crente*; he, the decent preacher; in all, everything was positive; Limirio is alive; alive in the heart of the people.

⁴³ The 'entire family of Antonio' consisted of a wife, a daughter, and a son who had a wife and two baby sons. The son often visited Limirio in Novo Paraíso since he was already looking for an adequate land for his family to settle in Bamerindus. As Limirio's wife did not have a clear idea about when to come back to Novo Paraíso, she let Antonio's son sell some properties.

⁴⁴ As Turner (1975: 145) writes: 'The studies of symbols in the anthropological literature had been directed to 'a renewed reconciliation between studies of pragmatic action and studies of symbolic action' in a framework of social dynamics'. Here, '[s]ymbols are seen as instrumentalities of various forces - physical, moral, economic, political, and so on - operating in isolable, changing fields of social relationships'.

⁴⁵ *Communitas* is a Latin word suggesting 'with its unstructured character, representing the "quick" of human interrelatedness...[which] ...has an existential quality; it involves the whole man in his relation to other whole man' (Turner 1970[1969]: 127). The social events or rituals restore the wholeness of each person, which shape *communitas* that is temporarily 'opposed to the jural-political character of structure' (*ibid.*: 132). According to Turner, 'no society can function adequately without the dialectic' between structure and *communitas*. See also Ortner (1984) and Deflem (1991) for overviews of this concept.

⁴⁶ In symbolic (or cultural) studies of anthropology, this 'integral' individual has been explained as 'personhood' (Turner 1975) or 'ethos' (as an embodied attitude' drawing on Geertz 1973 in Gable 2006: 403).

⁴⁷ The local buying price for brazil nut timber per cubic metre varies according to the source of information. According to IBAMA, in 2005, the local buying price in São Geraldo was R\$ 13 and the selling price was R\$ 450 in São Paulo and R\$ 700 in Paraguay (Mendes 2005).

⁴⁸ The density of brazil nut trees per hectare 'varies considerably throughout the Amazon'. An average number of trees in the eastern Amazon where the study area is situated has been estimated at twelve reproductive trees per hectare (Mori 1992).

⁴⁹ *Coronel* is similar to Mexican *cacique*, whose origin is rooted in landed aristocracy in the colonial period. *Coronel* typically imposed his own 'system of norms' in the absence of the state authorities. As Shirley (1979: 353) writes: 'One should remember that the traditional pattern of social organisation and social order in the Brazilian interior had very little to do with the laws and codes created in the capitals. It was fundamentally a system created and enforced by the landed elite or by local leaders'.

⁵⁰ The story was based on the children of a foreman at one of the *carvoarias* of the Sawmill. The foreman said that he did not even know that the journalist came to his site of work until Almir came to ask him not to bring his children to the *carvoaria* who used to help their parents and to play around. Apparently, the article had an impact on Almir, but at the same time, Almir threatened the journalist not to visit Grotão again.

⁵¹ Because of the history of forest occupation, early settlers had a memory of hunting and eating jaguars, capybaras, armadillos, monkeys, and land turtles (*jabutis*). Today, these animals are all classified as endangered species and protected by IBAMA.

⁵² I thank ASDA and Paulo von Atzingen for making the interview available. The interview was recorded on 17 September 2001.

⁵³ He and Assimec were the strongest opponents of IBAMA's suggestion to suspend *Portaria* 108 that authorised the felling of 'inactivate' brazil nut trees in 1997 (see Chapter 4). See Homma (2000a) for details.

⁵⁴ *Na raça e na marra* is an expression that implies the nuances of resistance or struggle against unfairly imposed pressures.

⁵⁵ In the Sawmill, at least 14 different jobs were recorded in 2000: accountant (*bitleiro*); foreman (*diretor*); person who counts timbers and planks (*calculador*); carrier of planks (*carregador*); person who caulks planks with chemicals (*estopador*); laminator (*laminador*); furniture maker (*marceneiro*); logger (*motoqueiro* or *motoserra*); machine operator (*operador*); plank makers (*planchador*); carrier of saw dust (*poseiro*); driver with water tanks for charcoal furnaces; truck driver (*motorista*) and cook for the workers (*merendeira*). In *carvoarias*, there were also fuel woods owners and charcoal traders as well as intermediaries (Otsuki 2001).

⁵⁶ The region of Tucuruí was becoming one of the latest frontiers in Pará (Homma, personal communication, 2004) as the Estrada do Rio Preto was extended to connect Marabá to Novo Repartimento. Novo Repartimento was originally the territory of Paraknã tribe who had to be dislocated due to the construction of the Tucuruí Dam (which started in 1974). The municipality grew out a settlement of construction workers of the Transamazon Highway and the Tucuruí Dam.

⁵⁷ According to the earlier community survey (see Chapter 3), most settlers had migrated at least twice before settling in Novo Paraíso (Otsuki 2001).

⁵⁸ 'Typical' slavery in Brazil consists of the recruitment of poor workers by a person called *gato* who allures job-seekers with false contracts. Practices include: inhumane living conditions and *aviamento* (see Chapter 4); lack of payment; lack of issuing workers' licenses; and the

presence of armed guards who prevent workers from escaping the *fazenda* etc. 'Contemporary' slavery in Pará and the Amazon has been widely discussed. For recent publications on the topic, see Comissão Pastoral da Terra (1999), Comissão Justiça e Paz (1999), Breton (2002) and Sharma (2006). These studies show that many denounced *fazendeiros* also owned sawmills.

⁵⁹ The difference between rural workers and 'slave workers' (both usually called peons) can be identified in the different scope of agency that they can exercise with reference to available information. Mostly, slave workers are illiterate and vulnerable to allurements by *gatos* who would take them to *fazendeiros* (where normally the owners are absent and *gerentes* (directors) or *capatazes* (heads) are in charge of the workers). Rural workers have access to information (or at least they know their basic rights) with which they can negotiate with the employers. In both cases, they can easily be exploited, but rural workers are not confined to the *fazenda*, while slave workers are forced to live in inhumane conditions, often watched by armed guards.

⁶⁰ Drawing on the endless possibilities of practices of an American farmer, Schatzki (1996: 161) writes: 'The provision of general possibilities is an important feature of practices. In participating in practices, people acquire knowledge and abilities, become cognizant of rules, build and alter the physical environment, and have their reactions and the teleoaffectivities governing them shaped and calibrated. Practices thus conspire with physical states of affairs to delimit what people are generally able to do'.

Community Projects and the Process of Individualisation

Knowledge and the Context of Intervention

In the last chapter, we followed social events that marked configurations and reconfigurations of collectives in Grotão. In the reconfiguration process, the settlers' social domains were significantly redefined, and the social field of Grotão started to embrace empirically different localities extended across Bamerindus and Rio Preto. This process shaped a distinctive local style of settlement development, and it showed that the 'community' in the study area could be identified and represented differently by the actors involved. These actors derived their understandings of situations from social and political domains that had been redefined through processes which served to rearrange social action and reshape peoples' practices.

This chapter focuses on the process of rearrangement of the settlers' actions in the social field, which was the locus for ASDA's intervention. The intervention sought to introduce 'sustainable and participatory' community projects, and in the process the settlers learned to attach different meanings to previous collectives and started to individualise them. The process of individualisation further reconfigured the settlers' social domains and arenas and, as a result, the individual settlers could rearrange their actions. The chapter looks into this process in detail by building on the case of the Association-ASDA cooperation in the 'post-Limirio context' of Grotão, Bamerindus and Rio Preto in which neither leaders nor institutionalised collectives can be clearly identified. Here, the post-Limirio context is the context of intervention for ASDA projects. Within this context each settler identifies and further reconfigures his field of action with reference to the logic of the intervention.

The settlers' attachment of differentiated meanings to their fields of action is undergirded by situated 'knowledges'. According to Arce and Long (1992: 211), knowledge is 'constituted by the ways in which people categorise,

code, process and impute meaning to their experiences...which emerges out of a complex process involving social, situational, cultural and institutional factors'. In fact, knowledge of both settlers and development workers like *técnicos* is closely linked to their everyday practices and lifeworlds as well as their understanding of development intervention, which may further influence an individual's knowledge processes.

When the different views and knowledge encountered in a particular situation come together, they can form an 'interface' (Arce 1989; Long 1989; Arce and Long 1992) that presents an arena of contestations between actors backed by different social domains and logics of development intervention. The chapter will try to understand how the interface creates a context of intervention in the social field of Grotão within which actors start to individualise their previous collective activities.

Below, I will examine how the context to a particular development intervention is shaped and understood by settlers and *técnicos* by examining the case of a project titled 'Coordination of the Integrated Process for the Sustainable and Participatory Development of Grotão dos Caboclos' undertaken by the Association with support from ASDA. The case shows a discontinuous situation generated by community development methods within the Project, as applied to rural settlements in Pará. The project application required 'solid leadership and social organisation' in the 'target community', the majority of whose population were suffering from 'poverty', and it aimed 'to improve the life standards of the small producers' (*Documento de Projeto*, ASDA 1997). Local realities had to be adjusted according to this requirement, and it will be argued that this adjustment often resulted in a misrepresentation of 'community needs' by development experts (see Chapter 7 for more discussions on how to understand the use of 'poverty' in project documents of development agencies).

As we briefly saw in the last chapter, the main component of the project was 'community agro-industry', consisting of a rice processing unit and banana flour factory, inaugurated in 2000. In 2004, there were only 18 associates in the Association. I will examine the process of fragmentation within the Association by looking into accounts made by Silvio (Limirio's successor as the Association's president) and the *técnico* João in 2002 and then Pedro (Silvio's successor as the Association's president) and the *técnico* Augusto who started to take care of the ASDA's cooperation with the Association in 2004. Their accounts will elucidate different visions of settlers

and *técnicos* on the project, community, and the ideal of development, which formed a layer of 'knowledge interfaces' (Arce and Long 1992) in the project process. At these interfaces, we are able to observe the characteristics of individual and collective action of the settlers in relation to their identification with changeable social domains and social field.

Second, I will introduce the life projects of Raimundo and Manu as the latest examples of the individualised construction of the settlers' life projects in Grotão. Both of them were active Association members at different times, and their experiences with the Association's activities influenced how they understood development intervention and how they could further develop their life projects by learning how to elaborate projects on their own. If we follow the view of João shown below, their cases may highlight a culture of *imediatista* (which implies 'opportunism' that does not envision long-term planning or clear action principle). However, before making such a judgement, we may have to understand their 'rationalities' and knowledge processes shaped in their own project processes in relation to the intervention process.

Lastly, referring to these cases, the chapter will further elaborate a theoretical understanding of the 'failure' of the sustainable and participatory project as an outcome of the individualisation process observed in the settlers' social field. Here, 'to individualise' is understood as: 'to make or mark as individual or distinctive in character; to consider or treat individually or to particularise; and to make or modify so as to meet the special requirements of a person' (according to Collins English Dictionary, eighth edition, 2006).¹ For example, Beck et al. (1994) emphasise the importance of individualisation to explain the 'new ways of life that are continuously subject to change' in a place where fixed, traditional norms and certainties do not exist (see below). The settlers' individualisation process is discussed in relation to how they retain their individuality within their life projects and how they ultimately modify the presentation of 'community needs' in accordance with their particularised needs and desires.

If we recall the social development process of the settlement, as overviewed in the last chapter, the individualisation process can be understood as an indication of ongoing collective differentiation processes in the settlers' social field. In rearranging their actions and reshaping practices through their experiences with development intervention, social actors in the settlement analytically regain 'creativity' to develop their life projects with reference to

their own and to others' experiences. At this point, I will briefly review the theory of action, which has been shifting its focus of attention from individual actors' rationality to creativity, in order to discuss the nature of the settlers' arrangements of actions and knowledge processes that emerge at the interface between different actors within intervention situations.

A Community Project without a Community

The Association was originally created in Grotão as an organisation of *posseiros* who needed to claim land titles from INCRA and rural credit from the Amazon Bank. In the study area, a farmers' association is regarded similarly to a local bank, and a 'board of directors' in the administration is supposed to manage each associate's money and negotiate with INCRA and the Amazon Bank for further possible benefits. Therefore, the main goal of a farmers' association is not primarily 'community development' but rather to the facilitation of individual credit project.

In the beginning (around 1993), ASDA supported the Association to manage the associates' rural credit projects and implement basic infrastructure that was still precarious in Grotão. Limirio headed the Association and, as he was the representative of the mayor of São Geraldo at that time, the Association, ASDA and the Municipal Government consistently exchanged information through him. This was also possible because physical and symbolic boundaries of Grotão could represent an established 'community' at that time.

Around 1997, the situation radically changed. Limirio still headed the Association but the Municipal Government was legitimately represented by Valdir through the 1996 election, and the mayor's representative was appointed to Kito. The physical and symbolic boundaries of the 'community' were significantly reconfigured due to settlement invasions in the Fazenda Bamerindus. Also, the official *técnico* from ASDA was switched from Goro to João. In larger national and international political contexts, the Brazilian government embraced neo-liberalism, and international organisations and NGOs, including ASDA, promoted commercially-oriented development to achieve 'sustainable development' and 'poverty alleviation'. All these events affected change within the Association's organisational characteristics after 1997.

In 1997, the Association established a 'community agro-industry' with financial support from the Subprogram for Demonstrative Projects of the Amazon (hereafter, PDA), obtained through ASDA. When the agro-industry, which included the rice processing plant and banana flour factory, was officially inaugurated in February 2000, the inauguration ceremony was attended by politicians of municipal governments in the region, INCRA and Amazon Bank officials, coordinators and *técnicos* from ASDA, and *técnicos* and officials from the state and federal agricultural extension agencies. Agro-industry was presented to these people as an example of the settlers' 'self-organisation' (according to João). Consequently, ASDA gave training courses to banana flour factory workers to process banana and cooking courses for local women to use the banana flour in their dishes. However, the factory soon started to face financial problems and a general lack of support by other settlers, such that in 2001, it had to occasionally suspend the operation. In 2003, the operation of the entire agro-industry project permanently stopped.

The sustainable and participatory development project

Originally, PDA was launched in 1995, financed by PPG7 (Pilot Program to Conserve the Brazilian Forests, see Chapter 2), through the technical assistance agreement made between German international cooperation and the Ministry of Environment of Brazil.² It principally encouraged 'local organisations and civil society' to promote 'sustainable development' by taking 'innovative and experimental' approaches (Mancin 2001).

PDA has been especially influential in Pará as the state received one fourth of the total fund directed to the Legal Amazon in 1997 (nearly USD 5 million). The Association received a drop of this fund through ASDA, which started to elaborate 'production chain development projects' for several rural communities in Pará in 1995 (see Chapter 7). PDA partly strengthened a line of thinking which was directed to business promotion and active involvement of NGOs in realising sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon, and 'sustainable and participatory projects' were operationalised as 'production chain' and 'community agro-industry' managed by local organisations. In the project process, the Association was presented as 'the community organisation' of Grotão, which would promote sustainable production and commercialisation of agricultural and extractive products to benefit community members.³

As we shall see in the next chapter, there is an inherent problem of defining 'local organisation' and 'beneficiaries' in implementing projects that are internationally funded, since international donors and the development framework they use do not properly distinguish farmers' organisations (such as the Association) from local NGOs (such as ASDA) in respect to the different degrees of power and types of knowledge and action that the actors generate (cf. Holmén and Jiström 1994). The PDA's principle is to strengthen local organisations and civil society to promote sustainable development, but strengthening ASDA, for example, is not equal to strengthening the Association. ASDA can be specialised in taking 'innovative and experimental approaches' to their project planning whereas, for a 'counterpart' like the Association, ASDA's approaches do not necessarily reflect 'their' innovative and experimental approaches that they take to organise their livelihoods. Moreover, as we saw in the last chapter, defining the Association as 'a community organisation' of Grotão is already a discursive act.

Nevertheless, PDA financed the banana flour factory for the 'community' of Grotão based on an application presented by ASDA. According to João, banana was "explored by the associates" as the principal product to be commercialised, together with brazil nuts, milk and rice. At the same time, he said that banana was ideal because it could be grown in the agro-forestry system and could be easily processed to produce flour because ASDA had developed an 'adaptive' technology.⁴ Moreover, after the 1996 election, municipal governments around the region promised that they would consider buying the flour from the Association's factory for school lunches and, therefore, market for the final product was thought to be guaranteed.

This explanation raises some questions since, if the survey was conducted based on a premise of introducing the adaptive technology of drying banana to the Association, the Associates would have 'agreed' to 'participate' in the Project rather than vigorously 'explored' the possibility of flour production. As we will see below, the Associates actually 'explored' ways to improve their milk production instead of fruit plantation and commercialisation. When I asked João about this, he said that it was due to a lack of *conscientização*⁵ that producers did not appreciate the agro-forestry system and the importance of community agro-industry. While he insisted that it was the Associates' choice, it seemed that he had already directed the survey to 'convince' the associates to grow and commercialise banana.

In 2000, when the factory was finally inaugurated, there were 45 members in the Association. The number was significantly reduced from 270 associates in 1996 when the project was planned and the survey was conducted. Goro said that many associates had lost interest in the project since the project did not give them enough support to plant bananas, and the price that the Association paid was not as high as the producers had expected, especially since they compared it to the profits they could make from trade in cattle and milk production. He also criticised João and Limirio for not involving others' opinions in planning the Project.

According to João, however, the Association "really started to be structured in 1997". The remaining 45 Associates were "real producers who took care of the Association and treated it with a critical sense, as well as with a notion of action". He said that before, the Associates were "merchants, large landowners (*fazendeiros*) all mixed up, so a division was made" (August 2001 in São Geraldo). However, the 'real producers' were not good at keeping the factory running, as an account of the then Association's president shows below.

The views of Silvio on the banana flour project

Silvio became the president of the Association in July 2000, following the Limirio's leave (see Chapter 5), and he was "thrown out" from the Association by angry associates in 2003 (according to Augusto, a new *técnico* who entered São Geraldo in 2003 to 'restructure' the Association, see below). He gave the following account when I asked him about his perception of problems regarding the Association's cooperation with ASDA. At that time, the banana flour factory suspended its operations due to a "lack of market". We talked in the front yard of the factory where the employees used to unload and weigh bananas collected from producers.⁶

"The Association started simply as an income source for each producer to elaborate a credit project. We had trucks, a rice...[refinery]...machine, a large stock of rice and the working capital (*capital de giro*). We did the project with PDA through ASDA in 1997 mainly to install machines for banana...[processing].

What happened? We started to build a factory in 1999 and the construction company could not make it...[within the budget]. So, it became the expense of the Association as the 'counterpart'. This 'counterpart' was supposed to

get clay and timber. It became at that time (i.e. the end of 1999) more than 20,000 *reais*. The Association had to dispose its working capital to cover it.

The other...[problematic]...thing was the water tank. After the factory was built, 'they' (i.e. the Amazon Bank and ASDA) convinced us to ask for a new loan to install the tank. We took 15,000 *reais* of 30,000 we had in our account as credit...We had to pay back this debt, so we sold our Toyota (pick-up) for 7,700 *reais* in one payment in 2000, and we took 91 *reais* from each producer. We continue to be indebted. Today, we are almost broke.

Then, we started to produce banana flour. But, we did not have our invoice (*nota fiscal*) since ASDA was going to take care of it. We did not have package, and ASDA was going to get it, too. The technical part was with ASDA. We had a contract with ASDA. The commercialisation was with ASDA. If we had to go bankrupt, ASDA would have to pay the compensation. Our objective was only to produce. We produce, and where is the package? Where is the *nota fiscal*? The Project was not made in the way as we wanted but, in the end, it was operated in the name of the Association.

We processed banana flour for the package...[that ASDA finally brought]...but where is the commercialisation? It was more than six months after the date...[which ASDA had promised]...to sell the flour. I finally said to my secretary: "What are we doing? We are taking money of our Association and we are investing in a thing that does not work?"

ASDA said that the things were complicated because of the bureaucracy in Belém and so on (because ASDA had promised to sell flour in Belém). There were not enough personnel to help the situation. There were two nutritionists who participated in project planning, but they were doing other projects and could not come. Almost when we had to throw away the flour, we sold it to the military in Belém. We invested our capital in banana flour, we produced and produced. We were producing 500 kilos of flour every day but we were not selling even less than 100 kilos. The expenses were very high, too. A trip to Belém costs at least 1,000 *reais*. I myself have never made a document about all this. I think they (i.e. ASDA) know because I always communicate with them".

This account can be read as a 'typical' case of mistrust addressed by the intervened party which criticises the intervening party. To be fair to ASDA, banana flour projects were functioning in other project sites close to Belém where the targeted market was physically closer and, more importantly, where the 'communities' were more static (i.e. with less intensive and changeable flows of people and commodities and with less radical spatial change). The problem was that ASDA practically (and almost blindly) applied the project model to Grotão without considering significant differences that existed amongst their 'target communities'.

In any case, this account clearly shows how the Association depended on ASDA while they did not consider ASDA as a part of 'us'. As we briefly saw above, ASDA had done a market study in the name of the Association, which showed the promises of municipal governments to purchase the flour for school lunch. Planning was mostly carried out by Limirio and João at that time, since Limirio was expected to enter the municipal government of São Geraldo as the vice-mayor so that he could articulate the cooperation between the Association, ASDA, and municipal governments. Limirio's death and João's departure from ASDA undermined the plan. The situation was simply interpreted by the new president as 'they did what we did not want'. Here, interestingly, Limirio seemed to have been included in 'them' as Silvio tried to justify his position by criticising Limirio's actions.

It is easy to accuse ASDA of not properly grasping the situation and generating a failed project. However, the situation presents deeper problems associated with sustainable development intervention in general, which have worked to widen the gap between the Association's 'real' character (to facilitate the Associates' individual projects) and the 'fake' representation of it as a 'community organisation'.

As Silvio asserted at the beginning, the Association started 'simply as an income source' for each settler who needed to elaborate his individual credit project for himself and his family in the newly created settlement. In principle, credit was directed to finance each 'family production unit', which practically meant each '*fazenda*'. The Association was indispensable for individual settlers to obtain information about credit (also to directly negotiate with the Amazon Bank in Marabá); to write '*fazenda*-based' projects with *técnicos* from government extension offices or NGOs like ASDA; and to receive technical assistance.⁷

For the Association to obtain funding of PDA through ASDA, however, its original function of supporting individual cattle management in each *fazenda* had to be (discursively) changed since cattle businesses in general had been considered 'unsustainable' (cf. Fearnside 1990; Downing et al. 1992). PDA required the promotion of sustainable agricultural activities and natural resource management in the project and presupposed the existence of collective arrangements for 'small producers' and local organisations. Therefore, in order to obtain funding from PDA, the community had to be represented arbitrarily by its leaders and *técnicos*. The settlers, including both participants and non-participants in the Project, could observe the situation, reflect on their social domains, and make judgements on their own. Many of them reached a conclusion that the Project was not representing their interests.

Some different views of the settlers on product choice

In principle, the settlers criticised the wrong 'product choice' made by the Association. One of the most frequently heard criticisms was that the Association did not give the 'right incentives' for 'real producers' to plant bananas. One settler, who was a former associate and later moved to Bamerindus in 2000, said to me: "Honestly, I don't see how that factory works. You know the problem? No one eats the bananas that they wanted us to plant (i.e. *banana comprida*). They said that they would also work with *cupuaçu*, and I thought it would be better. But anyway, the type of banana is too susceptible to disease and the plantation is costly. So, the final product becomes too expensive compared to the banana flour that comes from Imperatriz (a major city in Maranhão close to Marabá). If the flour does not reach the market, I think their project will end because bananas don't sell except for that factory" (5 July 2000, Novo Paraíso).

Originally, *banana comprida* was introduced by the *técnicos* of ASDA and Pará State Institute of Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (EMATER),⁸ and it was not commonly consumed among the settlers. Moreover, as this settler commented, a majority of the settlers knew that banana flour imported from Imperatriz was cheaper than the flour sold by the Association and, therefore, even if they participated in the project, their products would not be able to compete. The producers generally did not opt for depending on one product unless they were absolutely sure about the relevance of doing so in their social and economic contexts.⁹

Moreover, local consumers were not attracted to the product. A woman who attended ASDA's cooking course said that the banana flour was not as tasty as she had expected and, thus, she would not buy it (she further said that the one from Imperatriz tasted better).¹⁰ The Association did not make an effort to promote its product since, as Silvio explained above, they were expecting commercial leadership from ASDA. The Association's apparent dependency on ASDA also gave a signal to other settlers that the project was not right for them.

With little support from other settlers, the Association was becoming isolated from the immediate social context of Grotão. The project was too 'innovative and experimental' for the settlers. As a result, in Grotão, the producers stopped planting *banana comprida* after one cycle of the plantation. In the end, the Association had to import banana from the further region of Piçarra to keep flour production going, just as it had to buy rice in Rio Preto to maintain the operations of the rice processing plant (see Chapter 5). The entire operation became expensive due to increased transport costs.

The 'real producers' of the Association then started to make a new proposal for their 'community milk processing plant'. By the time, almost all the associates and the majority of settlers were milk producers. As Valdir, the town councillor of São Geraldo elected from Novo Paraíso, put it: "I think that the Association is currently ignoring the real necessities of the community such as milk and meat processing facilities, better roads, residential telephones and a gas station. We are especially interested in getting our milk refinery and dairy factory. Do you know how much milk is produced in our region? More than 30,000 litres a day!" (9 June 2000 in Novo Paraíso).

As mentioned above, milk was already the main source of income for most of the Associates when the banana factory was planned. The Project's intention to build the 'community milk processing unit' was not approved by ASDA simply because 'sustainable and participatory development projects' financed by PDA had to take an 'innovative approach' to solve the 'problem' of, for example, 'cattle ranching in the Amazon'. João always lamented the 'cattle culture' or '*fazendeiro* mentality' prevailed among the settlers as he constantly tried to promote an agro-forestry system that had never worked in the region. In the end, he had to agree with the demands of settlers for a project for building a milk processing unit in Novo Paraíso. In July 2000, just before Limirio passed away, a project named 'Implementation of a Milk Processing Unit in Grotão dos Caboclos' presented by ASDA and the Association was

approved by the Assistance Programme for Community Projects of the Japanese Consulate in Brazil and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).¹¹

The 'real community need': a milk processing unit

In 2000, the nearest milk processing unit (*laticínio*) where settlers could sell their milk was in Eldorado (about 30 km from the village). It contracted two milk collectors (*leiteiros*) in Novo Paraíso, and they organised two milk collection routes around Grotão: one was Bamerindus-Pau Ferrado and the other was Lagoa do Ouro-Santa Inês. Each route had about 50 producers, and each producer sold an average of three *botijões* (a *botijão* indicates a 52-litre plastic milk bottle and, thus, an average milk producer in the region produced about 150 litres of milk daily). As the producers lived far from each other, either in the forest or in extensive *fazendas*, the milk collection trucks had to drive through unpaved, bumpy paths in the interior, and one collector took about six hours a day to collect milk bottles from all the producers.

I sometimes accompanied the collectors who departed the village centre of Novo Paraíso at five in the morning and returned at eleven. At the village, a large truck sent by the processing unit in Eldorado was waiting for the collectors and gathered all the filled bottles. It then carried all the bottles to Eldorado and, when milk finally reached the processing unit, more than eight hours would have passed after it was extracted. If the milk were judged to be in a bad state (called *coalhada*), the processing unit would not pay to the producers.¹²

As most settlers were getting their regular income from milk in Grotão and also in Bamerindus, a well-organised milk collection and processing unit in the neighbourhood were becoming a dream, especially for smaller producers (with less than 30 cows¹³) who could not independently arrange their own transport, unlike the large ones. After the 2000 election, one of Valdir's brothers prepared a milk processing unit just outside the village, but the sanitary inspection from Marabá forced it to close down. Around the same time, the processing unit in Eldorado filed for bankruptcy due to the owner's embezzlement (in 2003, the municipal government subsidised a meat processing unit (*frigorífico*) in the plot).

Therefore, in 2002, milk producers in and around Grotão had to send their milk to a milk processing unit in Piçarra (about 50 km from Novo Paraíso) or one in Marabá (85 km from Novo Paraíso).

Just before Limirio died, he and Manu (see below) started to plan the implementation of the Association's milk project together with João. After Limirio passed away and João left ASDA, the associates decided to build the milk processing unit just outside Novo Paraíso along the principal road. According to Silvio:

"The construction delayed a lot. The constructor came from there (i.e. Belém) and he talked about the travel expense – moreover, he was very bad. Then, the other one came to finish the work, but he could not do everything, so he abandoned. Then, came the other one, sent from ASDA. All the delay was due to the idea that the constructors who came from Belém knew how to work. Then, the unit still lacked a water tank, and the constructors never came again, until today, never came. The equipments are all there, the structure of the tank and everything, but until today, nothing.

Then, I said: "Let's see the machines that we are going to install inside the unit to think about an energy project we will have to send to *Rede Celpa* (electricity provider in Pará)". One *doutor* (i.e. expert) who specialised in milk refineries came to see how the progress was, and he discarded the installed machines for being too small and insufficient for the quantity of milk that we wanted to process. We returned all the machines to the company in Marabá. And, until today, these machines never returned to us. Man (*Rapaz!*), how people are demanding the milk processing unit! We have some machines here, but we still need three more machines. I want the *doutor* to send us a report for us to know the voltage of each machine so that we can make the energy project and see what kind of exchanger we must put in the unit to start the operation.

The installation of a water and electricity system was also delayed because the person who did the construction did not leave the space to install these systems. The energy project depended on it. I am waiting for the coordinator of ASDA (who was in contact with Silvio) to decide to settle this. ASDA did not send the constructors or *doutor* again. They finally finished the factory without making the energy and water projects. We have to break everywhere again to install electricity lines and water tubes".

Unlike the banana flour factory, the 'real producers', including both Associates and non-Associates, seriously needed the milk processing unit and were putting pressure on the Association. However, since the Association had gone ahead with the banana flour factory, they naturally expected ASDA to take care of technical matters. Therefore, from the beginning, Associates were dependent on ASDA's intervention and, by the same token, ASDA had to send its constructors and the *doutor* to fulfil the project requirements because the donors started to press ASDA to realise the unit's inauguration as scheduled.

Later, I met the *doutor* who worked at the federal university in Belém. When I asked him about the 'training course' that he gave for milk producers at the Association, he proudly told me that he had given a lecture to the producers who knew nothing about basic sanitation matters for milking and refining the milk. About the machines, he said that it was not his job to say which machines would have been adequate for their unit since ASDA and the Association had to decide within the available budget.

ASDA's coordinators were becoming increasingly weary of talking about the milk project and the Association. One coordinator simply said that the problem of the milk processing unit was one of electricity and, when electricity reached the Unit, everything would be fine. The other coordinator admitted that the Association and the Project were having problems and commented: "It is how the frontier region is". With this, he confirmed that the model of community-oriented association and cooperative did not work in 'the frontier region' since the people had "other mentalities" than those of the inhabitants in more established communities in the northern part of Pará. Nevertheless, he still insisted that the small farmers' association and their 'self-organisation' were crucial to 'do projects'. It seemed that he did not know how to withdraw from the situation.

ASDA finally sent all the necessary machines in mid-2003, together with a newly recruited *técnico* called Augusto. However, as Silvio predicted, it took time to arrange the electricity system so that the machines sat around in the half-finished unit. In the beginning of 2004, when electricity was almost connected to the Unit, someone stole the machines¹⁴ and, therefore, its inauguration was again delayed. In the beginning of 2005, the Unit was still not ready.

Meanwhile, in mid-2004, dairy companies called Sertanorte (from Piçarra) and Paralat (from Marabá), respectively, built milk processing plants at each end of the main street of Novo Paraíso. According to the milk producers, they still hoped to have 'their own' processing unit since milk prices set by Sertanorte and Paralat did not compete with each other and were equally set at 25 *centavos* per litre (31 *centavos* in the rainy season).¹⁵ The young, newly appointed *técnico*, Augusto, was eager to restart the paralysed banana flour factory, clean the debt, and establish the milk processing unit as a 'cooperative industry'.

The fragmentation process

Augusto was a 22 year-old *técnico agroindustrial* who specialised in community agro-industry. He was originally from the west of Pará and, as soon as he graduated from agricultural technical school in São Paulo in the mid-2003, ASDA contracted him and sent him to Grotão. In October 2003, he called for a meeting at the Association's headquarters to which 11 associates attended and, at the meeting, they decided to expel Silvio and his directors in order to form a new 'board of directors'.

According to Augusto, the Associates wanted to have Silvio arrested for selling two of the Association's lots in the village, without informing others, to an ex-milk collector who had just arrived from Piçarra. The milk collector paid the price with calves, and Silvio was said to have divided them with the Association's treasurer. These lots were acquired by Limirio through negotiation with INCRA over the installation of a water tank and office. As the Association moved its headquarters to another plot in which the rice processing unit and banana flour factory were built, the initial office was turned into a house for visitors. One associate said angrily: "I said to Silvio, 'what have you done? Selling the patrimony of the Association?' And, he just scratched his head!" After he left the Association, Silvio bought a new land plot in Lagoa do Ouro to raise cattle and also built a new house in the village centre.

After this incident, a new president was appointed, namely the 22 years old son of an original associate called Pedro, a proprietor of Pau Preto. Pedro's son had graduated from agricultural technical school in Goiás and moved to Novo Paraíso with the prospect of 'getting a job'. Naturally, the young man soon lost interest in the troubled Association and moved to São

Geraldo with his wife and child after only four months in post. When I visited the village again in February 2004, the presidency had been passed on to his father, Pedro, who closely worked with Raimundo, the Association's new treasurer (see below). Pedro said that, though he had not been involved in the Association's activities for years, it was a shame that the Association, which was equal to the origin of the settlement, was going to vanish. He looked disgusted when he mentioned Silvio: "Limirio left us *obras* (i.e. infrastructure) and Silvio damaged them all".

The first job that the new Association had to undertake was to clean up the accumulated debt of 60,000 *reais* (about USD 20,640 in February 2004), and to put the milk-processing unit in order. Raimundo told Augusto that he had already contacted a company in Marabá to sell the Association's tractor and 12-ton truck.

In February 2004, the Association officially had 18 associates in total. One day, Pedro visited the place where Augusto was staying (recently rebuilt hotel of Ms. Sebastiana¹⁶). Augusto proposed to ask for a new loan from the Amazon Bank as working capital to start the milk processing unit. Augusto said: "The milk unit can be the solution to all the problems and help restart the Association. Also, for the banana factory, we can propose a project to reform the existing structure of banana flour production to install the machines for producing *farinha* (cassava flour); that, people would buy".

Pedro amusedly said: "People used to call me '*Pedro Farinheiro*' because I had a *casa de farinha* (a cassava flour production unit), years ago. Now I don't do it anymore". For him, the banana flour factory was something to be cleaned up, and the Augusto's idea of turning the banana flour factory to a cassava flour factory did not sound realistic. Augusto also admitted that there were only two families in Bamerindus who produced cassava flour so that cassava would follow the same path as rice and banana. However, Pedro, who owned 30 cows, became very serious (with the tone of his voice changing) when he talked about the milk-processing unit. He solemnly declared to Augusto, who was the same age as his son:

"Now, milk is a serious matter. If the business does not go right or if we cannot pay...[to the producers]..., they will really kill us. They make a living from it, do you understand?"

Augusto's answer was: "I am here to help you. And, to grow together". Later that day, he borrowed a motorbike from one of the *mototaxistas* (motorbike taxi drivers) in the village and visited milk producers and ex-associates in Grotão, Pau Ferrado and Bamerindus to talk about the milk processing unit. Then, he went back to Belém to discuss the matter of the stolen machines with the coordinators of ASDA who eventually sent him to another project site. Augusto never returned to the Association afterwards. He was agonised as he "had raised expectations and animated the producers" whereas his "bosses" had different priorities and did not liberate money for him to travel and stay in Grotão again¹⁷ (13 August 2004 at ASDA in Belém).

The Association looked too fragmented to start the new 'serious' milk business without any *técnicos* or strong leaders who could articulate the need for technical and financial assistance. In the end of August 2004, Pedro and Raimundo told me that they had sold the trucks and cleaned the banana factory. They did not have a clear plan for starting the operation of the milk-processing unit since the Amazon Bank was weary of lending money to the Association. They just said that if a *técnico* like Augusto could help them, they could start a new cooperative to get a loan to carry out their milk processing business.

In September, the annual Rice Festival (i.e. the Festival of Producers) was going to be held. ASDA's withdrawal from Grotão was virtually declared at preparations for the Festival because it was the first time that ASDA sent neither a *técnico* nor gave financial support to the Festival. A woman who recently arrived from São Geraldo and opened a bar at the village centre started to lead the preparations for the Festival together with Pedro. They asked INCRA for some machines to establish the venue for the Festival and, as 2004 was another general election year,¹⁸ they also went to political candidates in São Geraldo and Eldorado to ask for financial support, as these candidates usually used the Festival for their political campaigns. Pedro said that he felt "responsible" for the Festival. In the end, many settlers volunteered to clear the abandoned plot of the Association's headquarters to install the stands, tables and chairs, and dance floor. It seemed that the Festival was the last social event that led settlers to identify with their previous collective activities.

Intervention, action and knowledge processes

The situational changes that surrounded the Association in relation to intervention by ASDA represented a process of 'trial and error' experienced by each actor involved in the process. For example, the case of banana flour factory demonstrated that the settlers could explore and confirm that milk was the 'right product' because of participation in the banana production and processing activities. The case of the milk processing unit showed how the project itself pushed the settlers to observe their organisation's fragmentation process. While recognising some continuous elements in their social domains in such occasions as the Festival, the settlers tacitly processed the meanings attached to their social domains and fields of action, which had previously been shaped by the activities of the Association.

In the project process, changing personal relationships between the *técnicos*, coordinators, leaders of the Association, and other settlers affected the shaping of each intervention situation. These actors embodied different bodies of knowledge and lifeworlds, and their encounters formed different interfaces. For example, the *técnicos* acted between the Association's leaders and 'bosses' (coordinators) at ASDA; the coordinators acted between the *técnicos* and donors; and the Association's leaders acted between the associates and *técnicos*; at each interface, new knowledge and fields of action emerged. Other settlers who surrounded the interface situations derived their own understandings through participation, interaction, observation and discussion.

These interface situations showed that, while each category of actors represented a particular body of knowledge, at an individual level, a *técnico*, coordinator, leader, associate or non-associate could all enrich his or her own body of knowledge with reference to their personal experience (Arce 1989). As a result, Goro, João, and Augusto, for instance, each presented a different style of dealing with the process of intervention and with their 'beneficiaries'. The same could be said of Limirio, Silvio, and Pedro, as the Association's presidents. Naturally, different combinations of *técnicos* and leaders of the Association formed different interface situations, which could be observed, contextualised, and judged freely by others.

The following account of João shows a *técnico's* reflexive understanding of such changeable interface situations.¹⁹

"Today, you see people with 50 cattle who were really 'weak' 5 or 8 years ago. The Association brought a big courage to the community, to everyone. Here

in this region, people seek to raise cattle because milk is a product that has a definitive production chain, though unjust, but definitive. You have cattle, and you have someone to sell to. You plant something, but when you have to commercialise, you stay marginal...Today, people see forest (*mata*) taken for granted and not as a possible source of development. Today, you can notice that people who get rid of *mata* are people who have pasture. We need strong politics of *conscientização*, very strong. No one wants anything for a long term. It is a culture of *imediatista*...There is a series of projects. Some are interesting; others are not interesting. It is necessary to do a survey on these projects and see if they are made correct or not. And, then, we need to try to adjust the project to each situation”.

According to João, the Association ‘brought a big courage’ to the associates and, as a result, ‘small producers’ at that time became ‘larger’ (or according to him, ‘stronger’) cattle ranchers. The first ‘courage’ was brought by Goro who had a distinct style of working with the settlers from João. João saw and understood the ‘first interface’ created by Goro as a particular context on which he could act based on his knowledge and general understanding of the ‘frontier culture’. Such culture, for him, presented a culture of *imediatista*. In his image, the Association should have been able to transmit a different type of courage to promote the ‘strong politics of *conscientização*’.

Obviously, in the settlers’ lifeworlds, the Association’s initial support for people to own ‘50 cattle’ and its subsequent promotion of banana flour presented a serious discontinuity. As a result, many settlers lost interest in the ‘sustainable and participatory project’, which nominally aimed to promote community participation and sustainable agriculture.

The settlers generally did not consider that they were ‘participating’ in a development project. Instead they took it as an opportunity to enrich their life projects and become ‘sustainable’. They were surely *imediatista* in the sense that they were quick to assign meanings to their immediate actions at a particular interface, referring to their past experiences and also to changing social domains and material arrangements. Their actions and reflexive understandings of each interface further reshaped the interface situations and, in this process, the settlers internalised new knowledge and possibility of action in their lifeworlds.

Individualising Community Projects

At this point, we need to discuss how action and knowledge shaped through interface situations have led settlers to individualise their practices. The process of individualisation can be analysed by looking into how each 'participant' of the project derived his own understanding of the interface from the act of participation. Below, we will firstly look at an individualised project-making process engaged in by Raimundo and, then, at the life project process of Manu. Their 'projects' represent the settlers' 'rationalities' in temporarily particularising practices with reference to their experiences with the Association and the community agro-industry project.

Raimundo's 'own' projects

Raimundo was originally from the state of Maranhão and entered Grotão in 1989 through the state of Tocantins. He obtained a 10-*alqueire* land plot in Lagoa do Ouro, and was an active Association member in the first few years. In 2000, he was 42 years-old, and he told me that he had been always a 'farmer' (*lavrador*) and cultivated crops and thus he did not know how to deal with cattle. He was one of the rare settlers who did not show an interest in cattle. He was more concerned with making money out of his *roça* (farm). Others in Lagoa do Ouro, who were mostly *fazendeiros* (see below for the case of Manu), thought Raimundo was 'crazy' (*louco*) since they considered his plot suitable for opening a *fazenda*.

In spite of Raimundo's 'ideal' character for an association that had tried to orient its associates towards non-cattle keeping activities, Limirio once complained about Raimundo as being "one of those *aproveitadores*" (indicating that Raimundo was taking advantage of collective activities for his own interest, i.e. a 'free-rider'). In the beginning of 2000, Raimundo started a family business making sweet banana paste (*doce de banana*) by borrowing money from the Association. At that time, both Limirio and João, were trying to establish the community agro-industry project by counting on Associates' individual credit deposits and, therefore, Limirio saw Raimundo's act as egoistic. According to Raimundo, he wanted to "try to do a project" on his own with financial resources that were legitimately available to him.

In August 2000, he moved his residence to the village centre from his farm in Lagoa do Ouro and rented a shack in the village to install a huge iron pan to cook banana. He said that he got the idea of banana paste production

from 'the banana business of the Association' as well as from his wife who sometimes cooked bananas to store for some time. At his shack, his two teenage sons and his wife packaged and labelled the cooked banana, and he told me that he was visiting supermarkets in Novo Paraíso, Piçarra, and São Geraldo to sell the final products every two weeks.

Raimundo planted bananas himself but sometimes also needed to buy bananas from other producers. The type of banana used for the paste production did not have to be 'special' like the *banana comprida* used for the flour production and, therefore, he could still find producers who would supply bananas from around Grotão. People called him *Raimundo Banana* because he was constantly asking his fellow settlers for bananas. In 2001, he heard about SEBRAE, a state agency that supported small entrepreneurship,²⁰ and contacted the office in Marabá to develop his banana paste business.

When I met Raimundo again in 2004, I asked him what had happened to the SEBRAE project. He replied: "It didn't work. People of SEBRAE came to see the factory and told me that I needed to go through a sanitary inspection, registration, all these things, before getting their support. But I don't know how it works because I don't have money to pay for them. Then, bananas became too expensive, so I stopped the whole thing at the end of 2002. There were no more people planting bananas around here".

Then, he continued: "Last year, I got a loan from the Amazon Bank and made a *represa* (fish nursery) to grow *tambaqui* (*Colossoma macropomum*). I put 23,000 fish in it, but the December rains washed them away. The bank of the nursery was not solid enough...but I still think that fish is a good business. You can buy a 1000 fry for 60 *reais* in Maranhão. They say that you can sell *tambaqui* for 3 *reais* per kilo! I think that I will still try...[to grow]...fish next year".²¹

Raimundo said that he had learned a lot from the Association in terms of being able to develop his own project and wanted to know more about ASDA and how he could get support or project ideas. He became the Association's treasurer at the end of 2003 when Silvio left, since he wanted to keep the Association operational in order to seize different credit opportunities. Raimundo was not as sentimental as Pedro who identified the Association with the history of 'our settlement' but instead was more pragmatic; he considered the Association as a source of information and resources for his personal projects.

Raimundo was also quite cautious when he needed to talk about money. He said, after the incident with Silvio that he became quite attentive to other people's behaviour since no one could be easily trusted when money was involved. Later, he asked me what the *técnico* Augusto wanted in Novo Paraíso. I simply said that Augusto was a *técnico* sent from ASDA to work with the Association. Then, he shrugged and murmured: "But you never know what those *técnicos* want from us".²²

In short, Raimundo regarded the Association as a resource pool from which he could draw ideas and financial support to realise 'his own project'. Therefore, he did not seem to be concerned with the Association's activities themselves. However, because of his 'individualised' interest, he became one of the most enthusiastic (ex)-Associates who tried to maintain the Association.

Manu's life project

Manu had been the Director (*gerente*) of the banana flour factory of the Association, and his daughter (a 16 year-old) used to be the factory's secretary. His second son (a 21 year-old) was in charge of the Association's rice processing plant for a few years. When Manu was busy with the banana business, the eldest son (a 23 year-old), who lived inside Manu's property with his wife, practically took care of Manu's *27-alqueire fazenda* and tended to "just 100 or so" heads of cattle.²³ After the factory closed, Manu started to work fully on his *fazenda* again, which was situated a few kilometres from Raimundo's farm in Lagoa do Ouro.

Manu was born in the 1950s in the interior of Riachão in Maranhão. He had lived as a *vaqueiro* (cowboy) since he was thirteen until he decided to move to Pará at the beginning of the 1990s. He made the decision to move to Pará because he was fed up "with the *vaqueiro's* salary of 'two calves per year'." He was also worried about the children's future since the land in Riachão was completely "*chapada*" (dry and cracked). In 1993, he entered Lagoa do Ouro and, upon arrival, he joined the Association to obtain a land title and credit. Over five years, he became the owner of 20 bulls and 32 cows. He said that it was "all a *vaqueiros'* dream" to own cattle instead of tending cattle for others.

In August 2004, I visited Manu at his *fazenda*. On the way from the village to Lagoa do Ouro, I noticed that his neighbours had moved away from the region: "(Paulo?) He moved to São Geraldo to work on his father's land. His wife moved out to Araguaína with her cows because Paulo had an affair

with a girl from...[the brothel of]...Nené. (Cetim?) He died last year and his niece came from Piauí to sell his plot. Nonato moved to Rio Preto with our sons at the beginning of this year. We are going to move to Rio Preto, too, hopefully around July next year”.

Manu’s *fazenda* formed a part of the landscape of the cemetery of brazil nuts. The white and burnt brazil nut trees dotted the pasture on which white cattle (*nelore*) grazed. His house was made of brazil nut planks and it stood on a hill; from the patio, we could survey the entire pasture.

When I asked Manu where his sons were and what his plan was, he started to explain:²⁴

“When the rain stopped, they (i.e. the first and second sons) travelled to the region of Rio Preto, which opened in 2002. It is situated on the way from Marabá to Novo Repartimento along the *Estrada do Rio Preto* (where Almir opened his *fazenda*, as described in the last chapter). There is a camp between the villages of Quatro Bocas and Agua Gelada – that’s where my sons are now; its seven kilometres from the *Estrada*. Together with Nonato’s cattle, they moved 250 cattle in total. They went with five *boiadeiras* (cowboys);²⁵ one of them was our son, and one *cozinheira* (female cook). You have to eat, of course! It takes 30 days to get there on foot!...In Rio Preto, there are still a lot of *madeira noble* (valuable timber) like *jatobá*, *mogno* (mahogany), less brazil nut than here, but they are not good timber anyway. Almir is buying them. He has three sawmills in Rio Preto. Our sons are working really hard, cutting trees and clearing forest. They are camping now but, soon, going to build a house over there. At the moment, there is no way to carry sand and bricks to build a house. We are thinking about joining them next year. We were already there last month. Nazaré (his wife) went, too”.

To my question, “did you like it?” his wife replied, “oh yes. I used to ride a horse a lot and also farm (*plantava roça*) when we were in Maranhão. Here, no, we paid *peão* (peon) to do the job.²⁶ In Rio Preto, there are still a lot of *mata* and a lot of work to do, but I think it will be nice to live there”. When I asked Manu why he had to abandon his *fazenda* in Lagoa do Ouro, he said:

“No, until I can sell it for a really good price, I am not going to sell the property yet. Because my land is in bad condition and it won’t sustain all the cattle I have. The pasture grass (*capim*) is recovering now, and I will sell it for a good price and then I will move to Rio Preto.

Paraíso grew after Bamrindus was liberated. Now, everything is arranged and pretty (*arrumadinha e bonitinha*). But nowadays, there are a lot of thieves around here. Before, I had never heard of them. After...[the liberation of]...Bamerindus, there are a lot of people whom I don’t know. And, last month, the milk processing plant...[in Novo Paraíso]...started to pay us by cheque because of concerns over security.²⁷ I don’t like this because you have to go to the bank in São Geraldo (i.e. Banco do Brasil, the only bank agency in São Geraldo, nearly 100 km from the Manu’s *fazenda*) to change the cheques to real money...I really don’t know how it works.

I want a project for me. Here, you can’t cut these trees anymore because IBAMA comes when you do it and we get fined. The Association’s business was just like *brincadeira* (play), not really serious. I want to make a project for me, for example, to farm fish on my land. I saw Raimundo Banana’s *represa*...[before it was washed away]. I thought that kind of thing, I should do”.

According to Manu, the Association’s project was not, in the end, a serious business because it did not change, affect, or ‘improve’ his own livelihood organisation. As the banana factory’s director, he had received two minimum salaries at that time but, when the project was going awry, he concluded that ‘cattle were the best investment’, just as his neighbour, Nonato, used to insist. Nonato was also a member of the Association who always said that he never really “understood” why he had to plant rice or fruit trees instead of investing in a cattle business. Manu later said that although he tried to experiment with the agro-forestry system on his plot using the seedlings that João provided to Associates in 1995, he soon quit because he had realised that it was not “his vocation”.

Manu seemed to assess new situations such as closing the banana flour factory, payment by cheque, or the ‘opening’ of Rio Preto, with reference to his past experience as a *vaqueiro* or a *fazendeiro* and also to his domestic cycle. He decided to move to Rio Preto because Rio Preto offered him the safest and the

most viable option to expand his property and to divide it for his heirs in accordance with his experience.²⁸ In this sense, improvement of basic infrastructure (electricity had just reached Manu's *fazenda* before the interview was conducted) or town development in Novo Paraíso did not affect his decision to move on to another area. In order to take this 'option', however, he had to act through different projects and situations so that he could know that he was making the right decision.

Apparently, other settlers were going through a similar process, as he finally commented:

"Now, there is a lot of influence of Rio Preto over Grotão - it opened and, for example, many people in Quatro Bocas are from the region of Paraíso and Lagoa do Ouro. One can make another Paraíso out there".

Experiences with intervention and collective action

The cases of Raimundo and Manu showed their learning experiences drawing on NGO intervention and collective activities. They analysed intervention situations with reference to their social domains, their available human and non-human resources, and their participation in the Association's activities. This opened up new fields of action to which they could attach differentiated meanings. They both chose to make 'their own projects' instead of participating in or further fostering collective action because they did not see the relevance of the 'community project' to their life projects and lifeworlds. Yet, there was a significant difference between them: Raimundo wanted to use the existing structure of the Association to develop his project, while Manu opted for moving to another locality to repeat and develop 'his vocation' that the Association stopped supporting properly. This fact indicates that the outcomes of learning experiences by individual actors may vary significantly since each actor is capable of identifying his social domain in reference to past experiences and to immediate social situations.

The point here is that they knew what their own project (or vocation) was 'after' participating in the Association's activities and ASDA's project intervention. Their goals were shaped through a reflexive understanding of actions, which they had taken in the past through which they could further imagine the future project. In this process, the project model brought by the *técnicos* from outside (such as 'community agro-industry') was eventually

remoulded to present their models of arranging actions with others within the social field.

In this process, knowledge was regenerated in their lifeworlds as an outcome of certain arrangement of actions and practices in relation to the development intervention. In general, to borrow a metaphor from Bateson (1972: 83), the relationship between knowledge and action can be pictured as “The river moulds the banks and the banks guide the river”.²⁹ Raimundo’s and Manu’s or, possibly, the other settlers’ actions in general moulded the knowledge that guided new actions. This process constantly renewed their social domains in which previously stocked social knowledge came to be reconfigured and temporarily individualised. Their ‘individualities’, then, became apparent in contrast to the previous collective arrangements that had been shaped in their social field.

In this sense, neither Raimundo nor Manu was utterly egoistic. They knew what they were doing precisely by going through social relations and the relational changes that had taken place in the course of intervention, household processes, or landscape change. The logic of intervention in the form of community development or sustainable development often interpreted the knowledge processes of the settlers as a lack of *conscientização*. The settlers like Raimundo and Manu could (perhaps unconsciously) detect the (mis)representation of their knowledge processes in the course of intervention and eventually rearranged their actions to properly represent their bodies of differentiated ‘knowledges’.

A Theoretical Discussion on Action and Knowledge

In order to deepen our analysis of the relationship between action and knowledge, we need to draw on a theory of action backed by pragmatism that takes a close look at the nature of human action from an actor’s standpoint. It is because a theory of action may enable us to identify moments of individualisation or the shaping of collective action, as observed in Grotão. I do not intend to go far into a philosophical discussions on pragmatism here; however we can draw on some elements from recent debates on a theory of action in order to discuss diverse ‘rationalities’ that are manifest through different arrangements involving the individual actions of local actors.

The Theory of Action: from rationality to creativity

The theory of action forms a core of social theory (Joas 1993, 1996), which covers a wide range of discussions on individual rationality, collective action, social practices and social behaviourism.³⁰ (A theory of practice, especially that developed by Giddens, as introduced in Chapter 2, is also extensively discussed in the framework of the theory of action.) It mainly deals with the issue of patterns (and counter-patterns) of social action by analysing how an individual relates himself to others and to the wider societal context (including social structure or the natural environment) in the form of self-realisation in the social process. The form of self-realisation in relation to the self and others can naturally vary within an individual actor,³¹ and the theory of action is being directed to incorporate the concept of 'creativity' in order to theorise various patterns of social action (Joas 1996; Joas and Kilpinen 2006).

One of the first major works that clearly tried to depart from a theory of action undergirded by notions of 'universal' rationality and purposeful knowledge was the theory of communicative action developed by Habermas (1984, 1987). In the earlier Cartesian or Weberian understanding of human action, individual (and consequently collective) actions were enabled by the rationality that naturally stems from each individual's objective interest. Habermas re-examined this view by theorising 'communicative rationality' in order to question the long-standing explanation of human action in social theory which had equated every human action to 'purposive-rational action with regard to problems of maximizing profit or acquiring and using political power' (Habermas 1984: 5).

Partly drawing on Schutz (1964), Habermas conceptualises a 'lifeworld' as a social space where actors' 'communicative actions' take place. This does not equal a mere political subsystem but indicates a space in which individuals' (inter)actions fully interact with political and societal 'systems'.³² In this sense, the theory of communicative action has expanded the scope of social action that is composed of 'communicatively integrated and systemically organised domains of action, of the lifeworld and the social system' (according to Honneth and Joas 1988: 167).³³

According to Joas (1996), the theory of action is currently being directed to discuss how to reconceptualise social action and institutionalisation as creative processes. In his theorisation of 'the creativity of action', the individual is conceptualised as consisting of a 'pragmatic self' who 'has a past – and is oriented toward a future...[whose]...[a]ction in the present is deeply

informed by that past and that future' (according to McGowan 1998: 294).³⁴ This 'biographical' conceptualisation of 'individualised individuals' (Beck 1992; Beck et al. 1994; Bauman 1990, 2001; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002) stands in opposition to a conceptualisation of 'oversocialised individuals' in sociology more generally (Wrong 1961, see also Chapter 3). It is because the biographical reconceptualisation of the individual analytically maintains both individuality and sociality of the individual who cannot be detached from his experience or imagination shaped and reshaped in the social field.

In this vein, William James, one of the early pragmatists, conceptualises 'funds of experience that can both stimulate and ground...[the actors']...reflections about their immediate situation, opening up a wider range of future alternatives for their imaginations to consider and transmogrify into both fearful and desirable possibilities for their own lives' (quoted in Green 2006: 314). Analytically retained individuality then becomes an important element of the creativity of human action taken by social actors whose agency emerges in reference to the self, others, immediate collectives, and the natural environment in the course of their life projects.

When an individual regains individuality through his participation in collective activities, creative action embodies 'socially accepted rationalities' that do not necessarily have to represent economic, political, or societal interest (i.e. the creative individual's rationality may look totally 'irrational' in the eyes of the 'rational individual'). Thus, the settlers in Grotão, for example, temporarily drew their rationalities to justify their life projects and taking of creative action from past experiences and future dreams. These rationalities were informed by their participations in the development project and interactions with outside entities or the possible use of natural resources.

Knowledge processes and arrangement of individual actions

The socially accepted rationalities, in turn, become internalised in each actor's social domains (or stocked in their fund of experience) in which the field of individual action is continuously redefined. For example, leaders of institutionalised collectives (such as the Association) embodied and visualised the necessity and relevance of collective action, and the followers accordingly chose the courses of action that they wanted to follow. In this process, the collective action opened new fields of individual actions and generated

different types of knowledge and practices that could be further reshaped by the actors involved.

In principle, pragmatism conceptualises knowledge as 'habit' (Joas and Kilpinen 2006) that is shaped by the everyday practices of actors in their lifeworlds.³⁵ This understanding of knowledge is significantly different from a Cartesian or utilitarian understanding of knowledge that takes knowledge as something 'objective' (cf. Polanyi 1958) and separable from actors' actions and everyday practices. As Ploeg (1993) argues, local knowledge cannot be analytically detached from labour processes or interactions between different bodies of knowledge that are continuously incorporated into actors' knowledge processes through their everyday social world (see also Arce and Long 1994). Knowledge, in this sense, does not necessarily lead to certain action but, rather, emerges from a sequence of action which accompanies physical (and habitual) expressions of objects or material arrangements that are objectified by the proper actors in their recognition of social reality (Arce 2003b).³⁶

Therefore, for example, the creation of institutions is an important component of creative action and the regeneration of knowledge processes because it works to break routinised habits which are internalised in actors' social domains as taken-for-granted knowledge (Joas 1996; see also Gross 1999). The moment of institutionalisation establishes conditions within which actors can take further action by referring to past experiences dealing with the norms and rules of conduct in their previous social field. Thus, the institution gives a 'context' for an individual actor to participate in the flexible construction of 'the local site of the social' (following Schatzki 2005) by making creative associations with himself, others, and the social and natural environments.

Schatzki (2005: 471) explains the context of action as 'the site of the social', which is further linked to the field of possible 'intelligibility/meaning' composed of 'nexuses of practices and material arrangements'.³⁷ According to him, any practice is explained as 'an organized, open-ended spatial-temporal manifold of actions', and 'human existence' is understood as enmeshed in the 'practice-arrangement bundles' (*ibid*: 472). Since a person's life is practically 'the manifold of actions a person performs along with the mental and cognitive conditions she is in' (Schatzki 1996: 227), the possibility of creative action naturally emerges from a person's life process for her to objectify the context in which she can arrange her actions with others. The 'cognitive conditions', which indicate her body of knowledge, work to guide her arrangement of actions and their possible institutionalisation.

As Manu predicted above, even when each settler opts for individualising his project, there is always the possibility for him to ally with others and to form a new collective or organise a community institution in the new locality. In the study area, social and physical environment changes have occurred more radically and rapidly than in established communities with fairly fixed physical and symbolic boundaries. In the process of change, the meanings attached to different social events or development intervention also changed. This presented new 'spheres of possibility for action' (Joas 1996). Local knowledge was regenerated in this process, further guiding actors to new fields of both individualised and collective action or, more simply, creative action.

Conclusions

This chapter has discussed various types of action and the reconfiguration process of social domains that could be observed at 'knowledge interfaces' shaped in the course of the Association's cooperation with ASDA in the post-Limirio context in Grotão. By looking into interfaces, we could grasp the moments of collective reconfiguration and the process of individualisation, which were shaped by the settlers' arrangement of actions and their differentiated knowledges.

In essence, in order to understand development project process from the actors' standpoint, we need to understand their emergent rationalities at each intervention situation even if, from the outset, the Association's project discussed in this chapter might have presented a typical example of 'a failure'. Of course, the majority of settlers also perceived the project as a failure or 'not so serious business' in the end, but they diversified their repertoire of actions through the participation in the project and perceived the failure to affirm and develop their own projects. In Grotão, together with the experience of previously configured collectives and their reconfiguration processes within the changing natural environment and political contexts, the settlers' fund of experience became quite rich in their everyday lives. In this sense, the 'failed project' certainly formed a context for both participants and non-participants in the project to rearrange their actions.

Here, we also need to pay attention to the 'intangible' elements that affected the process of action rearrangement in the settlers' ongoing experience, which could be observed in discourses made by the settlers and *técnicos*. For

example, the existence of Limirio in the 'post-Limirio' context was implicitly and explicitly important for each actor to make a judgement about the present situation. In every situational change that took place in the Association, Limirio appeared in the leaders' and the *técnicos*' discourses, as we could detect in Silvio's criticism of the ASDA supported project or in Pedro's denunciation of Silvio. Although this was not emphasised in the preceding discussion, João often said: 'If only Limirio were alive...'. The former dead leader's social existence seemed to have remained across different times and social domains, which also affected the settlers' knowledge processes shaped in each intervention situation.

This suggests that the settlers make their judgements about a situation and acquire different bodies of knowledge through various channels. These channels are not only shaped by the development project or the settlers' political or economic interests but also by internalised collective memories in their social domains and the continuity of everyday experience itself. Each channel fosters an actor's capability to both tacitly and explicitly manifest his 'rationality' situated in his social field, which this chapter explained as the emergence of 'creativity'.

At the same time, we cannot accuse ASDA of failing to understand the settlers' multiple rationalities or creativity in their intervention process since the *técnicos* and the coordinators of ASDA were also deriving their own understanding of the situation from their social domains and lifeworlds. They also arranged their actions to carry out their 'life projects' (which are affected by various channels in their lifeworlds). What makes them inherently different from the settlers is that their 'professional' activities are undergirded by a certain 'social logic' that requires 'coherence' among different entities (including ASDA) that consist of development industries (cf. Olivier de Sardan 2005).

This 'social logic' of development industries is usually embodied as 'epistemic practice' (Knorr-Cetina 2001). In the next chapter, we will turn our attention to the question of how the 'boundaries of "epistemic communities" (i.e. those composed of persons sharing the same sources and types of knowledge) can be identified' (Arce and Long 1992: 245) in relation to the international development community, which promotes the ideal of sustainable development. It is because, after all, the idea of 'community agro-industry' applied to the moving social field of Grotão and subsequently localised by the settlers was justified through negotiations between different

epistemic communities shaped in international development, and we need to know how that happened.

Notes

¹ According to the same dictionary, individualisation is similar to 'individuation' that indicates: 'the act or process of individuating; (in the Psychology of Jung), the process by which the wholeness of the individual is established through the integration of consciousness and the collective unconsciousness'. I use the term individualisation instead of individuation simply because the term individuation also carries a philosophical and psychological (and sometimes zoological) connotation that suggests the process in which a child acquires subjectivity or an individual is separated from a crowd (or a herd).

² The entire programme demonstrates a 'German' influence as the German government supplied nearly 40% of its total fund (about USD 350 million in 2000).

³ According to a newsletter of ASDA (September 1996), the project was implemented based on the 'initiative of the community' of Grotão, as the members wanted technical assistance and infrastructure to commercialise agricultural products such as rice and beans and extractive products like brazil nut oil.

⁴ This is dubious since driers for producing flour were made in Germany and imported through São Paulo.

⁵ *Conscientizar* can be translated as 'to raise consciousnesses' among workers (or of the 'working class'). In Brazil, the movement of *conscientização* was first proposed by a pedagogue, Paulo Freire, in the field of literacy education in the 1960s. Since then, the term has been used in social movements and education (especially environmental education). See Nygren (2003) for an ethnographic study on a similar view amongst development workers on their 'beneficiaries' in a settlement in Nicaragua.

⁶ Interview conducted on 23 June 2002.

⁷ Some researchers in Pará have pointed out that this 'technical assistance' facilitated the standardised project applications to all the producers, which were invariably directed towards cattle-based activities in the study area. According to Alfredo Homma, for example, a private extension office called Coopserviço in Marabá uses the same application form for all its applicants in order to obtain as many projects as possible. This type of 'extension service' is easily used as a mechanism that extracts money from INCRA for its own benefit (personal communication, May 2004). Moreover, in this way, everyone is encouraged to be cattle ranchers so that agriculture is not properly appreciated even by 'small' farmers (according to Teresa Cavalcante from the Centre for Family Agriculture Research of the Federal University of Pará, personal communication, May 2004).

⁸ Some *técnicos* from EMATER were working at ASDA just as Goro had been dispatched from SAGRI to ASDA.

⁹ This is generally understood as the risk-averse behaviour of small farmers who tend to diversify economic livelihoods (Ellis 1998).

¹⁰ Banana flour can be used in the same way as wheat flour and also in porridge (*mingau*).

¹¹ Around this time, JICA in Belém was trying to strengthen its tie with “highly professional local NGOs, preferably headed by foreigners” like ASDA (according to the director of JICA Belém in 2000).

¹² The milk collectors checked milk at each *fazenda* to keep records of quantity and also quality. With high temperatures in the Amazon, milk in closed plastic bottles can easily become fermented and damaged.

¹³ In the region, a cow produces 5-10 litres of milk every day. Therefore, ‘less than 300-litre’ milk producers were considered ‘small’ in this context.

¹⁴ Augusto later told me that he knew who stole the machines, but he clearly did not want to talk about it since a construction engineer sent by ASDA seemed to have involved in the scheme. He simply said that the stolen machines would never return once they were sold outside of the region.

¹⁵ In 2000, the milk price was between 15 and 20 *centavos* per litre and, therefore, 25 *centavos* in 2004 indicated ‘an increase’. However, in regard to inflation and an overall rise in commodity prices between 2000 and 2004, the producers considered the price of ‘25 *centavos*’ to be too cheap.

¹⁶ After Limirio died and Silvio sold the Association’s house, *técnicos* and visitors started to use the ‘Hotel of Ms. Sebastiana’. Ms. Sebastiana refurbished her house in which she previously sold bread and built a hotel with nine rooms and a small restaurant in 2002 because of the number of drivers and merchants who passed Novo Paraíso looking for accommodation.

¹⁷ At that time, ASDA increasingly cared about its self-image and reputation as it realised the importance of branding and business promotion of the products it supported. As Hilhorst (2000) shows, NGOs in general operate in the realm of discourses, and such operations tend to result in a lack of self-criticism and proper evaluation of ‘failed’ projects (see Chapter 7 for more discussions).

¹⁸ In the 2004 election, Manelão and Valdir won again while Lima and Kito lost again. It was interesting to see how Kito had converted himself to a *crente* ‘for the election’ (as some settlers gossiped). Another young man was also elected from Novo Paraíso as a town councillor for the first time.

¹⁹ Interview conducted on 3 July 2002 at the Municipal Secretariat of Agriculture and Environment in São Geraldo.

²⁰ SEBRAE stands for *Serviço Brasileiro de Apoio às Micro e Pequenas Empresas*. It was created in 1972.

²¹ *Tambaqui* is one of the most common fish in the Amazon. A tambaqui can reach 40kg and they are becoming increasingly popular for aquaculture in *fazendas*, even in the south of Brazil..

²² Naturally, he was also interested in what I was doing in the village or what I knew about ASDA and other ‘financial and technical supporters’ out there.

²³ Another son (a 20 year-old) was finishing a training course to become a schoolteacher and started to live in the village centre as he had “absolutely no interest” in cattle business.

²⁴ Interview conducted on 11 August 2004. As his views clearly express the views of majority of the early settlers and associates whom I knew, I quote extensively from his account.

²⁵ The *boiadeira* is a person who occasionally travels with cattle from one place to another (while the *vaqueiro* indicates a professional cowboy who usually has a fixed contract with a *fazendeiro*). According to Manu, the team of *boiadeiras* received 15 *reais* per cattle head per travel (i.e. on this trip, those five *boiadeiras* could receive 3,750 *reais*). It was much cheaper than contracting *gaiolas* (lorries for transporting cattle) for 250 cattle. Besides, the Estrada do Rio Preto stretched inside the forest and the lorries sometimes could not pass. Manu said: "It is much better for our cattle and horses to walk". He also said that he was glad that there were many *boiadeiras* in the region who knew how to treat animals.

²⁶ This account does not necessarily indicate that Manu became the 'owner' of labourers. As discussed in the last chapter, it seemed that *posseiros* are usually flexible about working on their own land (to obtain land titles and establish themselves as landowners) and also on others' land (to earn quick cash), and Manu himself could be a peon at different times.

²⁷ In Brazil the use of cheques is common to protect cash from frequent robberies. It is also quite convenient as anyone who receives the signed cheque can cash it at a specified bank by presenting the identity card (*identidade*); they do not have to own a bank account (though, naturally, those who can write cheques have to have a bank account). Therefore, from the milk plant owners' point of view, it was quite understandable that they stopped carrying a large amount of cash in the settlement and introduced cheques to milk producers.

²⁸ One of the important factors that pull landowners in Grotão to either Bamerindus or Rio Preto is the informal price of land. In 2000, for example, the second son of Manu bought 5 *alqueires* of forest in Bamerindus for R\$2,500 (R\$100 per hectare, about USD 34 in March 2004). Then, he learned that in Rio Preto, the price was exactly half this amount (USD 17 per hectare). In 2004, he sold his 'worked' plot in Bamerindus for R\$200 per hectare and, together with Manu and another brother, bought 50 *alqueires* of forest in Rio Preto for R\$10,000 (USD 14 per hectare). Meanwhile, around Grotão, the plots were becoming expensive (in 2004 they reached USD 292 per hectare), especially plots close to the village of Novo Paraíso.

²⁹ Here, Bateson is talking about the relations between 'ethos and cultural structure' and his search for physical analogies to think about ethnological material.

³⁰ Note that 'social behaviourism' is increasingly discussed in institutional economics. For example, a recent report on 'new economics for policy makers' published by a UK think tank called the New Economics Foundation. This report proposes shifting neoclassical economic theory to behavioural economic theory in order to incorporate principles like 'other people's behaviour matters' and 'habits are important' into economic development policymaking (NEF 2005).

³¹ The pragmatist explanation of relating the self to others largely draws on George H. Mead's conceptualisation of 'intersubjectivity' that takes the self as an emergent property of the social act. His thoughts have laid the basis for social psychology and symbolic interactionism in sociology, which emphasise meanings attached to an object as a basis for human action. See Thayer (1973) for an overview.

³² Habermas focuses on language games and speech acts as the means of communication that make social action possible in an actor's lifeworlds.

³³ Here, Honneth and Joas write that 'Habermas has striven to strengthen and deepen the basis of his theory of society with its structural duality' (*ibid.*: 167), which is the same tone of evaluation made to the structuration theory of Giddens, as we discussed in Chapter 1. Joas (1996: 219) writes that 'there is no difference between the respective goals of Habermas and Giddens'.

³⁴ According to Joas (1996), the theory of creative action proposes to focus on situated actions in order to analytically incorporate the 'non-teleological character of human intentionality' (i.e. human intentionality does not necessarily lead to a goal-oriented, purposeful action), 'corporeality' (i.e. the bodily nature of human actions), and primary sociality.

³⁵ Dalton (2004) points out that the recent pragmatist debate on action that brings out the issue of 'habit' seriously omits the previous contribution made by Bourdieu who theorised habitus as an interactive space in which the actors take actions and generate knowledge with reference to their immediate social positions (see Chapter 2 for details).

³⁶ There is a wide range of literature that deals with local knowledge in development. See Hobart (1993) for an overview; Sillitoe (1998) for a debate on the use of 'indigenous knowledge' in development planning and (2007) for discussion on the relationship between local knowledge and global science; Pottier (2003) for a recent debate on knowledge negotiations; and Olivier de Sardan (2005) for an analysis of 'popular technical knowledge' and 'technical-scientific knowledge.'

³⁷ Here, Schatzki is proposing 'site ontologies' that 'deny that all social phenomena are constructions out of individuals and their relations'. They are against the individualist approach while warranting a described account of social phenomena as an alternative to the historically prominent forms of societism (including functionalism and structural Marxism) (*ibid*: 467).

The Making of a Sustainable Business

The Boundaries of an Epistemic Community

In previous chapters, we have considered the social process of settlement observed in Grotão and surrounding areas. It has been argued that neither 'deforestation' nor 'development' can be properly understood without examining settlers' actions and practices, which are flexibly arranged and shaped through lifeworlds constructed in the forest. These practices have served to localise both governmental and non-governmental interventions, involving localisation processes that draw on settlers' social and individual knowledge. These knowledge processes enable settlers to continuously redefine their social domains through diversified experience vis-à-vis both intervention situations and change to the local landscape. This has generated a local style of development, which embodies 'complexes of binding obligations' and ongoing social arrangements in the settlers' social field (Moore 2000[1978]). Innovative development projects intended to direct social change often fail to achieve their intended purposes due to these complexities (Moore 2000 [1978], see also Clay and Schaffer 1984; Arce 2003b: 848-849).

As Ellen (2002) argues, criticisms of public policies and development projects that fail to take the complexity of local realities into account have been repeatedly presented in the anthropology and sociology of development and thus they are almost becoming a *cliché*. The previous analyses suggest that development policies are 'discursively' constructed (e.g. Escobar 1995; Crush 1995; Gasper and Apthorpe 1996) and have very little to do with 'what actually happens' on the ground (Clay and Schaffer 1984: 11). As we saw in the last chapter, the sustainable and participatory development project introduced by ASDA cannot escape from these criticisms, as the Project failed to deal with the multiple rationalities that existed among its 'beneficiaries'.

Why do policy makers and development experts keep elaborating innovative development approaches to direct social change if they bring so

little change in reality? As we discussed in Chapter 2, the concept of sustainable development, as applied to development in the Brazilian Amazonian, partly reconfigures the role of the state, the market and civil society and renews model of development as a set of natural resource management (NRM) strategies. It seems apparent that development experts, holding good intentions and righteous ambitions have to experiment with different strategies to justify their use of a sustainable development discourse backed by financial or political support from state and international organisations. After all, this experimental process supports an entire development industry that involves different types of experts, such as scientists, a wide range of consultants, and bankers. Local NGOs such as ASDA are enmeshed within this development industry despite the way they vigorously differentiate themselves from governmental and international development policy institutions to assert their 'local' presence within a globalised development community. At the same time, local NGO workers strive to speak the same language as 'global' experts in order to communicate and remain in the game.

In this chapter, we will consider the interaction process between local and global experts as a basis for identifying boundaries between epistemic communities in international development. The chapter focuses on how the development practices of ASDA and its relationship to international donors serves to frame problems such as 'deforestation' and 'poverty' in Pará. NGO practices of sustainable development are part of 'epistemic practices', which are shaped through the localisation of a global discourse of sustainable development and the globalisation of local development practices. By examining ASDA and its positioning in relation to both international and beneficiaries, we may be able to identify boundaries between epistemic communities. These boundaries are marked by the ways that development experts shape their practices through policy making, discussions and planned events (cf. Arce and Long 1992; Knorr-Cetina 2001).

The chapter starts with an overview of the history of NGOs in Brazil focusing particularly on the Amazon, in order to place ASDA in a historical frame of non-government development policies and practices in Pará. The historical overview follows changes in ASDA's organisational characteristics and reveals ASDA's account of the 'sustainable and participatory project' in Grotão. This is considered with reference to ASDA's dealings with epistemic communities in international development. Here, I will specifically examine

the 'production chain model' developed by ASDA as one of its innovative NRM strategies, which embraced the idea of community agro-industry and framed 'poverty' and 'the local' in the course of implementation.

The chapter then turns to look into an example of the worldview of a coordinator of ASDA to understand how NGO workers construct their social logic as 'local experts' who take a role in representing local realities at a global level. The emergent local experts can be considered to be 'programmed' to frame and represent local reality in order to share proper 'diagnoses' with NGO partners in national and international development communities. In this way, NGOs take part in what Giddens (1990) calls 'expert systems' that form epistemic communities, and they begin to be disembedded from immediate local contexts. In the process these NGOs start to present themselves as 'intermediate' agents working between the 'globalising and localising forces' of sustainable development policy processes (Fairhead and Leach 2003: 3; see also Chernela 2005).

Lastly, the chapter presents an ethnographic account of international events, which promoted a new development fashion, namely 'social entrepreneurship'. ASDA participated in the events to present its production chain model and it was considered an effective leader who embodied the local in these events. At the same time, a new body of 'business knowledge' generated by the international development community was inserted within ASDA's project presentation, as the production chain model was defined as a 'grassroots business model'. The account will elucidate the process of negotiations between local NGO experts and global experts and how the boundaries of epistemic communities become blurred. In this process, beneficiaries of ASDA, such as the settlers of Grotão, were presented as people with a collective demand to manage 'sustainable business' activities through global investment.

NGOs and Sustainable Development in Pará

Since the 1980s, NGOs have been considered principle agents of sustainable and participatory development and effective carriers of alternative approaches to previous, modernisation driven, top-down development approaches (e.g. Röling 1988, Fowler 1997, Uvin et al. 2000). The international development community generally recognised the importance of NGOs, as the state largely withdrew from the main stage of development in the course of neo-liberal

policy applications in the 1980s. NGOs were expected to operationalise policy agendas to deal with problems of 'poverty' and 'environmental degradation' under the banner of sustainable development. International organisations started to vigorously support NGO activities, which gave a political thrust and money to programmes like PDA.

Being established as principle actors of development, NGOs also began to attract criticism in ways that questioned the validity of political neutrality (Bratton 1989; Bebbington and Thiele 1993; Fisher 1997), accountability and representativeness (Hilhorst 2000; Lister 2003), transparency (Charlton and May 1995) and legitimacy (Atack 1999; Lister 2003; Lehr-Lehnardt 2005). As Hulme and Edwards (1997: 3) ask: '[NGOs' popularity]...is pleasant, but does it reflect genuine recognition or does it accrue because NGOs have now been socialised into the establishment - the "development industry"'? The question has been asked in a number of studies that regard NGOs as institutions taking part in political negotiations and discourse generations (see Charlton 1995 for a review of NGO studies in the 1990s, which suggests an increasing tendency of critical analyses of NGOs).

It is not my intention to judge whether NGOs are the appropriate actors to promote sustainable development. What interests me is how 'problems', namely 'poverty' and 'deforestation' in the Brazilian Amazon, have been framed by epistemic communities in international development that contain NGOs as important political and economic actors, even if their legitimacy is questioned in certain quarters. The framing process illustrates the relationship between development discourses and NGO practices on the ground, which are further configured by the way in which beneficiaries' generate practices that localise NGO discourses and practices. Examining the framing process, enables us to grasp how NGOs are part of epistemic communities and how they make certain knowledge claims with regard to sustainable development at the local level in order to organise epistemic practices vis-à-vis their national and international partners and beneficiaries.

NGOs in the Brazilian Amazon

In Brazil, NGOs are commonly understood as 'alternatives to institutional practices that are characteristic of universities, churches and leftist parties' (Fernandes 1985 quoted in Landim 2002). Most founders or presidents of NGOs in Brazil have their professional origins in 'universities, churches, or

leftist parties' and, in the early stages, they were influenced by social movements organised during the military regime aiming to foster democracy and citizenship through education and social assistance.¹ While some social movements remained committed to political activism (e.g. MST), others were legally (re)organised as 'civil society organisations' to develop 'non-political' specialisations in the so-called third sector to serve the 'public interest' (Landim 2002: 43).² Thus, although NGOs in general are not synonymous with non-profit organisations (NPOs), NGOs in Brazil are strictly defined as non-profit (*sem fins lucrativos*)³ (Haddad ed. 2002; *O Liberal* 14 June 2004).

In the mid-1980s, there were approximately 2,000 NGOs in Brazil. After the Rio Summit in 1992 in which the NGO Global Forum was held, the number dramatically increased to the extent that by 1995, about 250,000 NGOs were registered in Brazil (*Folha de São Paulo* 3 November 2004). As we saw in Chapter 2, around the time of the Summit, foreign scientists and Brazilian intellectuals from the south founded NGOs in the Amazon to experiment on various NRM approaches with financial support from newly created international funds such as the Pilot Program to Preserve the Brazilian Rainforests (PPG7). Some NGOs specialised in research activities while others started to develop extension activities in 'pilot communities' based on research and development (R&D).

ASDA was founded in Belém in 1992 as a university programme directed at research and education. In 1995, it was officially registered as an NGO and became one of the major extension centres for implementing sustainable development projects in Pará.

The trajectory of ASDA: from a public service provider to a business incubator

ASDA is a Brazilian development NGO and is often called a southern or grassroots NGO. As its interaction with the Association in Grotão has shown, ASDA is not a 'grassroots organisation', such as the producers' association and cooperative (Christoplos and Farrington 2004) to which ASDA provides both technical and financial support. At the same time, ASDA is a beneficiary of various international development programmes supported by international NGOs, international organisations or multinational corporations.

ASDA is a medium-size NGO in terms of financial capacity (approximate annual budget USD 350,000 in 2002) and the number of contracted people (overall, seven coordinators and about 40 *técnicos*,

administrators and members of field staff in 2003). Prior to its foundation, the founder and some researchers from universities in Pará carried out a project funded by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to introduce a water purification system to a peripheral district in Belém.⁴ After its foundation as a university programme, it subsequently amplified its area of activity from water purification to sanitary and energy improvement, and started to introduce an agro-forestry system to four pilot communities, including Grotão. In 1995, ASDA became an NGO. According to one coordinator, in Brazil, a university programme has to entail lectures and teaching; other 'non-educational' activities, such as agricultural extension, should stay outside the university structure. He told me that the auditing committee from the university was increasingly weary of ASDA's support for 'profit-making' activities by farmers' associations and cooperatives.

An organisational chart of ASDA before 1995 shows that the ASDA had been structured like a government, which consists of administration and financial units and different sectors such as cooperation, sanitation, product processing, health, agro-silviculture, education, energy, community counsel, information unit and municipal planning. Its initial role was a provider of public services in remote rural communities in Pará in cooperation with municipal and state government officials and *técnicos* dispatched from state agricultural extension agencies (e.g. Goro).

After 1995, the organisational chart was no longer used, as ASDA had established 'partnerships' with governments and international development agencies, and started to structure itself through these different projects.⁵ Its functionaries were categorised as coordinators, *técnicos/as*, *asesoras* (advisors/consultants), 'researchers' (who made socio-economic diagnoses of pilot communities), treasurers, secretaries, drivers and *office-boys* (and girls), employed according to the needs and financial scale of each project. It no longer presented itself as a public service provider, but instead started to look for a niche to take 'action for sustainable development' (the name ASDA was legally registered in 1995) and vigorously differentiated itself from existing institutions, such as the state and market.

A development niche was eventually found by ASDA in processing, value-adding and marketing of 'non-timber forest products' (see below) as they effectively enabled the NGO to build a story-line involving 'generating income for poor people in Pará through the sustainable use of natural resources'. As Fairhead and Leach (2003: 228) point out, '[n]eo-liberal contexts encourage

experimentality, creating entrepreneurial economies in which contractualised NGOs, donor-funded projects and researchers compete for funds'. ASDA fitted its activities exactly into this 'neo-liberal context' as it started to emphasise its capacity to undertake experimental and innovative projects to secure funding for its projects. In 1998, ASDA took part in the Biotrade Initiative set up by UNCTAD in order to further concentrate its speciality on marketing sustainable products produced by small producers in the Amazon⁶ and, with this, it increasingly started to talk about strengthening sustainable business (cf. Ministry of Environment and PPG7 2002).

When I visited ASDA for the first time in 1999, a coordinator who was a lawyer and led the Initiative at that time (hereafter called Doutora) told me that the principal role of ASDA could be visualised as a "bridge" between small producers and the market. She also said that it would be ideal if the state and market worked properly for the poor to be sufficiently empowered and ASDA were no longer needed (in this sense, the collapse of the Association-ASDA cooperation in Grotão was ideal⁷). She complained about the lack of market for products produced by small producers (such as banana flour in Grotão) and lack of technical and financial support given to their marketing activities by government agencies and international donors. Nevertheless, according to her, governments, international organisations and corporations formed an "alliance" with ASDA, which was necessary in order for ASDA to take action for 'poor people' in Pará.

As we can recognise from this explanation, the need for 'marketing' was combined with the need for 'poverty alleviation'. Around this time, ASDA started to present itself in its promotional literature as a 'business incubator' to which end it introduced the production chain model as one of the most innovative NRM strategies for sustainable business promotion. In effect it created a visual and simplified image of poverty and deforestation in Pará for an outside audience. Promotion in this way was highly successful in so far as it attracted a wide range of partners and alliances to support ASDA's projects.

The production chain model

The idea of a production chain (*cadeia produtiva*) has been widely discussed and operationalised by development experts and agricultural extensionists in the Brazilian Amazon. This model emerged particularly after the mid-1990s (Warner III and Pontal 1997). ASDA has led various production chain

projects; these have involved the plantation and processing of coconut, *açaí* (*Euterpe oleracea*), banana, *cupuaçu* (*Theobroma grandiflorum*) and different types of fibrous plants. We may observe the logic behind production chain projects promoted by ASDA in the following speech given by a coordinator in a meeting held in 2000. The meeting aimed at promoting sustainable business across the 'Amazonian continent' (ACTO 2004):

"We are talking about sustainable development of the Amazon. What does it mean? It means that we have to create jobs and income in rural areas to stop our rural poor ('*nossos caboclos*' in his words, see below) from flowing into the cities. The creation of jobs...[must be done]...through the sustainable use of natural resources. Our challenge is to transform the current unsustainable economic structure (i.e. underpinned by cattle ranching and mining in Pará). In order to change the structure, we have to establish different economic opportunities".

For that purpose, the coordinator insisted: "We need a clear model to be implemented at municipal levels". The model he demonstrated consisted of elements such as basic sanitation, agro-forestry (to promote sustainable agriculture), and community agro-industry (to process and add value to raw materials). These elements complete the 'chain' of development in a 'target community'. The chain is indeed an ideal metaphor for discursively promoting structural change since it could visualise the "replicability and scalability" of pilot community projects (see also Hooper et al. 2004 for a technical discussion on replicability and scalability of community-based sustainable development projects).

The production chain model is often included in a framework of non-timber forest product (NTFP) development within wider discussions on NRM strategies. In these discussions, production chains are conceptualised as a means to guarantee the commercial viability of extractive activities (e.g. Coppen et al. 1995; Hyman 1996; Marshall et al. 2003). Recently, NTFPs analytically include 'anthropogenic' resources (see FAO 1999; and Ros-Tonen and Wiersum 2005 for different definitions of NTFPs). The agro-forestry and community agro-industry projects implemented in opened forests in Pará are also regarded as sustainable NTFP projects that are considered ideal for environmental management of the forest margin.

In this vein, in 1996, PDA approved the sustainable and participatory project proposed by ASDA, which consisted of different production chain projects, to be promoted as one of the most innovative approaches to sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon. One of the production chain projects resulted in the banana flour factory in Grotão, as we saw in the last chapter.

Framing a poor community

As discussed in Chapter 2, NRM strategies such as NTFP promotion and production chain models entail well-planned systems. In order to implement well-planned systems, the 'target communities' need to be well organised to maintain regularised patterns of interaction between producers and project. Therefore, upon approval of the PDA project, ASDA gave a training course in its headquarters in Belém for 'local community leaders' to enable them to strengthen their organisations (i.e. associations and cooperatives), which were earmarked for the production chain project funded by PDA.

From Grotão, Limirio attended the training course in order to prepare himself for the upcoming 'banana project'.⁸ The training course consisted of 11 sessions, and each community leader was expected to delineate his community's 'development modules' (*paradigmas de desenvolvimento*). The sessions covered different areas such as production, food security, nutrition, health, poverty and natural resource management and, in each session, *técnicos* and coordinators of ASDA as well as experts from universities in Belém attended as facilitators.

The first session encouraged Limirio to identify the 'community' of Grotão according to population characteristics and a geographical map. After the sessions, the facilitators told the leaders to prepare a 'poverty map' of their communities and diagnose natural resource management and institutional arrangements. In this process, settled small producers and rural workers in Grotão were identified as the 'poor', because they were isolated and alienated from the centre (i.e. towns and cities) and also isolated from available technical and financial resources. According to the project document used at the training course, 'environmental degradation, exploration by commercial intermediaries and political fragmentation' further aggravated poverty in Grotão.

Obviously, in the case of Grotão, 'poverty' only represented one possible interpretation of a settler's life situation at a given time. Moreover, as we have seen in previous chapters, environmental degradation (or 'deforestation') occurring as part of settlers' livelihood organisation processes, had little to do with their understanding of 'poverty'.⁹ Likewise, exploration by commercial intermediaries (which is often discussed in a framework of *clientelismo* in the southeast of Pará, see Pickard 1994) was not perceived by settlers as a problem that led them to a state of poverty (though the settlers complained, for example, about the price of milk). Indeed, political fragmentation actually strengthened the way the settlers organised themselves in relation to government interventions and internal power struggles. However, the training course urged Limirio to identify both the poverty level of his community and environmental problems so that these 'problems' could be properly solved through participating in activities that promoted the production chain in the PDA framework. Looking at the project document, I remembered that an associate in Grotão once asked Goro: "Why does the new project have something to do with poverty (*pobreza*)? We are not poor."

In short, project beneficiaries may become discursively 'poor' by participating in a production chain project. The assumption of 'poverty worsened due to environmental degradation' is also discursive as we have seen. Nevertheless, for example, Doutora seemed to really believe that poverty alleviation was crucial to achieve sustainable development in the Amazon because it would prevent the poor from "cutting and selling trees". At the same time, an emphasis on poverty largely helped the promotion of the production chain model as it vindicated commercial activities that would lead to income generation for the poor at the grassroots level.

According to Bateson (1972: 66), when 'the patterns of thought of the individuals' in a group are standardised, they start to become 'logical' for the particular group. As Doutora was a coordinator of ASDA, meaning a 'boss' of the *técnicos*, her standardised view of 'the poor cutting trees' influenced the views of development workers who were responsible for implementing production chain projects. Thus, her view presented a certain logic and became a 'rationality' established in the course of project process. In the larger picture of international development, such knowledge claims were accepted because poverty worked to simplify the image of complex local realities and ongoing social arrangements. As 'development projects' started to indicate development itself (Craig and Porter 1997), the notion of poverty

effectively became a framing tool¹⁰ for local NGOs like ASDA to justify its representation of the beneficiaries and their community and collective demands. It also corresponded to the requirements of internationally funded programmes, such as PDA, which were penetrated by the pro-poor principle in international development.

The Making of Local Experts

In principle, a representation of local reality involves a process of abstractions and organisational imaginations that situate local NGO workers in 'expert systems'. That is 'disembedding mechanisms of modernity', which work to 'lift out social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of time-space' (Giddens 1990: 21). In this process, 'poverty', for example, becomes a conceptual 'object' (e.g. Arce 2003b) detached from the immediate local context. In this regard expert systems construct the global logic of sustainable development, which is in turn operationalised by local actors who are expected to represent local situations appropriate to the requirements of international funding programmes.

Local NGO workers, and also local politicians and bureaucrats, start to encounter different bodies of knowledge through international development funding programmes and learn to reflect the local reality within the requirements. In this process, the image of the 'poor cutting down trees' becomes an attractive visual representation to depict in project documents, and the production chain model is established as an effective prescription to prevent such conduct.

The prescription, however, was experimental and a PDA requirement was that it needed to be tried out within 'pilot' communities as part of an innovative approach. According to Fairhead and Leach (2003: 228), '[w]hen projects are cast as experimental (as 'pilot'...), project staff become as much "scientists" and research managers as administrators'. In the case of ASDA, the workers start to recognise the importance of presenting themselves as local experts who effectively represent 'our reality' in the globalised setting of development project negotiations.¹¹ Emergent local experts started to take on the role of intermediation between global and local discourses and social relations, making them 'brokers of meanings' (Hilhorst 2001). At the same time, this process also affected the lifeworlds and social domains of local experts as they learned and rearranged their action through the encounter with

global discourses generated in epistemic communities within international development, as we can see in the accounts of Doutora below.

Doutora

Doutora was born in Belém in the 1950s, and studied international law at the University of São Paulo. She told me that she had been in The Hague for her training. In the 1980s, she was involved in the administration of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty (today's Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation, see Chapter 2) and became a passionate 'Amazonianist'.¹²

Whenever she had a chance, Doutora advocated 'Amazonian values' and frequently lamented 'our misery of poverty'. She publicly insisted: "If foreigners think that the Amazon forest is important and are willing to help us to conserve it, I think it is *ótimo* (perfect)!" (12 April 2003). In 1995, with the establishment of ASDA as an NGO, she organised a large meeting in Belém to build an alliance between local, national and international development institutions to tackle with the problems of poverty and deforestation in the Amazon. In 1998, she led ASDA's participation in the Biotrade Initiative after the production chain model was established as the principal NRM strategy by researchers and *técnicos* affiliated with ASDA.

Although Doutora did not appear to be consciously manufacturing her discourse, the combination of the Amazonian values and 'our misery' formed an effective language to ask international agencies for funding and to establish new sustainable development programmes. She was an eloquent speaker, and the empirically uncertain (or rather incorrect) assumption of 'our hungry people are destroying the Amazon forests (which are also yours!)' impressed the media and non-local experts from national and international funding organisations. She was eager to represent 'our reality' to the outside while adjusting this reality according to how a particular funding scheme was supposed to 'help us'. Her use of 'us' was situational as it sometimes indicated ASDA or the beneficiaries and at other times indicated Amazonian people in a very abstract form.

This representation mode has been configured in relation to Doutora's social domain. In her everyday life, she acted as a generous *patroa* (patron) for 'her people' since she believed that poverty (no matter what she meant by it) was unfortunate. Thus, she once told me that she was helping poor families by employing maids and drivers at home.¹³ For outsiders, however, she often

warned them not to patronise 'her people' because that was against the empowerment principle of ASDA's production chain projects.

Doutora's attitude towards project making often highlighted a sense of ambivalence. She usually outrightly asked international donors for grants to promote sustainable business in the Amazon but at the same time she never seriously considered borrowing money from local banks (although ASDA instructed farmers' associations like the Association in Grotão to do so). It seemed that she really believed that rich people should have done the same to her as she was doing for her people. She often said that she could empathise with how poor people felt in their lives as she had lived side by side with them.

This stance meant that Doutora was reluctant to transform an ASDA project directly into a commercial enterprise although, in many respects, the production chain project followed a path to turn itself into a business. She said: "If we become an *empresa* (enterprise), we cannot get grants; we have to stay non-profit". This created a dilemma between available grants and the business principle that she was supposed to embrace. In this process, Doutora crafted different languages to speak of 'her poor', the rainforest, and the commercial or financial sustainability of projects.

Once, she showed me how to plan a production chain project to present to international donors. She drew an organisational chart and defined positions and expertise needed to establish a production chain. For example, if demonstrating a banana project, she started by allocating field staff (i.e. *técnicos*) who could instruct farmers to implement the agro-forestry system, and went on to allocate nutritionists, machinery experts (for processing the bananas), sanitation experts, and marketing and sales staff. This then led her to demonstrate how she would need to contract an accountant, secretaries, and coordinators for each section of the chain. Beneficiaries were placed under each section as 'organised groups'.

Doutora wrote various project proposals and sent them to different donors to get them to fund different segments for the intended beneficiary groups (e.g. farmers' groups for the plantation, workers' groups for processing, etc.). In general, beneficiaries were 'poor' and needed to be empowered to form these groups (i.e. organise themselves). By defining them as 'the poor', their initial life conditions would be supposedly improved through a project anyway, and a little benefit expected from the project could be justified. At the same time, due to the large number of experts needed for the project, a

large part of the overall budget had to be allocated their salaries and consultancy fees.

As the case of Grotão showed, when the 'groups' proposed by a project were not internalised within the intended beneficiaries' lifeworlds, the model constructed on paper could easily collapse. However, the model itself presented a promising innovative approach to achieve sustainable development in the Amazon and usually worked to obtain funding and recognition from national government institutions and international donors. By interacting with national experts (mostly from the south of Brazil) and international development experts, Doutora learned how to show her model as being legitimate and important for 'her people'. This presentation was often viewed as the embodiment of local expert knowledge, which was moulded with reference to her own lifeworld and also to international expert knowledge that had encouraged a local development worker to make representations of the local reality in the global framework of sustainable development.

Framing 'caboclo'

One of the effective languages for emergent local experts in Pará to represent the local on global platforms turned out to be '*caboclo*'. *Caboclo* represents the Amazonian peasantry, as discussed in anthropological studies on 'non-Amerindian' indigenous people (e.g. Wagley 1953; Parker 1985; Nugent 1993; Hariss 1998). In the scholarly community, *caboclo* has been roughly defined as a particular category of people in the Amazon associated with indigenosity and the forest.¹⁴ During the course of my fieldwork it became apparent that no one actually identifies himself as a *caboclo* (except when he wants to make fun of himself) as it carries a pejorative connotation. In this sense, the first detailed *caboclo* study written by Wagley (1953: 105) still offers the best explanation of *caboclo*: 'The First Class people of Itá (today's municipality of Gurupá in northern Pará) are apt to view all the people below them in the social hierarchy as simply "the people," or as "caboclos." In turn, the town-dwelling Second Class indicate their superiority to all the rural population by speaking of them as "caboclos," and the farmers reserve this term for island collectors, to whom they feel superior. And finally, island collectors would be slightly offended if they were called "caboclos," for they make little distinction between themselves and farmers. The island collectors use the term "caboclo" to refer to the tribal Indians who inhabit the headwaters

of the Amazon tributaries. The Amazon “caboclo,” therefore, exists only in the concept of the groups of higher status referring to those of lower status’. For example, the brazil nut collectors (*castanheiros*) were often depicted as *caboclos* by the *posseiros* who had encountered them in the forest in the occupation process (see Chapter 4). In Grotão, some people actually wanted to change the official name of the settlement project from ‘Grotão dos Caboclos’ since these proud settlers did not like an expression that suggested the lower status of their new settlement.

Recently, however, the term *caboclo* has started to carry some ‘ecological’ connotations as it has started to represent forest-dwellers. Just as Amerindians, *caboclos* are sometimes depicted as those who can properly manage the forest as their cultural resource (e.g. Nugent 1993, 2003). When ASDA’s coordinators presented the production chain model to the donors outside, they often used the term *caboclo* in the project documents to illustrate the model’s indigenosity as well as the innovativeness of valorising Amazonian ‘traditions’. For example, final products of a production chain were said to embody ‘our *caboclo* culture’ and, by identifying their projects as part of the *caboclo* culture, local experts could even ‘lower’ themselves in the social hierarchy or make the hierarchy invisible to outsiders.

The beneficiaries, on the other hand, used the word *caboclo* only to tease themselves since they rarely identified themselves as *caboclos* or even with the people of *Amazônia*. People on the ground identified where they belonged to according to the locale in their social field in which their own categorisation and codification patterns had been established. Thus, the settlers in Grotão, for example, rarely thought that they were Amazonians. Even in more ‘traditional’ communities in the floodplain of the Amazon, people usually identified their location according to areas of activity or residence.¹⁵ Nevertheless, local experts needed an interesting and image-generating local story to convey to international experts by representing ‘our unique Amazonian culture’. In this way, the beneficiaries’ worldview was assigned to the generalised mode of ‘collective identity’, which was detached from their lifeworlds (see Ingold 2000 for how ‘environmentalism’ polarises views on environment as ‘globe’ and ‘lifeworld’).

“Learning from Social Entrepreneurs”

At this point, we turn to some concrete cases that show interaction processes between local and international experts. Below, I will briefly sketch two international events in which I participated as a local expert from ASDA to present the product chain model.¹⁶ The first event is called the Development Marketplace, an annual event of the World Bank conceived in 2000 in which 'grassroots projects' (funding limit USD 250,000 for a year) compete with each other to obtain funding from the Bank (and associated sponsors).¹⁷ The second event is called the Global Philanthropy Forum, an annual forum of philanthropy foundations, which is promoted by the World Affairs Council based in California.

Development Marketplace

While the World Bank 'is the single most important foreign agency to exert direct influence on Brazilian environmental issues' through the lending programmes¹⁸ (Ribeiro and Little 1996), my contact with the Bank was made when the Bank invited ASDA to apply for funding at the Development Marketplace. ASDA had previously participated in a similar event called the Equator Initiative promoted by the United Nations Development Programme through which its name became known to the international development community.¹⁹ Many participants in the previous Equator Initiative were invited to the World Bank to present their innovative projects at the Development Marketplace.

The Development Marketplace symbolises the recent Bank's direct involvement with NGOs or what they call 'grassroots actors' including local governments and businesses. Grassroots actors that have undertaken innovative projects in past years were selected through a number of steps, and nearly 150 entities were invited to the World Bank headquarters in Washington D. C. There, they were expected to present their projects to the juries (composed of Bank Group employees, representatives of private foundations, business leaders, consultants, academics from business schools, etc.). The projects were classified into 12 sectors,²⁰ and the best-presented projects were earmarked for available funding.

In December 2003, I flew to Washington D.C. to participate in the event, carrying a box of sample products prepared by the beneficiaries of some of ASDA's production chain projects. These products were labelled as samples of *caboclo* products, which were neatly packaged by designers contracted by

ASDA for the event. The influence of local experts over the project was generally unquestioned in the application process. As long as the project was carried out by a local organisation and talked about poverty alleviation for pursuing sustainable development, it qualified as a grassroots project (for a discussion on defining the local in the context of the World Bank's project interventions, see Forbes 1996).

Upon arrival, participants of the event had to prepare stands to present their projects. The Main Hall of the Bank was filled with coloured stands. ASDA's stand was situated in a separate room adjacent to the Main Hall in the Small and Medium Enterprise Development (SME) sector. With nearly 150 stands, the event looked like a trade fair. Indeed, as the name of the event suggested, it was a marketplace of development projects that were waiting to be 'traded'. In a space of 1mx1mx2m, personnel from each project pinned up posters, products, charts or organisation brochures to attract possible 'buyers'. In the evening, the participants were led to a large conference room where the young coordinator of the event made a welcome speech to a crowd of what she called "social change agents". She said that the event had a great influence over the Bank's employees since it gave a significant opportunity for them to "learn from the creative ideas of social change" brought from all over the world.

During the event, there were some seminars in which participants were supposed to interact with consultants and private foundation representatives. These seminars were called 'knowledge exchange'²¹ and divided into categories of 'sector dialogues' and 'funder-funded dialogues'. I found out that the knowledge which they (the Bank and other donors) talked about actually indicated 'business knowledge', and we were presented as 'social entrepreneurs' who were expected to adopt business principles to tackle with the problems of poverty and environmental degradation (we were carrying 'social missions' in their words).²² The business knowledge was needed for the rookie social entrepreneurs working in NGOs and public sectors to talk to business consultants who tried to introduce available capital for investment, especially the so-called 'venture capital'. The consultants explained to me that the venture capital was private funds 'out there' to be invested in potential grassroots businesses such as the production chain projects that I presented. In the end, it was not quite a knowledge exchange but we were given a lecture on how to talk to consultants.

Experts from a body like the International Finance Cooperation (IFC) (mostly titled investment officers) came over to my stand and invited me to their seminars on 'strengthening grassroots business organisations' in which I was supposed to learn how to network. In the end, our project was selected to receive a grant of USD 200,000. At the ceremony, one of the officers from IFC came up to me and said: "What you have to do now with the money is to make a business plan". In fact, all the consultants whom I met at the event told me to spend a part of the money to pay for a business consultant to make a good business plan for the project. In the end, it seemed that it was they who wanted to know the interesting business venture opportunities by inviting grassroots actors to the event, rather than that local organisations and NGOs desperately needed their help.

"What is a business plan?" was a question that the instant social entrepreneurs had to ask to the consultants who were mostly MBA (Masters in Business Administration) holders and mentioned it as if it were the most normal thing to talk about. One thing was clear to me at this stage: the production chain projects for sustainable development seemed to require business plans in order to attract capital for investment. It also meant that the business knowledge would integrate local projects into the global economic order, and local experts needed to represent their grassroots businesses to possible investors.

The Global Philanthropy Forum

In March 2005, I was invited to a similar event called the Global Philanthropy Forum, this time, clearly as a social entrepreneur, by a private foundation which promoted the 'matchmaking' between social entrepreneurs and private donors. The event was planned as a part of the Annual Conference on Borderless Giving held in San Francisco. According to the World Affairs Council, the organiser of the Conference, the Global Philanthropy Forum was formed as 'an agile network of over 500 individual donors, who are joined by foundation leaders, policy practitioners and agents of change from around the world in a shared effort to identify ways to effect systemic change' (Wales 2005). I was again asked to present the production chain projects of ASDA at the Forum.

Before participating in the actual event, I had to fill in a form that asked the 'individual's approach to social change'. One of the criteria that defined

the individual as a social entrepreneur for this event was the 'scalability' of his or her approach. According to Juma and Timmer (2003: 6), the concept of 'scaling up' involves a process of 'social learning', which is 'defined as increasing the awareness and enhancing the capacity of social systems to operationalise the global sustainable development agenda'. Here, a social entrepreneur was thus expected to induce the 'awareness' of the global sustainable development agenda at the local level and contribute to its operationalisation (see also Alvord et al. 2004).

Sixteen social entrepreneurs were invited to the event from various countries and the event's promoters told each of us to 'make a pitch' about the project to attract donors. According to one of the promoters, the United States had a 220 billion-dollar donor market, and individual philanthropists who wanted to discover their social entrepreneurs donated 70% of the money. (See Vogel 2006 for a detailed study on the relations between philanthropy and the making of the 'US Empire' in global civil society.). The pitch was supposed to help a part of these donors who gathered at the event to identify their targets. We were told to compete against each other by making project pitches to fight over the money-holders out there. An article from Stanford Business School was passed around, which emphasised the importance of 'loud and clear' messages that would stick to people's - especially donors' - minds (Heath 2004).

In the three-day event, there was a series of speeches by celebrities (ex-presidents of some countries, well-known CEOs of large corporations, Nobel laureates, etc.) and thematic workshops. The social entrepreneurs were exposed to the donor community on the second day, which seemed to have been divided into two groups: one group of donors focused on conventional grant giving; and the other group took the venture capitalist approach and looked for local organisations with clear business principles.²³ They discussed about how philanthropy should have been today, and how important the emergent social entrepreneurs were in order to operationalise their philanthropy ideals.

During the conference, the social entrepreneurs were asked to attend a seminar on how to use the internet to exchange knowledge and information about funding. The leader of a women's association from Afghanistan (one of the social entrepreneurs) whispered: "I am not learning anything from this. We don't have a good internet connection or even electricity in the first place". Many of the social entrepreneurs were feeling awkward with the rapid and

rather superficial connection with the donors through information technology. As the World Bank's 'knowledge exchange' has shown, the donors seemed to be willing to give a lecture to the group of emergent social entrepreneurs on how to comply with the rules of international development.

At the same time, social entrepreneurs were treated as heroes who could change the troubled world, and the donors were eager to find heroes to work with. The essence of the project was, after all, reduced to a pitch and visual presentation to impress donors with the flashy event. Gough (1969: 17) writes that 'the archetypal entrepreneur is not only the man (*sic*) of initiative but the man who "runs his own show".' In this sense, the social entrepreneurs were practically expected to follow this archetype to attract funding or investment by running their own shows. Or, perhaps, they had to be more eloquent than the archetypal entrepreneurs since they were supposedly undertaking 'social missions'.

Localising and globalising knowledges and epistemic practices

These accounts of the two development funding events illustrate how local NGO workers or local organisational leaders interact with global experts and their 'systems', which consist of international organisations, business consultants or private philanthropists. At these events, local representatives were labelled social entrepreneurs and expected to embody detached leadership in a global development context. As Mintzberg (2006: 12) aptly puts it, 'singling people out to be developed as leaders encourages that heroic view of leadership, out of context instead of rooted in it'. The entrepreneurial focus placed on development projects in a neo-liberal environment facilitates this detachment, since it reflects an image of the new development professionals who have emerged from business communities.

In a detailed analysis of epistemic communities, Haas (1992: 28) writes that 'decision makers tend to apply simplified images of reality which are highly resistant to modification...[they]...are not always aware of the possible impact of the signals they send, since they tend to presume that the receivers of these signals have a worldview which mirrors their own'. Global experts need their heroes to be developed because their image of development is shaped by their own beliefs and intentions, which have made them experts in their epistemic communities (i.e. business communities or international organisations). In other words, the singling-out and detachment of leaders

from local contexts is necessary to globalise the local experts and justify the global experts' images of their own. By doing so, the local experts (or the emergent social entrepreneurs) may receive and process global experts' 'signals' properly.

After returning from the Development Marketplace, I had to tell my colleagues at ASDA about the new business knowledge I acquired. In June 2004, the coordinators of ASDA organised a workshop for NGO workers and cooperative leaders based in Pará to learn 'how to make a business plan'. At the same time, they started to seek business consultants in the south of Brazil for project management. This quick reaction eventually showed contradictions in ASDA's principles (it should have been 'no longer needed' if the state and market worked properly for 'the poor', see above). The business principle makes the 'organisational future' of NGOs (as not-for-profit enterprises) one of the criteria of project evaluation (UNCTAD 2003: 3) since NGOs continuously need to seek commercial investments to run and expand their grassroots businesses.

The future-orientedness of business knowledge resonates with expert knowledge generated in expert systems (Ploeg 2003: 230-232). In fact, sustainable business promotion perfectly fits into the logic of calculated planning of both environmental conservation and economic development. By promoting this logic, ASDA was automatically drawn into an international 'vortex' of development, that is, 'something of the growing global coordination of science and policy, without orchestration by any particular international organisation, state or located institution' (Fairhead and Leach 2003: 26). In this coordination, boundaries of epistemic communities become obscure since the localisation of sustainable development policy and practices and the globalisation of locally developed NRM strategies such as the production chain model continuously affect them.

As a result, even if the production chain model fails on the ground, it survives in the discursive coalitions formed in epistemic communities or in the vortex of international development. In this process, the local reality is simplified and yet legitimised for particular project applications. Local NGOs play an important role in this formation of discursive coalitions or 'common story-lines' established among development professionals from different backgrounds (see Chapter 2) and, therefore, we may need to be aware of 'the power of the mediating agents in constructing the frameworks that define the criteria through which collective demands can be defined and problematised'

(Chernela 2005: 630). The collective demands cannot be simply represented in a framework of the overarching local in contrast to the global, since there are complex layers of interfaces involved even in a very micro community project implemented in the name of sustainable development (cf. Mehta et al. 1999).

Conclusions

By drawing on a case of the production chain model developed by ASDA, this chapter has discussed the process of making a sustainable business as a type of innovative NRM strategy in Pará. The case showed framing processes of poverty and environment problems in Grotão through which ASDA applied the production chain model to promote the agro-forestry system and community agro-industry. By presenting the model to possible donors, the NGO workers became local experts who were specialised in representing their local reality, and the representation was significantly disembedded from the immediate local contexts.

The chapter has shown this process by describing two development funding events, which I participated as a local expert from ASDA. Here, I should note that my own experience as a NGO worker at these events has significantly influenced my understanding of development practices and epistemic communities in international development. As a researcher, I was critically observing how experts – including myself – interacted at these events; as an expert, I realised that I had to participate in discourse coalitions of sustainable development at least to secure the same ground for negotiations as global development experts. In a way, I strategically presented the production chain model, knowing that it embodied the neo-liberal commercial focus on sustainable development policies and projects generated in and applied to the Brazilian Amazon in the late-1990s. This chapter has shown that this neo-liberal policy and project legitimised entrepreneurial languages and economies that encouraged local experts to participate in globalised development practices. In this process, the terrain in which the production chain model was conceptualised and developed transcended the boundaries of the state, market and civil society by including all the entities as ‘sustainable business partners’.

The chapter has demonstrated that even a small-scale, grassroots project is not free from the global, political and economic influences that shape the entire development industry. The epistemic practices of local experts and

also *técnicos* on the ground were both directly and indirectly affected by the encounter with international expert knowledge embodied in project documents and personal interactions in international events. At the same time, through the encounter, a global discourse of sustainable development was also influenced by local development practices as this discourse came to embrace local discourses and images of development, no matter how they oversimplified and misrepresented the complex local reality. The overall outcome of the encounter was the reconfiguration of epistemic communities that continuously require different expertise to establish new fashions in development practice. In this sense, the boundaries of epistemic communities were beginning to blur, whereas the project beneficiaries' knowledge processes tended to be carefully excluded from the frame of sustainable development.

Notes

¹ The Federation of Organisations for Social and Educational Assistance (FASE) is one of the largest NGO networks in Brazil; it was founded in 1976 with strong support from the then outlawed Worker's Party (PT).

² According to Landim (2002: 42-43), the idea of the third sector originated in the United States, which presents a sector specialised in 'social investment' mainly through philanthropy. In Pará, the largest third sector organisation is represented by a local media dynasty, which has been promoting 'social responsibility' through its newspaper.

³ NGOs can make a profit to invest in their own activities, and NGO-oriented business promotion is actively supported by international donor agencies like the World Bank as we see below. In this context, NGOs are increasingly described as 'not for profit' organisations rather than 'non-profit' organisations.

⁴ The founder had no previous experience of 'development', and he once told me that he had learned how to deal with the way "international development agencies behave" through the UNICEF project.

⁵ For a concise overview on the notion of development partnerships involving southern NGOs, see Hailey (2000).

⁶ For a discussion on how conventional rural extension services had been 'production-oriented' and neglected the commercialisation of final products, see Christoplos and Farrington (2004).

⁷ Once I asked her what she thought about the problems associated with community projects, and she replied that the 'community' in general was nothing *bonitinha* (pretty) as it always incurred conflicts and feelings of jealousy amongst its members in relation to available projects. She said: "I think we cannot make a project just with 'a community' because even our *micromundo* ('micro-world') is becoming more complex" (December 2004).

⁸ This social account is reconstructed based on project documents and narratives made by João in July 2000 (following Limirio's death).

⁹ If asked the project beneficiaries would say that 'poor' people are those who are *passando fome* ('suffering from hunger'). Those people who are 'hungry' usually do not participate in 'community projects' but are likely to be beneficiaries of government social programmes such as *Bolsa Família* or *Bolsa Escola* (see Verner 2004 and Rocha 2001 for detailed discussions on social programmes in Pará).

¹⁰ In the field of policy argumentation analysis, 'framing' is mainly understood as 'concerning what and who are included and excluded' and 'distinguishing some aspects of a situation rather than others' (Gasper and Apthorpe 1996: 8). Framing is closely related to institutionalisation of 'a target group' in development programmes that is the main sequence of policy practices in general (Clay and Schaffer 1984: 7).

¹¹ Local experts are not necessarily 'scientific-technical elites'. In Brazil, the word elite tends to indicate the national elite and government officials (e.g. Reis and Moore 2005) while local experts may include state or municipal officials who constantly seek political connections with those elites.

¹² The word 'Amazonianist' is often used to indicate foreign researchers whose research field is in the Amazon (e.g. Nugent 1993). Local experts or intellectuals also often call themselves Amazonianists but their use is oriented to attract the outsiders' recognition.

¹³ For how foreign intellectuals often become impressed with the patronage relations unquestionably maintained by the Brazilian counterparts, see Rabinow (1992).

¹⁴ I am aware that this is a very rough statement because more complex issues around caboclo and 'culture' of the Amazonian population have been raised in social anthropology (see Hariss 1998 for a concise overview of 'caboclo studies'). Here, it is not the place to review the debate, but I present various definitions/explanations of *caboclo*: 'a Brazilian "backwoodsman" (originally a white and Indian half-breed) who practises a very rudimentary agriculture' (Foweraker 1981); 'civilized Brazilian Indian of pure blood' (Langenscheidt's Pocket Portuguese Dictionary 1989 [1980]); 'General term for members of the rural lower class in the Amazon. They typically combine horticulture, extraction, hunting, and fishing in varying proportions' (Bunker 1985); 'the Portuguese speaking Amazon peasant' (Wagley 1985: vii); 'In Amazonia, caboclos are a mixed-blood group resulting from the intermarriage of Amerindians with early Portuguese settlers and, later, with Northeasterners of African descent who moved into the region in the mid-18th century and during the Rubber Boom of the late 19th century.' (Parker 1985: xx); 'Between peasant and Indian lies the purely Amazonian figure of the *caboclo* - in Spanish, *ribereno* or *mestizo* ... - a racially mixed population that grew with the migration into the region during the rubber boom' (Schmink and Wood 1987:40); 'The term refers to Amazonian backwoodsmen. Initially it was used to refer to detribalised Indians and various racial mixtures that included Indian blood' (Hecht and Cockburn 1989: 235); 'a term which refers to deculturated Indians, people of mixed ethnic ancestry, "traditional" (i.e. pre-Transamazônica) Amazonian peasants' (Nugent 1993); '*Caboclo* is the term used for the indigenous peasantries of the Brazilian Amazon' (Clearly 1993).

¹⁵ Typically in Brazil, if you ask 'where are you from?', people answer by referring to their *naturalidade*, meaning, to the state in which they were born.

¹⁶ As discussed in Chapter 3, my ethnographic experience in this thesis is based on experience as a practitioner and a researcher. Here, I present the accounts of these events as

reconstruction of my experience as a practitioner, through which I reflect on development practices as a researcher.

¹⁷ According to the Bank's homepage (www.developmentmarketplace.org), Development Marketplace started as the internal 'Innovation Marketplace' among Bank staff in 1998.

¹⁸ For example, on 15 September 2005, the Bank announced that it would lend USD eight million to the federal government to promote environmental sustainability in Brazil.

¹⁹ The Equator Initiative was launched in 2000 to promote 'community-based sustainable development and biodiversity conservation' in equator regions (www.equatorinitiative.org). See Juma and Timmer (2003) and Hooper et al. (2004) for details.

²⁰ Agriculture/rural development, civil society/social protection including community-driven development/social development, disabilities, education, energy/intrastructure/transport, environment/biodiversity, health/nutrition, HIV/AIDS, information and communication technologies, microfinance, small and medium enterprises/private sector development, and water and sanitation.

²¹ The World Development Report 1998/1999 focused on 'Knowledge for Development' and accompanied the publication of *Organizing Knowledge for Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development* (Serageldin et al. 1998). The Bank promoted itself around that time as 'Knowledge Bank' and it tried to transform the image of money lender and political player to 'a neutral broker of knowledge'. Since then, the term 'knowledge' was applied to connect every aspect of development planning to managerialism (see Heinrich Böll Foundation 2002).

²² Note that in different contexts, private donors are also called social entrepreneurs. See, for example, Ashoka Fellows (www.ashoka.org) for the definition of social entrepreneurship.

²³ According to a survey report of *The Economist*, 'philanthropy business' is currently growing especially in the United States as 'the number of super-rich people keeps growing'. The new philanthropists tend to give away a part of their equity and profit to solve the 'world's urgent problems' in a 'much more businesslike' manner than traditional philanthropists (print edition, 23 February 2006).

A Conclusion: Sustainable Development and Human Agency in the Brazilian Amazon

Rethinking the Social in Sustainable Development

This thesis has been a study of the social process of settlement observed in the Brazilian Amazon. It has shown how settlers encounter and localise the logic of 'organisation' and 'community' presumed by sustainable development discourses and practices. It has been argued that the concept and practice of sustainable development often wrongly presupposes the existence of durable social institutions and local organisations in a place where people flexibly identify with their social domains and renew the social field by altering their natural environment. I have been especially interested in understanding different patterns of settlers' actions and practices in the course of landscape change in the Brazilian Amazon. Development workers and experts too often interpret these patterns as a simple embodiment of 'destructive' behaviour by Amazonian settlers. While it is true that settlers 'destroy' the valuable Amazon rainforest, it is also true that they are establishing and organising their livelihoods and creating the social space in the forest to develop their life projects. Approaches to Amazonian conservation have met with many failures with regard to curbing settlers' 'destructive' behaviour, because they fail to consider how the settlers have built their lives by clearing the forest and accumulated experiences in the process. Likewise, government-led forest regulations over the brazil nut forest, territorial reorganisations that demarcate settlement projects, and NGO projects generate counter-tendencies, which eventually reconfigure the intended purposes of forestry regulations and conservation projects.

Outsiders, including *técnicos* and local NGO workers who try to organise the settlers, often describe the process of reconfiguration as a mess and the lawlessness, and lack of state authority and *conscientização* that is characteristic

of the Amazonian settlements. However, for the settlers on the ground, such reconfigurations are outcomes of ongoing social arrangements. The social arrangements continuously localise government and non-government interventions, and the overall outcome is observed as the continuous renewal of the character of the settlement as a social field. Naturally, 'institutions' that should be mapped and framed in implementing the community-based sustainable development model are renewed and redefined in this process.

In this thesis, I have described the settlers' experience of their social field in relation to processes of development intervention and landscape change, in order to elucidate unpredictability and creativity of the settlers' community institutions. We called these institutions 'collectives' to include institutionalised organisations, informal groups, and various personal networks. By doing so, I suggest the possibility of taking rather 'indirect' approaches to forest conservation and sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon (cf. Richards 1992), which focus on the analytical space of the 'social' reconstructed in the process of sustainable development.

In studies on Amazonian development, the 'social' is often treated as an externality to economic development or simply incorporated into phrases such as the 'social context of deforestation'. Natural resource management studies also use a 'social language' to speak of socially oriented local participation and community involvement in development or environmental planning whereas this is in fact underpinned by the assumptions about human behaviour that experts or conservationists make. These studies share, although in an unintended manner, the paternalist views of sustainable development programmes. These programmes tend to categorise and dichotomise the inhabitants of the Amazon as roughly 'adaptive' or 'destructive'; or 'indigenous' or 'non-indigenous', with reference to 'desirable' conditions of the forest. These views regard the forest as a 'structure' that determines the condition of its inhabitants' actions.

Following Turner (1970[1969]: 131), I regard the 'social' as 'not identical with the "socio-structural". There are other modalities of social relationship'. Thinking about the social in sustainable development begins with various modalities of social relationship and landscape. In other words, we need to set the social as an analytical site in which individual actors manage to coexist in various forms by interacting with the surrounding natural environment.

The pattern of individuals' coexistence in a particular natural environment has been a principal concern for natural resource management.

Claims by development workers that 'the settlers need to be organised' stem from a social logic that connects the image of institutionalised social order to the planning of institutionalised resource management. At the same time, the ways in which settlers who have not previously shared the same social and historical background coexist are both diverse and heterogeneous, not only on their own but also in relation to different development interventions, landscape changes or national political and economic changes.

Methodologically I have drawn on an actor-oriented approach and used extended case-study methods to reveal the social process of settlement and landscape change. These methods have enabled me to look into various areas of social life from an actor's standpoint; this has enabled me to present the various modalities and complexities of social relationships in different situations. The thesis has focused on certain areas of social life, namely the social field, domain, and arena, which are continuously shaped and reshaped through settlers' practices. Local knowledge processes are closely linked to the social and political spatial changes, and local institutions should be understood as patterns of practices that configure these spaces. In this line of thinking, an analysis of the social entails an analysis of action, which naturally takes us back to the fundamental question of the relationship between structure and human agency, as I outlined at the beginning.

In concluding this thesis, I want to reflect on the issue of structure and agency to suggest indirect social approaches to forest conservation in the Brazilian Amazon. These approaches suggest the importance of focusing on social change and contents of apparent community institutions with regard to sustainable development. Institutions are processes, and we need to be aware that in practice sustainable development must encompass social processes and landscape change as a medium and outcome for local actors to arrange their actions and shape their practices. In this vein, I will summarise below the main theoretical and practical implications of this thesis, and discuss the importance for social researchers to participate in the sustainable development debate.

The Amazon Forest as a Changeable Process

The case studies of Grotão showed that the forest in the study area cannot be considered a structural frame that determines how people act but resources for them to establish their social, economic, and political spaces. These spaces

represent fields of activities, social relationships and value in which settlers arrange their actions and configure social practices in a creative way. In essence, the 'structuration' of the forest is a part of the settlers' everyday practices and existence. Therefore, if development experts or government officials seriously want to conserve the forest, they need to duly negotiate with the settlers who must radically change their life courses and style of local development. In addition, as Chapter 5 demonstrated, local politics and power struggles play an important role in legitimating the local interpretation of natural environment. The current focus on 'zoning', based on the map, or the production chain model promoting a 'sustainable business', often falls short or is even counterproductive because it tries to adjust the 'visible form' of local institutions to the principle of sustainable development and associated social order, while neglecting the 'content' of the social arrangements that are in place (cf. Cleaver 2002). As the empirical material has demonstrated, ongoing social arrangements by the settlers are often considered 'disorganised' and 'destructive'. However such views tend to be based on what outsiders observe and the value judgements that they put on their observations without seeking to understand how these social arrangements are understood by the people concerned and why social change appears so apparently 'disorganised' and to whom.

Social practices and landscape

How have settlers' ongoing social arrangements come to be depicted as 'destructive' in sustainable development discourses? This thesis has tried to grasp two different meanings attached to the same landscape in the Amazon: one is 'lifeworld' and the other is 'globe' (cf. Ingold 2000). The settlers' social arrangements in relation to the forest take place in their lifeworlds, and the sustainable development discourses are generated with reference to global concerns over the bio-physical future of ecosystem.

For Amazonian settlers, the forest represents many things. It indicates a new possibility of obtaining land plots; a new locale for establishing a settlement; a new political space; or, quite simply a load of timbers. By sharing the same or similar interpretations of the forest, settlers organise and individualise their practices and localise government and non-government development interventions. The landscape depicted as cemeteries of Brazil

nut trees are a vivid embodiment of such an interpretation, as it has shown possible social spaces for the settlers to establish their settlements.

For outsiders, especially development experts or conservationists, the same landscape of the cemeteries represents a state of complete devastation of the rainforest. The experts organise their epistemic practices by portraying the Amazon forest as an invaluable global common, and warn of its rapid disappearance. The concept of sustainable development is undergirded by such crisis-oriented views, generated and justified by epistemic communities in international development. The sensationalist media further disseminate the image of crisis and depict inhabitants of the Amazon either as forest encroachers or as protectors. In this functionalist view, the inhabitants of the Amazon are supposed to enact rules of conservation and resource management. However, this thesis showed that the biophysical condition of the Amazon in relation to the global environmental condition has nothing to do with the settlers' everyday practices in their social field. How do we bridge the gap?

The human agency of the Amazonian settlers

In this thesis, I have suggested the importance of focusing on the concept of human agency to understand the multiplicity of settlers' actions and the relationship between those two distinct views of the same landscape. The Amazonian settlers' agency is oriented towards their knowledgeability and capacity to construct their lives in the rainforest. This can work to both organise and individualise collective arrangements of resource management or 'sustainable and participatory development projects' in the settlement. As I explored in Chapters 5 and 6, the agency of the Amazonian inhabitants is fostered through individual and collective experiences in relation to landscape change and development intervention.

Human agency is often understood as a property of the individual and what makes voluntaristic or purposeful action possible. The actor-oriented approach or the theories of practice and action discussed in the thesis turned this view around to retain agency's sociality and relationship with structure to understand various areas of social life. Understanding social domains and arenas, for example, is important to an analysis of the social nature of agency, because it brings out the issue of how the quality of agency may change in each actor's life course.

An Amazonian settler's life course is initially enabled by the 'socially informed' agency. Many settlers in Grotão did not have a clear idea about how their lives would be in Pará when they left their places of origin outside the Amazon. Political opportunities, government propaganda, stories told by others or the opening of nearby roads have shaped their expectations and fired their imaginations. Such new images for the imagination have been simultaneously internalised in each actor's lifeworld, and have created a process that has allowed groups of *posseiros* to flow into Pará on an *ad hoc* basis.

Once these groups reach Pará, *posseiros* form various collectives and institutionalised organisations to claim their rights and entitlements to land and credit. In this process, their agency is fostered through certain social relationships, as they experience newly generated social interactions in the community. 'Community institutions', such as farmers' associations, temporarily strengthen the collectivity of individual settlers. Consequently, the collective experience permits each 'member' to regenerate his knowledge process and diversify goals and purposes of actions.

The diversification of goals and purposes indicates a process of reactivation of individuality. This is an outcome of a settler's ongoing identification with his field of action and a temporary manifestation of his difference from others. Manu's case in Chapter 6 showed that the landscape can shape an actor's social domain from which he can accrue meanings to take a particularised action. The 'bundle' of particularised actions (following Schatzki 1996) then reshapes social practices that redefine symbolic boundaries of the social field. In this process, the agency of a settler might indicate capability to read the landscape and stay knowledgeable of the possibility of opening up physical, social and political spaces by involving others and government and non-government interventions.

In sum, the agency of the Amazonian settlers indicates a set of various capabilities fostered by changeable modalities of social relationships vis-à-vis landscape change. This means that when we want to conserve the forest, we need a processual or biographical understanding of agency of the settlers in the Brazilian Amazon. It is especially so when we deal with mobile people whose practices are not constrained by a fixed location ('community') and institutions.

In approaches to community-based resource management, agency is often understood as the capability of resource users to structure collective action to arrange their institutions over certain natural resources. At the same time, in discussions on 'sustainable settlement' building in Latin America,

agency often indicates an individual settler's decision making in environmental management in his territory (e.g. Jones 1990). However, what is at issue is how both the 'structuring of collective action' and 'individual decision making' actually take place in sequence, because agency is informed by ongoing expectations, social interactions, and a reflexive understanding of the interaction. In turn this affects processes of individual decision making in a settler's life course.

Therefore, when development experts intervene and introduce sustainable development policy and projects to settlements in the Amazon, they need to know at what moment of the settlers' history they are intervening to have a general idea about the settlers' sociality (and also individuality). As each settlement project has a different history of land occupation and relation to the local authority, it is ideal to have a site-specific intervention that does not rely upon a single 'community model' for achieving sustainable development. It is because agency cannot be separated from social, political and historical contexts, and the Amazonian settlers often regain socially informed agency after the 'community' is established and rearrange their actions.

Collective and the individual

In order to include the historical and social contexts and site-specificity of the 'target' area into planned intervention, it is necessary to follow how settlers in Pará organise and individualise their actions with reference to their life project processes and the social field. By doing so, we come to grasp 'site-specific forms of sociality' (Schatzki 1996) of the settlers in relation to a larger framework of sustainable development policy and project.

Chapters 5 and 6 explored such site-specific forms of sociality through several interface situations created between local actors, government officials or NGO workers. The interface situations elucidated the process of encounter between multiple rationalities, discourses, and lifeworlds in the local development process. These interfaces illuminated diverse organisational logics and rationalities that existed in the settlers' moving 'semi-autonomous social field'. The multiple rationalities indicate that social forms of the settlers are not always clearly goal-oriented or embedded in solid, well-structured social institutions. The social forms are mostly loosely identified by each settler with reference to the locality, history, kinship, landscape as well as a sense of community; they are also occasionally institutionalised for a group of

settlers to take political action, expand property or promote a particular religion.

The importance of bringing the notion of the collective to the fore is in its connotation with the existence of history and experience in a social form. For example, collectives configured around Limirio include his first occupation camp in the forest, the worship house of the Assembly of God, the institutionalised farmer's association, and a group of political supporters whom he mobilised. To each collective, the members attached different meanings in reference to Limirio's life and their own experience of interaction. Each collective generates social knowledge, which is further internalised in each member's field of action.

Events that followed Limirio's death and the symbolic action taken by his fellow settlers at his funeral and the Rice Festival he initiated have enabled us to understand the changing process of settlers' agency. Through this process social practices evolve around the actors' experience with arranging collective (or symbolic) action and individualising them to take 'pragmatic actions'. The settlers were never utterly individualistic or egoistic but, through the experiences with different forms of collective action, they learned to internalise collective memory and particularise collective identity. Thus, we need to focus on the process of identification in which the settlers themselves understand characteristics of their community in their social field.

In this sense, community institutions are not only processes but also contexts for an individual settler to understand his situation and objectify his personal needs and wants. Upon these contexts, individuals can further act to shape social practices to localise different development interventions (which often try to institutionalise particular collectives). In short, institutions open a possible sphere of creative action, which temporarily retains individuality within an institutionalised collective arrangement. This process is all too often misinterpreted as a process of disorganisation in policy and project processes, which are based on an imagined structural order of the environment. Social researchers should elucidate the local actors' social forms and present the actors' sociality in relation to an ideal of natural resource management.

The Role of Social Researcher in Sustainable Development

Several potential contributions can be made by social researchers in terms of further research on sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon. Here, I

indicate four areas of inquiry: organisation, poverty, deforestation, and settlement and agrarian reform policies.

First, when we talk about an 'organisation', we need to pay attention to the changeable quality of agency of members in their life courses. As we have discussed so far, organising and individualising capabilities both exist within the settlers' lifeworlds, which enable them to use organisations strategically to obtain benefits and eventually particularise them to develop personal projects. Therefore, it is important to identify at which particular 'structuring' or contestation moment certain policies or projects serve to intervene to promote community-based natural resource management. As Craig and Porter (1997: 56) put it, the 'creativity' of development professionals indicates 'seeing beyond the framing process' that should involve 'the creation of space and enablement'. Ethnographic case-studies provide an understanding of 'space beyond the frame' for development practitioners. More importantly, they enable us to critically reflect on various knowledge claims made by practitioners to frame the agency of our subjects.

Second, in taking the biographical approaches to natural resource management, we need to be careful how the notion of 'poverty' is used or framed within sustainable development policy and project documents. If we really need to tackle the problem of poverty, we should talk about issue of social policies or programmes, rather than 'sustainable development' policies and programmes. In my opinion, the deliberate connection of poverty to deforestation obfuscates the real issue of addressing the problem of poverty in Brazil and the Amazon.

As Kitamura (1994) strongly suggests, the problem of poverty in the Amazon is chronic, stemming from the historical exploitative labour relations consolidated in the extraction economy and the lack of legal arrangements. These elements are rooted in the wider social structure of Brazil that places the poor simply as a 'mass' and outcaste (Leeds 1964). Meanwhile, in today's Brazil, almost every political issue - including economic growth, employment, social inclusion, and democracy - is discussed under the overarching concept of sustainable development (Ministry of National Integration 2004). We need to be aware of what exactly policy makers try to achieve in the name of sustainable development.

Third, the connection of poverty to deforestation also misinterprets the real issues associated with the problem of 'deforestation'. For example, it obscures the simple reality that the most 'destructive' actors in the settlement

projects are rich loggers. Of course, the loggers, as the case of Almir has shown, generally become rich by buying out logs from the 'poor squatters', but the poor cut trees to start up their living, which goes beyond 'selling trees' out of desperation.

In a larger picture of international development, the current commercial turn of sustainable development actually distracts attention from an assessment of the environmental impact of existing settlement projects in Pará to entrepreneurial, 'cutting-edge' (according to Fairhead and Leach 2003) project elaborations. As the case studies in this thesis have shown, extensive deforestation has occurred throughout settlement projects in the southeast of Pará due to the settlers' construction of life projects in the newly created physical and social spaces in the forest. This means that, at the policy level, the problem of 'deforestation' in the Amazon is closely linked to problems associated with agrarian reform, whose basic approach to building settlement projects has not been changed since the 1970s. Nevertheless, the continuous experimental and entrepreneurial recommendations to sustainable development projects elaborated by different types of experts have made the issue of agrarian reform an obsolete subject or 'out of fashion'. At the same time, advocates of agrarian reform have largely disregarded forest-land relations since they have focused on the redistribution of 'land' properties without sufficiently considering the use of forest, which such land redistribution can influence.

In addition, a problematisation of the 'cattle culture', which accelerates the conversion of forest to pasture in the Amazon, should be discussed in terms of the framework of how people localise agrarian reform policies. Lamenting the cattle rancher's 'mentality' or establishing a pessimistic narrative tone (such as 'cattle ranchers are resistant to diversify their productive activities to contribute to forest conservation', e.g. Perz 2004) work to limit the possibility of grasping the process of change from a rancher's standpoint. Denouncing cattle culture at best leads settlers to further develop the cattle-related activities, as they need to represent their own knowledge process against misrepresentation by outsiders. By looking into interface situations, we need to deepen the analysis of social forms that are shaped around cattle ranching and development intervention in the Amazon. We need to further investigate how the cattle economy facilitates varied patterns of exchanges (involving land and forest transactions) and social practices informed by historical contexts of

occupation and government policies in order to properly address the 'problem' called cattle ranching in the Amazon.

These are difficult issues, since various legal requirements and political interests can undermine any possible reform efforts. In any case, at least, we should assert that agrarian reform policies or sustainable development projects should be site-specific and socially oriented. Amazonian settlers' participation in 'national' agrarian reform, based on models elaborated outside the Amazon, for example, runs counter to the intended outcome of the reform policies. Settlers seldom stay on the same plots because of the available forest for occupation in the Amazon. Or, innovative sustainable development projects often induce a sense of discontinuity in the settlers' lifeworlds because the projects do not stem from ongoing social arrangements. Thus, we need to show balanced views on how to properly monitor and suggest changes to the current policy frameworks based on what people do and make sense of what they do.

If we place settlement projects at the core of the 'deforestation' problem in the Brazilian Amazon, we should see the cause of deforestation is neither poverty nor capitalist frontier expansion but the processes involved in how settlers' construct their life projects and generate a social field. What really matters to sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon is the way its inhabitants coexist, which is seldom constrained by administrative or customary boundaries. As specialists of social analysis, sociologists and anthropologists can contribute a great deal to an understanding of settlement and environmental policies. We need to show that deforestation in the Amazon is closely linked to the accumulation of settlers' new experiences and lack of national and international political frameworks to incorporate these settlers' experiences into considerations.

Social researchers stay marginal to settlement and environmental policy debates in the Brazilian Amazon because we often fail to offer an operational framework to be applied to these policies. However, as I discussed in Chapter 3, it is not really the vocation of social researchers to offer an immediate operational framework to design policies. If we try to do so, we will fall into a trap of fixing institutions for local actors or categorising them as destroyers or protectors of the forest. What we can do is to take a close look at what people actually do in relation to their individual and collective activities, in order to recover complexities of micro-foundation of macro-structure and reveal the uncertainty and social effects of natural resource management.

As we saw in Chapter 7, people in the Amazon may not even identify themselves as inhabitants of *Amazônia*. If they are expected to manage their forest, the entire view that emphasises the importance of 'saving the Amazon rainforest' should be turned into a view that stresses the significance of social development for the people who live in the region that they call the Amazon. Staying marginal, social researchers can strive to reinterpret sustainable development policy processes by addressing the issues of agency, social practices, and landscape. By doing so, we demystify discourses that surround the tropical rainforest and suggest a possibility of truly engaging local individuals in 'their sustainable development' endeavours.

References

- Acheson, James M. (2006) 'Institutional Failure in Resource Management' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 117-134.
- Adams, W. M. (1990) *Green Development: Environment and Sustainability in the Third World*. London: Routledge.
- Agência Ver Editora (1999) *Nosso Pará: Economia dos Contrastes*. Belém: Agência Ver Editora Ltda.
- Agrawal, Arun and Clark C. Gibson (1999) 'Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation' *World Development* 27(4): 629-649.
- Agrawal, Arun and K. Sivaramakrishnan (2000) 'Introduction: Agrarian Environments' in *Agrarian Environments: Resources, Representation, and Rule in India*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1-22.
- Alsop, Ruth (ed.) (2005) *Power, Rights, and Poverty: Concepts and Connections*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Alston, Lee J., Gary D. Libecap and Bernardo Mueller (1999) *Titles, Conflict and Land Use: The Development of Property Rights and Land Reform on the Brazilian Amazon Frontier*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Alvord, Sarah H., L. David Brown and Christine W. Letts (2004) 'Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study' *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 40(3): 260-282.
- Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organisation (2004) *Strategic Plan 2004-2012*. Brasília: OTCA.
- Anderson, Anthony B. (1990) 'Smokestacks in the Rainforest: Industrial Development and Deforestation in the Amazon Basin' *World Development* 13(9): 1191-1205.
- Apthorpe, Raymond (1970) 'Development Studies and Social Planning' in R. Apthorpe (ed.) *People Planning and Development Studies: Some Reflections on Social Planning*. London: Frank Cass and Company, pp. 1-28.
- Apthorpe, Raymond (1976) 'Peasants and Planistrators in Eastern Africa 1960-1970' in D. C. Pitt (ed.) *Development from Below: Anthropologists and Development Situations*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, pp. 21-55.
- Arce, Alberto (1989) 'The Social Construction of Agrarian Development: A Case Study of Producer-Bureaucrat Relations in an Irrigation Unit in

- Western Mexico' N. Long (ed.) (1989) *Encounters at the Interface: A Perspective on Social Discontinuities in Rural Development*. Wageningen: Wageningen Agricultural University, pp. 11-51.
- Arce, Alberto (2003a) 'Value Contestations in Development Interventions: Community and Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches' *Community Development Journal* 38(3): 199-212.
- Arce, Alberto (2003b) 'Re-Approaching Social Development: A Field of Action between Social Life and Policy Processes' *Journal of International Development* 15: 845-861.
- Arce, Alberto and Norman Long (1992) 'The Dynamics of Knowledge Interfaces between Bureaucrats and Peasants' in N. Long and A. Long (eds.) *Battlefields of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, pp. 211-246.
- Arce, Alberto and Norman Long (1994) 'Re-Positioning Knowledge in the Study of Rural Development' in D. Symes and A. J. Jansen (eds.) *Agricultural Restructuring and Rural Change in Europe*. Wageningen: Wageningen Agricultural University, pp. 75-86.
- Arce, Alberto and Norman Long (2000) 'Consuming Modernity: Mutational Processes of Change' in A. Arce and N. Long (eds.) *Anthropology, Development and Modernities: Exploring Discourses, Counter-Tendencies and Violence*. London: Routledge, pp. 159-183.
- Archer, Margaret S. (1982) 'Morphogenesis versus Structuration: On Combining Structure and Action' *The British Journal of Sociology* 33(4): 455-483.
- Arima, E. (2000) 'Caracterização dos Produtores Familiares Rurais Beneficiários do FNO Especial' in L. R. Tura and Assis, F. A. (ed.) *Campesinato e Estado na Amazônia: Impactos do FNO no Pará*. Brasília: FASE, pp. 107-128.
- Associação dos Municípios do Araguaia e Tocantins (1996) *Sul e Sudeste do Pará HOJE*. Belém: AMAT/UNICEF.
- Attack, Iain (1999) 'Four Criteria of Development NGO Legitimacy' *World Development* 27(5): 855-864.
- Badstue, Lone Bech (2006) *Smallholder Seed Practices: Maize Seed Management in the Central Valleys of Oaxaca, Mexico*. Wageningen: Wageningen University (unpublished PhD thesis).
- Bailey, F. G. (1971) 'The Management of Reputations and the Process of Change' in F. G. Bailey (ed.) *Gifts and Poison: The Politics of Reputation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 281-301.

- Barrett, Christopher B., David R. Lee and John G. McPeak (eds.) (2005) 'Institutional Arrangements for Rural Poverty Reduction and Resource Conservation,' Special Issue, *World Development* 33(2): 193-332.
- Bateson, Gregory (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Batten, T. R. (1957) *Communities and their Development: An Introductory Study with Special Reference to the Tropics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1990) *Thinking Sociologically*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2001) *The Individualized Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bebbington, Anthony (1999) 'Capitals and Capabilities: A Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods, and Poverty' *World Development* 27(12): 2021-2044.
- Bebbington, Anthony and Graham Thiele (1993) *Non-Governmental Organizations and the State in Latin America: Rethinking Roles in Sustainable Agricultural Development*. London: Routledge.
- Beck, Ulrich (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, Ulrich (1995) *Ecological Politics in an Age of Risk*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash (1994) *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich and Elizabeth Beck-Gernsheim (2002) *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences*. London: Sage.
- Becker, Berta K., Mariana Miranda and Lia O. Machado (1990) *Fronteira Amazônica: Questões sobre a Gestão do Território*. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília.
- Berry, Sara (1997) 'Tomatoes, Land and Hearsay: Property and History in Asante in the Time of Structural Adjustment' *World Development* 25(8): 1225-1241.
- Biddle, W. W. and L. J. Biddle (1965) *The Community Development Process: The Rediscovery of Local Initiative*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston Inc.
- Booth, David (1994) 'Rethinking Social Development: An Overview' in D. Booth (ed.) *Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice*. Harlow: Longman Ltd., pp. 3-34.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1985) 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups' *Theory and Society* 14(6): 723-744.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1992) *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braga, B., E. Salati and H. Mattos de Lemos (1999) 'Sustainable Water-Resources Development of the Amazon Basin' in A. K. Biswas, N. V. Cordeiro, B. P. F. Braga and C. Tortajada (eds.) *Management of Latin American River Basins: Amazon, Plata, and São Francisco*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, pp. 3-47.
- Brandão Jr., Amintas and Carlos Souza Jr. (2006) 'Desmatamento nos Assentamentos de Reforma Agrária na Amazônia' *O Estado da Amazônia*, Série AMAZON 7. Belém: AMAZON.
- Branford, Susan and Jan Rocha (2002) *Cutting the Wire: The Story of the Landless Movement in Brazil*. London: Latin American Bureau.
- Bratton, Michael (1989) 'The Politics of Government-NGO Relations in Africa' *World Development* 17(4): 569-587.
- Breton, Binka le (2002) *Vidas Roubadas: A Escravidão Moderna na Amazônia Brasileira*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Brito, Daniel Chaves de (2001) 'Reforma do Estado e Sustentabilidade: A Questão das Instituições Desenvolvimentistas da Amazônia' in M. J. J. Costa (ed.) *Sociologia na Amazônia: Debate Teóricos e Experiências de Pesquisa*. Belém: UFPA, pp. 71-103.
- Brocklesby, Mary Ann and Eleanor Fisher (2003) 'Community Development in Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: An Introduction' *Community Development Journal* 38(3): 185-198.
- Brokensha, David and Peter Hodge (1969) *Community Development: An Interpretation*. California: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Bromley, Daniel W. and Cochrane, J. C. (1994) 'Environmental and Natural Resources Training Project (EPAT/MUCIA)' *Working Paper 13*, University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- Brosius, J. Peter, Anna Lowenthaupt Tsing and Charles Zerner (1998) 'Representing Communities: Histories and Politics of Community Based NRM' *Society and Natural Resources* 11, 157-168.

- Browder, John O. (1989) *Fragile Lands of Latin America: Strategies for Sustainable Development*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Brown, Michael and Amy Goldin (1973) *Collective Behavior: A Review and Reinterpretation of the Literature*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Inc.
- Bunker, Stephen G. (1985) *Underdeveloping the Amazon: Extraction, Unequal Exchange, and the Failure of the Modern State*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, Micheal (1998) 'The Extended Case Method' *Sociological Theory* 16(1): 4-33.
- Buttel, Frederick H. (1996) 'Environmental and Resource Sociology: Theoretical Issues and Opportunities for Synthesis' *Rural Sociology* 61(1): 56-76.
- Canel, Eduardo (1997) 'New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization Theory: The Need for Integration' in M. Kaufman and H. D. Alfonso (eds.) *Community Power and Grassroots Democracy: The Transformation of Social Life*. London: Zed Books, pp. 189-221.
- Carney, Diana (ed.) (1998) *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contributions Can We Make?* London: Department for International Development.
- Casado, Guzmán, G., M. González de Molina and E. Sevilla Guzmán (1999) *Introducción a la Agroecología como Desarrollo Rural Sostenible*. Madrid: Ediciones Mundi-Prensa.
- Caviglia, Jill L. (1999) *Sustainable Agriculture in Brazil: Economic Development and Deforestation*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
- Centro de Estudos e Ação Social (2003[1975]) 'Terra e Posseiro na Amazônia Legal' *Cadernos do CEAS* 39, 32-49, reprinted in *Cadernos do CEAS* 207, online edition (www.ceas.com.br/cadernos/cc207rep.htm).
- Cernea, Michael M. (ed.) (1985) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, Robert (1988) 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Key Strategy for People, Environment and Development' in C. Conroy and M. Litvinoff (eds.) *The Greening of Aid: Sustainable Livelihoods in Practice*. London: Earthscan Publications, pp. 1-17.
- Chambers, Robert (1994) 'The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal' *World Development* 22(7): 953-969.
- Chambers, Robert (2004) 'Ideas for Development: Reflecting Forwards' *IDS Working Paper* 238, Institute of Development Studies.

- Chambers, Robert and Gordon R. Conway (1991) 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century' *IDS Discussion Paper* 296, Institute of Development Studies.
- Charlton, Roger (1995) 'Sustaining an Impact? Development NGOs in the 1990s' *Third World Quarterly* 16(3): 566-575.
- Charlton, Roger and Roy May (1995) 'NGOs, Politics, Projects and Probity: a Policy Implementation Perspective' *Third World Quarterly* 16(2): 237-255.
- Chernela, J. M. (2005) 'The Politics of Mediation: Local-Global Interactions in the Central Amazon of Brazil' *American Anthropologist* 107(4): 620-631.
- Chestnut, R. Andrew (1997) *Born Again in Brazil: The Pentecostal Boom and the Pathogens of Poverty*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Chomitz, Kenneth M. (2007) *At Loggerheads? Agricultural Expansion, Poverty Reduction, and Environment in the Tropical Forests*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Christoplos, Ian and John Farrington (2004) 'The Issues' in I. Christoplos and J. Farrington (eds.) *Poverty, Vulnerability, and Agricultural Extension: Policy Reforms in a Globalizing World*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-43.
- Cicourel, Aaron V. (1981) 'Notes on the Integration of Micro- and Macro-Levels of Analysis' in K. Knorr-Cetina and A.V. Cicourel (eds.) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 51-80.
- Clay, Edward and Bernard Schaffer (1984) 'Introduction: Room for Manoeuvre: The Premise of Public Policy' in E. Clay and B. Schaffer (eds.) *Room for Manoeuvre: An Exploration of Public Policy Planning in Agricultural and Rural Development*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, pp. 1-12.
- Cleary, David (1993) 'After the Frontier: Problems with Political Economy in the Modern Brazilian Amazon' *Journal of Latin American Studies* 25: 331-349.
- Cleaver, Frances (1999) 'Paradoxes of Participation: Questioning Participatory Approaches to Development' *Journal of International Development* 11: 597-612.
- Cleaver, Frances (2000) 'Moral Ecological Rationality, Institutions, and the Management of Common Property Resources' *Development and Change* 31(2): 361-383.
- Cleaver, Frances (2002) 'Reinventing Institutions: Bricolage and the Social Embeddedness of Natural Resource Management' *The European Journal of Development Research* 14(2), 11-30.

- Clüsener-Godt, Miguel and Ignacy Sachs (eds.) (1995) *Brazilian Perspectives on Sustainable Development of the Amazon Region*. Paris: Unesco.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1978) 'Ethnographic Method in the Real Community' *Sociologia Ruralis* XVIII (1): 1-22.
- Cohen, Anthony P. (1985) *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, Percy S. (1968) *Modern Social Theory*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Comissão Justiça e Paz (1999) *Trabalho Escravo nas Fazendas do Pará e Amapá 1980-1998*. Belém: Comissão Justiça e Paz, CNBB-Norte II.
- Comissão Pastoral da Terra (ed.) (1999) *Trabalho Escravo no Brasil Contemporâneo*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Comisión Amazónica de Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente (1993) *Amazonía Sin Mitos*. Quito: Editora Oveja Negra.
- Conroy, Czech and Miles Litvinoff (eds.) (1988) *The Greening of Aid: Sustainable Livelihoods in Practice*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Conway, Tim, Caroline Moser, Andy Norton and John Farrington (2002) 'Rights and Livelihoods Approaches: Exploring Policy Dimensions' *Natural Resource Perspectives* 78, Overseas Development Institute.
- Conyers, Diana (1982) *An Introduction to Social Planning in the Third World*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Copatorô (2004) *Políticas de Crédito para a Agricultura Familiar*. Conceição do Araguaia: Copatorô-DFID: Série Políticas Públicas 3.
- Coppen, J.J.W., D. L. Green, A. Gordon and G. A. Hone (1995) 'Markets and the Public/Private Sector Interface: Their Importance in the Successful Development of Non-Wood Forest Products' *Non-Wood Forest Products* 3.
- Craig, David and Doug Porter (1997) 'Framing Participation: Development Projects, Professionals, and Organisations' in D. Eade (ed.) *A Development in Practice Reader: Development and Patronage*, Oxford: Oxfam, pp. 50-57.
- Crewe, Emma and Elizabeth Harrison (1998) *Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid*. London: Zed Books.
- Crush, Jonathan (1995) 'Introduction: Imagining Development' in J. Crush (ed.) *Power of Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-26.
- Dalton, Benjamin (2004) 'Creativity, Habit, and the Social Products of Creative Action: Revising Joas, Incorporating Bourdieu' *Sociological Theory* 22(4): 603-622.

- Dean, Warren (1987) *Brazil and the Struggle for Rubber: A Study in Environmental History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dean, Warren (1995) *With Broadax and Firebrand: The Destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deflem, Mathieu (1991) 'Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner's Processual Symbolic Analysis' *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(1): 1-25.
- Delanty, Gerard (2003) *Community*. London: Routledge.
- Dickenson, J. P. (1982) *Brazil*. London: Longman.
- Dilley, Roy (1999) 'Introduction: The Problem of Context' in R. Dilley (ed.) *The Problem of Context*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 1-46.
- Dore, Ronald (1981) 'Introduction' in R. Dore and Z. Mars (eds.) *Community Development*. Paris: Unesco, pp. 13-46.
- Douglas, Mary (1992) *Risk and Blame: Essays in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Dove, Michael (1993) 'A Revisionist View of Tropical Deforestation and Development' *Environmental Conservation* 20: 17-24.
- Downing, T. E., S. B. Hecht and H. A. Pearson (eds.) (1992) *Development or Destruction: The Conversion of Tropical Forest to Pasture in Latin America*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Durrenberger, E. Paul (ed.) (1984) *Chayanov, Peasants, and Economic Anthropology*. London: Academic Press, Inc.
- Dutra, Manuel (2003) 'Biodiversidade e Desenvolvimento Sustentável: Considerações sobre um Discurso de Inferiorização dos Povos da Floresta' in M. Fernandes and L. Guerra (eds.) *Contra-Discurso do Desenvolvimento Sustentável*. Belém: Associação de Universidades Amazônicas, pp. 170-196.
- The Economist (2002) 'Sustaining the Poor's Development' 29 August 2002 (*The Economist* print edition).
- The Economist (2006) 'Surveys on Philanthropy' 23 February 2006 (*The Economist* print edition).
- Edelman, Marc (2001) 'Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 285-317.
- Edwards, Michael (1994) 'Rethinking Social Development: The Search for 'Relevance'' in D. Booth (ed.) *Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice*. Harlow: Longman Ltd., pp. 279-297.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. and H. J. Helle (eds.) (1985) *Perspectives on Sociological Theory*. 2 volumes, London: Sage.

- Ellen, Roy (2002) "'Déjà vu, All over Again", *Again: Reinvention and Progress in Applying Local Knowledge to Development* in P. Sillitoe, A. Bicker and J. Pottier (eds.) *Participating in Development: Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge*. London: Routledge, pp. 235-258.
- Elliott, Jennifer A. (1999 [1994]) *An Introduction to Sustainable Development*. London: Routledge.
- Ellis, Frank (1998) 'Survey Article: Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification' *The Journal of Development Studies* 35(1): 1-38.
- Ellis, Frank and Stephen Biggs (2001) 'Evolving Themes in Rural Development 1950s-2000s' *Development Policy Review* 19(4): 437-448.
- Emmi, Marília Ferreira (1999 [1987]) *A Oligarquia do Tocantins e o Domínio dos Castanhais*, second edition, Belém: UFPA/NAEA.
- Emmi, Marília Ferreira and Rosa Elizabeth Acevedo Marin (1997) 'De Posseiros aos Assentados: Precaridade das Ações Fundiárias no Sudeste do Pará' in M. C. N. Coelho and R. G. Cota (eds.) *10 Anos da Estrada de Ferro Carajás*, Belém: UFPA/NAEA, pp. 251-273.
- Emmi, Marília Ferreira, Rosa Elizabeth Acevedo Marin, and Rosineide da Silva Bentes (1987) 'O Polígono Castanheiro do Tocantins: Espaço Contestado de Oligarquias Decadentes' *Pará Agrário* 2, Belém: IDESP, pp. 12-21.
- Escobar, Arturo (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, Peter (1996) 'Government Action, Social Capital and Development: Reviewing the Evidence on Synergy' *World Development* 24(6): 1119-1132.
- Evens, T. M. S. and Don Handelman (eds.) (2006) *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Fairhead, James and Melissa Leach (2003) *Science, Society and Power: Environmental Knowledge and Policy in West Africa and the Caribbean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrington, John, Diana Carney, Caroline Ashley and Cathryn Turton (1999) 'Sustainable Livelihoods in Practice: Early Applications of Concepts in Rural Areas' *Natural Resource Perspectives* 42, Overseas Development Institute.
- Fearnside, Philip M. (1983) 'Stochastic Modelling in Human Carrying-Capacity Estimation: A Tool for Development Planning in Amazonia' in E. F. Moran (ed.) *The Dilemma of Amazonian Development*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 279-296.

- Fearnside, Philip M. (1990) 'Environmental Destruction in the Brazilian Amazon' in D. Goodman and A. Hall (eds.) *The Future of Amazonia: Destruction or Sustainable Development?* London: Macmillan, pp. 179-225.
- Fearnside, Philip M. (1995) 'Agroforestry in Brazil's Amazonian Development Policy: The Role and Limits of a Potential Use for Degraded Lands' in M. Clüsener-Godt and I. Sachs (eds.) *Brazilian Perspectives on Sustainable Development of the Amazon Region*. Paris: Unesco, pp. 125-148.
- Fearnside, Philip M. (2001) 'Land-Tenure Issues as Factors in Environmental Destruction in Brazilian Amazonia: The Case of Southern Pará' *World Development* 29(8): 1361-1372.
- Ferguson, James (1994 [1990]) *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fernandes, Marcionila and Lemuel Guerra (eds.) (2003) *Contra-Discurso do Desenvolvimento Sustentável*. Belém: Associação de Universidades Amazônicas.
- Fielding, Nigel G. (ed.) (1988) *Actions and Structure: Research Methods and Social Theory*. London: Sage.
- Finnemore, Martha (1997) 'Redefining Development at the World Bank' in F. Cooper and R. Packard (eds.) *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 203-227.
- Fisher, William F. (1997) 'Doing Good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 439-464.
- Fleisher, David (1998) 'Cardoso Government's Reform Agenda: A View from the National Congress 1995-1998' *The Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Winter 1998, online edition (www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi-qa3688/is1998a/ai_n8760085).
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (1999) 'FAO Forestry: Towards a Harmonized Definition of Non-Wood Forest Products' *Unasylva* 50.
- Forbes, Ann Armbricht (1996) 'Defining the "Local" in the Arun Controversy: Villagers, NGOs, and the World Bank in the Arun Valley, Nepal' *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 20(3), online edition (<http://209.200.101.189/publications/csq/csq-article.cfm?id=676>).

- Foweraker, Joe (1981) *The Struggle for Land: A Political Economy of the Pioneer Frontier in Brazil from 1930 to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, Alan (1997) *Striking a Balance: A Guide to Enhancing the Effectiveness of Non-Governmental Organisations in International Development*. London: Earthscan.
- Gable, Eric (2006) 'The Funeral and Modernity in Manjaco' *Cultural Anthropology* 21(3): 385-415.
- Garbett, G. Kingsley (1970) 'The Analysis of Social Situations' *Man* 5(2): 214-227.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1984 [1967]) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gaspar, Des and Raymond Apthorpe (1996) 'Introduction: Discourse Analysis and Policy Discourse' in R. Apthorpe and D. Gaspar (eds.) *Arguing Development Policy: Frames and Discourses*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 1-15.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, Anthony (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1984) *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gluckman, Max (1968) *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goodman, David and Anthony Hall (eds.) (1990) *The Future of Amazonia: Destruction or Sustainable Development?* London: Macmillan.
- Gore, Charles (1993) 'Entitlement Relations and Unruly Social Practices: A Comment on the Work of Amartya Sen' *Journal of Development Studies* 29(3): 429-460.
- Gough, J. W. (1969) *The Rise of the Entrepreneur*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Green, Judith (2006) 'Pluralisation and Deliberative Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach' in J. R. Schook and J. Margolis (eds.) *A Companion to Pragmatism*. London: Blackwell, pp. 301-316.
- Grillo, R. D. (1997) 'Discourses of Development: A View from Anthropology' in R. D. Grillo and R. L. Stirrat (eds.) *Discourses of Development: Anthropological perspectives*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 1-33.

- Gross, Niel (1999) 'Book Review: Hans Joas, *The Creativity of Action*' *Theory and Society* 28: 335-342.
- Gudynas, Eduardo (1993) 'The Fallacy of Ecomessianism: Observations from Latin America' in W. Sachs (ed.) *Global Ecology: A New Arena of Political Conflict*. London: Zed Books, pp. 170-178.
- Guha, Ramachandra and Juan Martinez-Alier (1997) *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. London: Earthscan.
- Haan, Leo de and Annelies Zoomers (2005) 'Exploring the Frontier of Livelihoods Research' *Development and Change* 36(1): 27-47.
- Haas, Peter M. (1992) 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination' *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol. 2: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Haddad, Sérgio (ed.) (2002) *ONGs e Universidades: Desafios para a Cooperação na América Latina*. São Paulo: ABONG.
- Hailey, John (2000) 'NGO Partners: The Characteristics of Effective Development Partnerships' in S. P. Osborne (ed.) *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective*. London: Routledge, pp. 311-323.
- Hall, Anthony (1989) *Developing Amazonia: Deforestation and Social Conflict in Brazil's Carajás Programme*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hall, Anthony (1997) *Sustaining Amazonia: Grassroots Action for Productive Conservation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hammond, John L. (1999) 'Law and Disorder: The Brazilian Landless Farmworkers' Movement' *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 18(4): 469-489.
- Hajer, Maarten A. (1997 [1995]) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hardin, Garrett (1968) 'The Tragedy of the Commons' *Science* 162: 1243-1248.
- Harris, Mark (1998) 'What it Means to be "Caboclo": Some Critical Notes on the Construction of Amazonian Caboclo Society as an Anthropological Object' *Critique of Anthropology* 18(1): 83-95.
- Harriss, John (2002 [2001]) *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital*. London: Anthem Press.
- Haynor, Anthony L. (1989) 'Micro-Macro Integration in Sociology: Whither Progress?' *Sociological Forum* 4 (3): 447-453.

- Heath, Chip (2004) 'Loud and Clear: Crafting Messages that Stick: What Nonprofits Can Learn from Urban Legends' *Stanford Social Innovation Review* Winter 2003: 18-27.
- Hecht, Susanna and Alexander Cockburn (1989) *The Fate of the Forest: Developers, Destroyers and Defenders of the Amazon*. New York: Verso.
- Heinrich Böll Foundation (ed.) (2002) 'Managing Sustainability World Bank-Style: An Evaluation of the World Development Report 2003' *World Summit Papers* 19, Heinrich Böll Foundation.
- Helmore, Kristin and Naresh Singh (2001) *Sustainable Livelihoods: Building on the Wealth of the Poor*. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press Inc.
- Hilhorst, Dorothea (2000) *Records and Reputations: Everyday Politics of a Philippine Development NGO*. Wageningen: Wageningen University (unpublished PhD thesis).
- Hobart, Mark (ed.) (1993) *An Anthropological Critique of Development: the Growth of Ignorance*. London: Routledge.
- Hoefle, Scott William (2000) 'Patronage and Empowerment in the Central Amazon' *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 19: 479-499.
- Holdcroft, Lane E. (1984) 'The Rise and Fall of Community Development 1950-1965: A Critical Assessment' in C. K. Eicher and J. M. Staatz (eds.) *Agricultural Development in the Third World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 46-58.
- Holmén, Hans and Magnus Jiström (1994) 'Old Wine in New Bottles? Local Organisations as Panacea for Sustainable Development' in H. Holmén and M. Jiström (eds.) *Ground Level Development: NGOs, Cooperatives, and Local Organisations in the Third World*. Lund: Lund University Press, pp. 7-36.
- Holston, James (1991) 'The Misrule of Law: Land and Usurpation in Brazil' *Comparative Study of Society and History*: 695-725.
- Homma, Alfredo Kingo Oyama (2000a) *Cronologia da Ocupação e Destruição dos Castanhais no Sudeste Paraense*. Belém: Embrapa Amazônia Oriental.
- Homma, Alfredo Kingo Oyama (2000b) 'Public Policies as Inducers of Brazil Nut Trees "Announced Death" in the Southeast of Para State' *Abstract* 00396 for World Congress of Rural Sociology, Rio de Janeiro: UNICAMP/IRSA/SOBER.
- Homma, Alfredo Kingo Oyama (2003) *História da Agricultura na Amazônia: Da Era Pré-Colombiana ao Terceiro Milênio*, Brasília: Embrapa Informação Tecnológica.

- Homma, Alfredo Kingo Oyama (2004) 'Cemitério das Castanheiras' *Ciência Hoje* 34(202): 60-63.
- Homma, Alfredo Kingo Oyama, Rui de Amorim Carvalho, Sandra M. N. Sampaio, Benedito N. Rodrigues da Silva, Luiz Guilherme Teixeira Silva and Myriam C. Cesar de Oliveira (2002) 'A Instabilidade dos Projetos de Assentamentos como Indutora de Desmatamentos no Sudeste Paraense', unpublished paper, Belém: Embrapa Amazônia Oriental.
- Honneth, Axel and Hans Joas (1988) *Social Action and Human Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooper, Michael, Rubab Jafry, Matthew Morolla and Josselin Phan (2004) 'Scaling-up Community Efforts to Reach the MDGs: An Assessment of Experience from the Equator Prize' in *The World Conservation Union* (ed.) *The Millennium Development Goals and Conservation: Managing Nature's Wealth for Society's Health*, IUCN, pp.129-142.
- Hulme, David and Michael Edwards (1997) 'NGOs, States and Donors: An Overview' in D. Hulme and M. Edwards (eds.) *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* London: Macmillan Press Ltd., pp. 3-22.
- Hurrell, Andrew (1991) 'The Politics of Amazonian Deforestation' *Journal of Latin American Studies* 23: 197-215.
- Hyman, E.L. (1996) 'Technology and the Organisation of Production, Processing and Marketing of Non-Timber Forest Products' in M.R. Pérez and J.E.M. Arnold (eds) *Current Issues in Non-Timber Forest Products Research*. Bogor: CIFOR, pp. 197-218.
- Ianni, Octavio (1981 [1978]) *A Luta pela Terra*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes Ltda.
- Ingold, Tim (2000) *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwellings, and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (2005) *Produção da Extração Vegetal e da Silvicultura 2004*. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE.
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (2001) *Censo Demográfico 2000*. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE.
- Instituto de Desenvolvimento Econômico-Social do Pará (1987a) *Pará Agrário 2*. Belém: IDESP.
- Instituto de Desenvolvimento Econômico-Social do Pará (1987b) *Pará Agrário 3*. Belém: IDESP.
- Instituto Nacional de Colonização e Reforma Agraria (2002) *Projetos de Assentamentos no Sul e Sudeste do Pará*. INCRA-Marabá.

- Instituto Nacional de Colonização e Reforma Agraria, Unidade Avançada de São Geraldo do Araguaia (2000) *Relatório Anual 2000*. INCRA/UASGA.
- International Institute for Environment and Development (1994) *Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management*. London: IIED.
- Joas, Hans (1993) *Pragmatism and Social Theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Joas, Hans (1996) *The Creativity of Action*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Joas, Hans and Erkki Kilpinen (2006) 'Creativity and Society' in J. R. Schook and J. Margolis (eds.) *A Companion to Pragmatism*. London: Blackwell, pp. 323-335.
- Jones, Jeffrey R. (1990) *Colonization and Environment: Land Settlement Projects in Central America*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Juma, Calestous and Vanessa Timmer (2003) 'Social Learning and Entrepreneurship: A Framework for Analyzing the Equator Initiative and the 2002 Equator Prize Finalists' *Working Paper* version 5 December 2003, Science, Environment, and Development Group, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Kapferer, Bruce (2006) 'Situations, Crisis, and the Anthropology of the Concrete: The Contribution of Max Gluckman' in T. M. S. Evens and D. Handelman (eds.) *The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 118-155.
- Kapoor, Ilan (2002) 'The Devil's in the Theory: A Critical Assessment of Robert Chambers's Work on Participatory Development' *Third World Quarterly* 23(1): 101-117.
- Keeley, James and Ian Scoones (1999) 'Understanding Environmental Policy Processes: A Review' *IDS Working Paper* 89, Institute of Development Studies.
- Kingsbury, Damien (2004) 'Environment and Development' in D. J. Kingsbury, Remenyi, J. McKay, and J. Hunt (eds.) *Key Issues in Development*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 266-291.
- Kitamura, Paulo Choji (1994) *A Amazônia e o Desenvolvimento Sustentável*. Brasília: Embrapa-SPI.
- Kitamura, Paulo Choji and Carlos Hans Müller (1986) 'A Depredação dos Castanhais Nativos na Região de Marabá' EMBRAPA/CPATU, Simpósio do Trópico Úmido, *Anais* VI, Brasília DF.

- Klooster, Daniel (2000) 'Institutional Choice, Community, and Struggle: A Case Study of Forest Co-Management in Mexico' *World Development* 28(1): 1-20.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin (1981) 'Introduction: The Micro-Sociological Challenge of Macro-Sociology: Towards a Reconstruction of Social Theory and Methodology' in K. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel (eds.) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 1-47.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin (2001) 'Objectual Practice' in T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, and E. von Savigny (eds.) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 175-188.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin and A.V. Cicourel (eds.) (1981) *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- And Macro-Sociologies*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Korten, David C. (1986) 'Introduction: Community-Based Resource Management' in D. C. Korten (ed.) *Community Management: Asian Experience and Perspectives*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press Inc, pp. 1-15.
- Kuper, Adam (1992) 'Introduction' in A. Kuper (ed.) *Conceptualizing Society*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-14.
- Landim, Leilah (2002) 'Múltiplas Identidades das ONGs' in S. Haddad (ed.) *ONGs e Universidades: Desafios para a Cooperação na América Latina*. São Paulo: ABONG, pp. 17-50.
- Latour, Bruno (1986) 'The Powers of Association' in J. Law. (ed.) *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* London: Routledge, pp. 264-280.
- Law, John (1994) *Organizing Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Layder, Derek (1997) *Modern Social Theory: Key Debates and New Directions*. London: UCL Press.
- Leach, Melissa, Robin Mearns and Ian Scoones (1999) 'Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management' *World Development* 27(2): 225-247.
- Leeds, Anthony (1964) 'Brazilian Careers and Social Structure: An Evolutionary Model and Case History' *American Anthropologist* 66(6): 1321-1347.
- Lélé, Sharachchandra M. (1991) 'Sustainable Development: A Critical Review' *World Development* 19(6): 607-621.
- Lehr-Lehnardt, Rana (2005) 'NGO Legitimacy: Reassessing Democracy, Accountability and Transparency' *Cornell Law School Papers Series* 6.
- Li, Tania Murray (1996) 'Images of Community: Discourse and Strategy in Property Relations' *Development and Change* 27: 501-527.

- Li, Tania Murray (2001) 'Boundary Work: Community, Market, and State Reconsidered' in A. Agrawal and C. C. Gibson (eds.) *Communities and the Environment: Ethnicity, Gender, and the State in Community-Based Conservation*, New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, pp. 157-179.
- Lisansky, Judith (1990) *Migrants to Amazonia: Spontaneous Colonization in the Brazilian Frontier*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Lister, Sarah (2003) 'NGO Legitimacy: Technical Issue or Social Construct?' *Critique of Anthropology* 23(2): 175-192.
- Little, Paul E. (1995) 'Ritual, Power, and Ethnography at the Rio Earth Summit' *Critique of Anthropology* 15(3): 265-288.
- Little, Paul E. (2001) *Amazonia: Territorial Struggles on Perennial Frontiers*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Long, Norman (1968) *Social Change and the Individual: A Study of the Social and Religious Responses to Innovation in a Zambian Rural Community*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Long, Norman (1997) 'Agency and Constraint, Perceptions and Practice: A Theoretical Position' in H. de Haan and N. Long (eds.) *Images and Ruralities of Rural Life: Wageningen Perspectives on Rural Transformations*. Assen: Van Gorcum, pp. 1-20.
- Long, Norman (2001) *Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Long, Norman (ed.) (1989) *Encounters at the Interface: A Perspective on Social Discontinuities in Rural Development*. Wageningen: Wageningen Agricultural University.
- Long, Norman and Ann Long (eds.) (1992) *Battlefields of Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Long, Norman and Jan Douwe van der Ploeg (1989) 'Demythologizing Planned Intervention: An Actor Perspective' *Sociologia Ruralis* XXIX(3/4): 226-249.
- Long, Norman and Jan Douwe van der Ploeg (1994) 'Heterogeneity, Actor, and Structure: Towards a Reconstitution of the Concept of Structure' in D. Booth (ed.) *Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice*. Harlow: Longman Ltd., pp. 62-89.
- Long, Norman and Jan Douwe van der Ploeg (1995) 'Reflections on Agency, Ordering the Future and Planning' in G. E. Frerks and J. H. B. den Ouden (eds.) *In Search of the Middle Ground: Essays on the Sociology of Planned*

Development. Department of Sociology, Wageningen Agricultural University, pp. 64-78.

Loveman, Mara (2005) 'The Modern State and the Primitive Accumulation of Symbolic Power' *The American Journal of Sociology* 110(6): 1651-1683.

Mallaby, Sebastian (2004) *The World's Banker: A Story of Failed States, Financial Crises, and the Wealth and Poverty of Nations*. New York: The Penguin Press.

Mancin, Rinaldo César (2001) *Estado e Sociedade na Busca do Desenvolvimento Sustentável em Projetos Demonstrativos*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília (unpublished master's thesis).

Manshard, Walther and William B. Morgan (eds.) (1988) *Agricultural Expansion and Pioneer Settlements in the Humid Tropics*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Marcus, George (1995) 'Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.

Marshall, E., A. C. Newton and K. Schreckenber (2003) 'Commercialisation of Non-Timber Forest Products: First Steps in Analyzing the Factors Influencing Success' *International Forestry Review* 5(2): 128 - 137.

Mattos, Virgínia (1996) *História de Marabá*, Marabá: Grafil.

Mayhew, Susan (2004) *A Dictionary of Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGowan, John (1998) 'Toward a Pragmatist Theory of Action' *Sociological Theory* 16(3): 292-297.

Meggors, Betty J. (1996 [1971]) *Amazonia: Man and Culture in a Counterfeit Paradise*, revised edition. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Mehta, Lyla, Melissa Leach, Peter Newell, Ian Scoones, K. Sivaramakrishnan and Sally-Anne Way (1999) 'Exploring Understandings of Institutions and Uncertainty: New Directions in Natural Resource Management' *IDS Discussion Paper 372*, Institute of Development Studies.

Mendes, Carlos (2005) 'Dez Mil Castanheiras Derrubadas no Sul do Pará' *Estadao*, 20 July 2005.

Merrill, Francis E. (1948) 'The Study of Social Problems' *The American Sociological Review* 13(3): 251-259.

Midgley, James (1986) 'Community Participation: History, Concepts and Controversies' in J. Midgley (ed.) *Community Participation, Social Development and the State*. London: Methuen.

Midgley, James (2003) 'Social Development: The Intellectual Heritage' *Journal of International Development* 15: 831-844.

- Ministry of Environment and PPG7 (eds.) (2002) *Negócios para a Amazônia Sustentável*. Brasília: MMA.
- Ministry of National Integration (2004) *O Brasil na Era do Desenvolvimento Sustentável: Crescimento, Emprego, Inclusão Social, e Democracia: Este É o Novo Brasil*, Brasília: Ministry of National Integration.
- Mintzberg, Henry (2006) 'Developing Leaders? Developing Countries?' *Development in Practice* 16(1): 4-14.
- Miranda, Alcir Gursen de (1988) *A Figura Jurídica do Posseiro*. Belém: Edições CEJUP.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde (1969) *Social Networks in Urban Situations: Analyses of Personal Relationships in Central African Towns*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde (1983) 'Case and Situation Analysis' *Sociological Review* 31: 187-211.
- Mol, Arthur (2001) *Globalization and Environmental Reform: The Ecological Modernization of the Global Economy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Monteiro, Maurílio de Abreu (2004) 'Siderurgia na Amazônia Oriental Brasileira e a Pressão sobre a Floresta Primária', paper presented at 2nd Conference of Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Ambiente e Sociedade. Campinas: UNICAMP.
- Monteiro, João Brasil (2001) *O Castanheiro*. Marabá: Unknown publisher.
- Moore, Sally Falk (1998) 'Changing African Land Tenure: Reflections on the Incapacities of the State' *The European Journal of Development Research* 10(2): 33-49.
- Moore, Sally Falk (2000[1978]) *Law as Process: An Anthropological Approach*. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.
- Moore, Sally Falk (2005) 'General Introduction' in S. F. Moore (ed.) *Law and Anthropology: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 1-4.
- Moran, Emilio F. (1981) *Developing the Amazon*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Moran, Emilio F. (ed.) (1983) *The Dilemma of Amazonian Development*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Moran, Emilio F. (ed.) (1990) *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology: From Concept to Practice*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Mori, Scott A. (1992) 'The Brazil Nut Industry: Past, Present and Future' in M. Plotkin and L. Famorale (eds.) *Sustainable Harvest and Marketing of Rainforest Products*. Washington D. C.: Island Press, pp. 241-251.

- Moser, Caroline (2005) 'Rights, Power, and Poverty Reduction' in R. Alsop (ed.) *Power, Rights, and Poverty: Concepts and Connections*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank, pp. 29-50.
- Moser, Caroline and Andy Norton (2001) *To Claim Our Rights: Livelihood Security, Human Rights and Sustainable Development*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Mosse, David (1997) 'The Symbolic Making of a Common Property Resource: History, Ecology and Locality in a Tank-Irrigated Landscape in South India' *Development and Change* 28: 467-504.
- Mosse, David (2006) 'Anti-Social Anthropology? Objectivity, Objection, and the Ethnography of Public Policy and Professional Communities' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12: 935-956.
- Motta, Márcia Maria Menendes (2001) 'A Grilagem como Legado' in M. M. M. Motta and T. L. Pinheiro (eds.) *Voluntariado e Universo Rural*. Rio de Janeiro: Vicio de Leitura, pp. 16-28.
- Nagaishi, Goro, Lionel Bardin, and Marco A. S. Cardoso (1999) *Estratégias de Comercialização para a Agricultura Familiar no Pará*. Belém: FUNTEC.
- Neefjes, Koos (2000) *Environment and Livelihoods: Strategies for Sustainability*. Oxford: Oxfam Publishing.
- New Economics Foundation (2005) 'Behavioural Economics: Seven Principles for Policy Makers' *Theoretical New Economics* 1, London: New Economics Foundation.
- Nishizawa, Toshie and Juha I. Uitto (eds.) (1995) *The Fragile Tropics of Latin America: Sustainable Management of Changing Environments*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Norder, Luiz Antonio Cabello (2004) *Políticas de Assentamento e Localidade: Os Desafios da Reconstituição do Trabalho Rural no Brasil*. Wageningen: Wageningen University (unpublished PhD thesis).
- Nugent, Stephen (1993) *Amazon Caboclo Society: An Essay on Invisibility and Peasant Economy*. Providence: Berg.
- Nugent, Stephen (2003) 'Ecologism as an Idiom in Amazonian Anthropology' in D. G. Anderson and E. Berglund (eds.) *Ethnographies of Conservation: Environmentalism and the Distribution of Privilege*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 189-204.
- Nugent, Stephen and Mark Harris (eds.) (2004) *Some Other Amazonians: Perspectives on Modern Amazonia*. Washington D. C.: Brookings Institution Press.

- Nuijten, Monique (1992) 'Local Organization as Organizing Practices: Rethinking Rural Institutions' in N. Long and A. Long (eds.) (1992) *Battlefields of Knowledge: the Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 189-207.
- Nyamu-Musembi, Celestine and Andrea Cornwall (2004) 'What is the "Rights-based Approach" All About? Perspectives from International Development Agencies' *IDS Working Paper 234*, Institute of Development Studies.
- Nygren, Anja (2000) 'Development Discourses and Peasant-Forest Relations: Natural Resource Utilization as Social Process' *Development and Change* 31: 11-34.
- Nygren, Anja (2003) 'Nature as Contested Terrain: Conflicts over Wilderness Protection and Local Livelihoods in Río San Juan, Nicaragua' in D. G. Anderson and E. Berglund (eds.) *Ethnographies of Conservation: Environmentalism and the Distribution of Privilege*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 33-49.
- Oakley, Peter (1998) 'Review Article: Community Development in the Third World in the 1990s' *Community Development Journal* 33(4): 365-376.
- Oliveira, Nelson Pinto de, C. M. Oliveira and C. C. Ribeiro (1998) 'Development without Destruction: A Directive Sustainable Development in Pará' in D. E. Leihner and T. A. Mitshein (eds.) *A Third Millennium for Humanity? The Search for Paths of Sustainable Development*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 253-264.
- Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre (2005) *Anthropology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change*. London: Zed Books.
- Ortiz, Sutti (1970) 'The "Human Factor" in Social Planning in Latin America' in R. Apthorpe (ed.) *People Planning and Development Studies: Some Reflections on Social Planning*. London: Frank Cass and Company, pp. 152-162.
- Ortner, Sherry B. (1984) 'Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26(1): 126-166.
- Ostrom, Eleanor (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, Eleanor (2005) *Understanding Institutional Diversity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Otsuki, Kei (2001) *Community and Sustainable Development on the Amazon Frontier: A Case of Novo Paraíso in Southern Pará State, Brazil*, Tokyo: The University of Tokyo (unpublished master's thesis).

- Otsuki, Kei (2003) 'A Case Study of Land Property Concentration on the Brazilian Eastern Amazon Frontier in the 1990s' *Japanese Journal of Tropical Agriculture* 47(3): 155-161.
- Overseas Development Institute (1999) 'What Can We Do with a Rights-based Approach to Development?' *Briefing Paper* 3.
- Ozório de Almeida, Anna L. and J. S. Campari (1995) *Sustainable Settlement in the Brazilian Amazon*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, Eugene P. (ed.) (1985) *The Amazon Caboclo: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. *Studies in Third World Societies* 32, Williamsburg: College of William and Mary.
- Parkin, David (1995) 'Latticed Knowledge: Eradication and Dispersal of the Unpalatable in Islam, Medicine and Anthropological Theory' in R. Fardon (ed.) *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, pp143-163.
- Pearce, David, Anil Markandya and Edward B. Barbier (1989) *Blueprint for a Green Economy*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Peet, Richard and Michael Watts (1993) 'Introduction: Development Theory and Environment in an Age of Market Triumphalism' *Economic Geography* 69(3): 227-253.
- Perz, Stephen (2001) 'The Changing Social Contexts of Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon' *Social Science Quarterly* 83(1): 35-52.
- Perz, Stephen (2004) 'Are Agricultural Production and Forest Conservation Compatible? Agricultural Diversity, Agricultural Incomes, and Primary Forest Cover among Small Farm Colonists in the Amazon' *World Development* 32(6), 957-977.
- Petit, Pere (2003) *Chão de Promessas: Elites Políticas e Transformações Econômicas no Estado do Pará Pós-1964*. Belém: Editora Paka-Tatu Ltda.
- Petras, James (1998) 'The Political and Social Basis of Regional Variation in Land Occupations in Brazil' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 25(4): 124-133.
- Picard, Jacky (1994) 'O Clientelismo nas Colônias Agrícolas do Sudeste do Pará' in M. A. D'Incao and I. M. da Silveira (eds.) *A Amazônia e a Crise da Modernização*. Belém: Muesu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, pp. 279-299.
- Pichón, F. J. and J. E. Uquillas (1999) *Traditional and Modern Resource Management in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Pimbert, Michel (2004) *Institutionalising Participation and People-Centred Processes in Natural Resource Management: Research and Publications Highlights*. Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme, IIED/IDS.

- Pinto, Lucio Flavio (2005) 'Internacionalisar ou Nacionalisar: Dilemma' *Jornal Pessoal* 17 March 2005, online edition (www.amazonia.org.br/opiniaio/artigo_detail.cfm?id=152419).
- Ploeg, Jan Douwe van der (1993) 'Potatoes and Knowledge' in M. Hobart (ed.) *An Anthropological Critique of Development: the Growth of Ignorance*. London: Routledge, pp. 209-227.
- Ploeg, Jan Douwe van der (1996) *Labour, Markets, and Agricultural Production*. Wageningen: Circle for Rural European Studies.
- Ploeg, Jan Douwe van der (2003) *The Virtual Farmer: Past, Present and Future of the Dutch Peasantry*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Plummer, Ken (1983) *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problems and Literature of a Humanistic Method*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Polanyi, Michael (1958) *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Posey, Darrell and William Balée (eds.) (1989) *Resource Management in Amazonia: Indigenous and Folk Strategies*. New York: New York Botanical Garden.
- Pottier, Johan (2003) 'Negotiating Local Knowledge: An Introduction' in J. Pottier, A. Bicker and P. Sillitoe (eds.) *Negotiating Local Knowledge: Power and Identity in Development*. London: Pluto Press, pp. 1-29.
- Rabinow, Paul (1992) 'A Modern Tour in Brazil' in S. Lash and J. Friedman (eds.) *Modernity and Self Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 248-264.
- Redclift, Michael (1987) *Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions*. London: Mathuen.
- Reis, Elisa P. and Mick Moore (2005) *Elite Perceptions of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Zed Books.
- Reis, Eustáquio J. (2001) 'Os Impactos do Pólo Siderúrgico de Carajás no Desflorestamento da Amazônia Brasileira' *Parcerias Estratégicas* 12, Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada.
- Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins and Paul E. Little (1996) 'Neo-Liberal Reciptes, Environmental Cooks: The Transformation of Amazonian Agency' *Série Antopologia* 213, Universidade de Brasília.
- Richards, Paul (1992) 'Saving the Rainforest? Contested Futures in Conservation' in S. Wallman (ed.) *Contemporary Futures: Perspectives from Social Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp. 138-153.

- Rocha, Sonia (2001) 'Applying Minimum Income Programs in Brazil: Two Case Studies: Belém and Belo Horizonte' *Texto para Discussão 746*, Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada.
- Röling, Niels (1988) *Extension Science: Information Systems in Agricultural Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ros-Tonen, M.A.F. and F. K. Wiersum (2003) *The Importance of Non-Timber Forest Products for Forest-Based Rural Livelihoods: An Evolving Research Agenda*. Amsterdam: AGIDS/UvA.
- Rowlett, Russ (2000) *How Many? A Dictionary of Units of Measurement*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina.
- Sachs, Wolfgang (2003 [1992]) 'Environment' in W. Sachs (ed.) *Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books, pp. 26-37.
- Sampaio, Sandra M. N., Watrin, O. S. and Venturieri, A. (1997) 'Alterações e Dinâmica na Cobertura Vegetal e no Uso da Terra do Polígono dos Castanhais no Sudeste Paraense', unpublished paper, Belém: Embrapa Amazônia Oriental.
- Schatzki, Theodore R. (1996) *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schatzki, Theodore R. (2001) 'Introduction: Practice Theory' in T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, and E. von Savigny (eds.) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-14.
- Schatzki, Theodore R. (2005) 'The Sites of Organizations' *Organization Studies* 26(3): 465-484.
- Schmink, Marianne and Charles Wood (1987) 'The "Political Ecology" of Amazonia' in P. E. Little, M.M. Horowitz, and A. E. Nyerges (eds.) *Lands at Risk in the Third World: Local-Level Perspectives*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 38-57.
- Schmink, Marianne and C. H. Wood (1992) *Contested Frontiers in Amazonia*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schmink, Marianne and Charles Wood (eds.) (1984) *Frontier Expansion in Amazonia*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Schneider, Robert R. (1995) 'Government and the Economy on the Amazon Frontier' *World Bank Environment Paper* 11.
- Schutz, Alfred (1964) *Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Scoones, Ian (1998) 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis' *IDS Working Paper 72*, Institute of Development Studies.

- Scott, James C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scudder, Thayer (1991) 'A Sociological Framework for the Analysis of New Land Settlements' in M. Cernea (ed.) *Putting People First*, expanded second edition. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 148-187.
- Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Florestas (2005) *Plano de Controle e Prevenção ao Desmatamento*. Brasília: Ministry of Environment.
- Secretaria Executiva de Transporte do Pará (2005) *Principais Rodovias do Pará*. Belém: SETRAN.
- Sen, Amartya (1981) *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya (1990) 'Food Economics and Entitlements' in C. K. Eicher and J. M. Staatz (eds.) *Agricultural Development in the Third World*, second edition, pp. 189-205.
- Sewell, William H. (1992) 'A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation' *The American Journal of Sociology* 98(1): 1-29.
- Sharma, Bhavna (2006) *Contemporary Forms of Slavery in Brazil*. Anti-Slavery International.
- Shirley, Robert W. (1979) 'Law in Rural Brazil' in M. L. Margolis and W. E. Carter (eds.) *Brazil: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 343-361.
- Sillitoe, Paul (1998) 'The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New Applied Anthropology' *Current Anthropology* 39(2): 223-252.
- Sillitoe, Paul (ed.) (2007) *Local Science vs Global Science*. Oxford: Berg.
- Silva, Valtuir Moreira da (2005) 'Posseiros do Córrego da Onça: Luta e Resistência em Itapuranga - 1970-1980' *Revista de História Regional* 10(1): 131-153.
- Simmel, Georg (1964 [1955]) *Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Singh, Naresh and Vangile Titi (eds.) (1995) *Empowerment for Sustainable Development: Toward Operational Strategies*. London: Zed Books.
- Slater, Candace (2003) 'Fire in El Dorado, or Images of Tropical Nature and Their Practical Effects' in C. Slater (ed.) *In Search of the Rain Forest*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 41-68.
- Smith, Nigel J. H., Emanuel Adilson S. Serrão, Paulo T. Alvim and Italo C. Falesi. (1995) *Amazonia: Resiliency and Dynamism of the Land and its People*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

- Smith, Nigel J. H., Jean Dubois, Dean Current, Ernst Lutz and Charles Clement (1998) *Agroforestry Experiences in the Brazilian Amazon: Constraints and Opportunities*. Brasília: The World Bank, Rainforest Unit.
- Sponsel, Leslie E., Robert C. Bailey and Thomas N. Headland (1996) 'Anthropological Perspectives on the Causes, Consequences, and Solutions of Deforestation' in L. E. Sponsel, T. N. Headland and R. C. Bailey (eds.) *Tropical Deforestation: The Human Dimension*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 3-52.
- Sternberg, Hilgard O. (1973) 'Development and Conservation' *Reprint Paper 447*, Centre for Latin American Studies, University of California.
- Strathern, Marilyn (1987) 'Out of Context' *Current Anthropology* 28(3): 251-281.
- Strathern, Marilyn (1988) 'Commentary: Concrete Topographies' *Cultural Anthropology* 3(1): 88-96.
- Strathern, Marilyn (1992) 'Parts and Wholes: Refiguring Relationships in a Post-Plural World' in A. Kuper (ed.) *Conceptualizing Society*. London: Routledge, pp. 75-104.
- Tendler, Judith (1997) *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thayer, Horace Standish (1973) *Meaning and Action: A Study of American Pragmatism*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Touraine, Alain (1988) *Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Townsend, Janet Gabriel (1995) *Women's Voices from the Rainforest*. London: Routledge.
- Turner, Ralph H. and Lewis M. Killian (1972) *Collective Behavior*, second edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Turner, Victor (1970[1969]) *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, second edition. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Turner, Victor (1975) 'Symbolic Studies' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 4: 145-161.
- Tyler, Stephen (1986) 'Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document' in J. Clifford and G. E. Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 122-140.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2003) *How to Make a Business Plan?* Geneva: UNCTAD.

- Uvin, Peter, Pankaj S. Jain and L. David Brown (2000) 'Think Large, Act Small: Toward a New Paradigm for NGO Scaling-Up' *World Development* 28(8): 1409-1419.
- Velsen, J. van (1967) 'The Extended-Case Method and Situational Analysis' in A. L. Epstein (ed.) *The Craft of Social Anthropology*. London: Tavistock, pp. 129-149.
- Verner, Dorte (2004) 'Poverty in the Brazilian Amazon: An Assessment of Poverty Focused on the State of Pará' *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 3357.
- Villarreal, Magdalena (1992) 'The Poverty of Practice: Power, Gender and Intervention from an Actor-Oriented Perspective' in N. Long and A. Long (eds.) (1992) *Battlefields of Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 247-267.
- Vogel, Ann (2006) 'Who's Making Global Civil Society: Philanthropy and US Empire in World Society' *The British Journal of Sociology* 57(4): 635-655.
- Wacquant, Loïc J. D. (1992) 'Toward a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology' in P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant (eds.) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, London: Blackwell, pp. 1-59.
- Wagley, Charles (1953) *Amazon Town: A Study of Man in the Tropics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wales, Jane (2005) 'Foreword' *Proceedings, The Third Annual Conference on Borderless Giving, Global Philanthropy Forum*, ii-v.
- Wallman, Sandra (1984) *Eight London Households*. London: Tavistock.
- Warner III, P.D. and A. C. Pontual (1997) *Manual de Comercialização de Produtos Florestais*. Brasília: Genesys.
- Warren, Roland L. (1970) 'The Context of Community Development' in L. J. Cary (ed.) *Community Development as a Process*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, pp. 32-52.
- Weinstein, Barbara (1983) *The Amazon Rubber Boom 1850-1920*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wendl, Tobias and Michael Röster (1999) 'Introduction: Frontiers and Borderlands: The Rise and Relevance of an Anthropological Research Genre' in M. Rösler and T. Wendl (eds.) *Frontiers and Borderlands: Anthropological Perspectives*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 1-27.
- White, Sarah C. (1996) 'Depoliticising Development: The Uses and Abuses of Participation' *Development in Practice* 6(1): 6-15.

- Wileden, Arthur F. (1970) *Community Development: The Dynamics of Planned Change*. Totowa: The Bedminister Press.
- The World Bank (1992) *World Development Report 1992: Development and Environment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- The World Bank (2002) *World Development Report 2003: Sustainable Development in a Dynamic World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Resources Institute and Amazon Institute of People and the Environment (2006) *Human Pressure on the Brazilian Amazon Forests*. Belém: Gráfica e Editora Alves.
- Wrong, Dennis H. (1961) 'The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology' *American Sociological Review* 26(2): 183-193.
- Wunder, Sven (2001) 'Poverty Alleviation and Tropical Forests: What Scope for Synergies?' *World Development* 29(11): 1817-1833.
- Yamada, Masaaki (1999) *Agroforestry Experience of Japanese Immigrants in Tomé-Açu, Pará, Brazil*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press (unpublished PhD thesis).
- Yearly, Steven (1992) 'Green Ambivalence about Science: Legal-Rational Authority and the Scientific Legitimation of a Social Movement' *The British Journal of Sociology* 43(4): 511-532.
- Zimmermann, Augusto (2004) 'Brazil's Parallel Society: Where Outlaws are the Law' *Brazzil Magazine* November 2004 (www.brazzil.com/content/view/8870/51/).

Newspaper Articles

Folha de São Paulo, 3 November 2004

O Liberal, 19 June 2002

O Liberal, 12 April 2003

O Liberal, 14 June 2004

Summary

Paradise in a Brazil Nut Cemetery: Sustainability Discourses and Social Action in Pará, the Brazilian Amazon

The concept of sustainable development has shaped development policies in the Brazilian Amazon since the 1990s. Both academic and policy debates on sustainable development focus on the question of 'how to curb deforestation' in the Amazon; this has led to the development of various natural resource management (NRM) strategies. Yet, the deforestation rate remains high, and some key issues concerning sustainable development and its efficacy in the Amazon are insufficiently explored. This thesis aims to consider deforestation as a social process and to address the importance of focusing on human agency of the inhabitants of the Brazilian Amazon and their social practices in analysing and engaging with sustainable development processes.

The thesis is the product of ethnographic fieldwork and the researcher's experience as a development worker in the state of Pará, situated in the eastern part of the Brazilian Amazon. This practical engagement led the researcher to analyse the social life of settlers in a settlement project called Grotão dos Caboclos in the southeast of Pará. Case studies explore how settlers' flexibly identify with their 'community', formal organisations and different social groups in relation to the natural environment and government and non-government development interventions. These processes are analysed through observation and accounts of the settlers' life histories, their everyday practices, and the arrangement of individual actions within different localities. These accounts serve to elucidate the changeable nature of collective action and social, economic and political fields in the settlement project. This leads to a review and discussion on NRM models that are underpinned by sustainable development discourses. It is discussed that the current focus on institutions in NRM significantly retains the complexity and fluidity of 'community' to the NRM debate whilst it continues to grapple with understanding moving social field and variable community boundaries. Referring to case studies in Grotão, the thesis describes community institutions designed for NRM as founded on changeable processes, which cannot be analytically separated from the human agency of settlers in the Amazon and the multiple social and political spaces they create in the forest.

The thesis conceptualises the natural environment as 'landscape' in reference to the way that settlers' practices shape social and political spaces and serve to localise development interventions. These practices indicate 'counter-tendencies', a set of actions that run 'counter to what development experts assume to be optional' (Arce and Long 2000: 182). In Chapter 2, I introduce theories of practice developed by Giddens and Bourdieu as a theoretical basis for understanding counter-tendencies that influence landscape change in the Brazilian Amazon.

Chapter 3 discusses methodological issues involved in investigating non-established community situations and 'multi-sited' development policy processes. In this thesis, I have mainly followed social situations that illustrate natural of moving social field of the settlers. Chapter 4 further explores social and political characteristics of the settlement of Grotão as a social field that represents the moving and changing social associations that settlers hold with reference to larger societal and historical contexts. The analytical concepts of 'social domain' and 'arena' are introduced to specify areas of the settlers' social life in their social field.

Chapters 5 and 6 demonstrate social events that characterise the social field of Grotão, which empirically includes the Fazenda Bamerindus and the region of Rio Preto, nearly 300 km from Grotão. While previous studies identify the process of the settlers' movements as 'frontier expansion', this thesis tries to grasp the process as a 'moving social field' in which the settlers reshape social practices that work to localise and modify the intended goals of development policies and projects.

The cases shown in these chapters illustrate a local style of development and local politics and power struggles that are closely linked to landscape change and development interventions. This leads Chapter 6 to focus on interface situations in which actors' knowledge processes are described. The settlers' knowledge processes individualise their collective arrangements, and the individualisation is often described by government officials and NGO workers as 'disorganised' or 'disorganisation'. Disorganisation has a negative connotation, especially for implementing NRM models, which entail well-planned systems to institutionalise natural resource use on the ground. This thesis suggests that the settlers have their own rationalities of organising themselves and resource uses and we, namely development experts and social researchers, need to shift the emphasis away from how to get institutions right

for NRM to how to incorporate these diverse collective arrangements into policy debates.

In Chapter 7, I show a production chain model developed by a local NGO in Pará to elucidate the process of justification of a particular NRM model even when it does not properly represent the local reality. Here, I outline my own experience as a NGO expert who presents the model at a global level. Through my own interactions with international development experts, I strengthen my understanding of the boundaries of epistemic communities in international development, which are increasingly blurred when generating sustainable development discourses and NRM models.

The general conclusion of this thesis is that the forest in the Brazilian Amazon should not be considered as a 'structure' that determines how the inhabitants act. Thus the conclusion in Chapter 8 considers the importance of focusing on human agency in relation to a structural understanding of the forest and its people, as promoted by development workers and conservationists. In this regard the thesis demonstrates that the Amazonian forest is a process and its conservation must include an understanding of the social development of its inhabitants. Methodologically, the thesis suggests that we need to take an actor-oriented perspective to grasp different modalities of social relationships and counter-tendencies. Theoretically, it shows the importance of focusing on an analytical site of the 'social', which is heuristically bounded by actors' social practices and the arrangement of individuals' actions with others. By focusing on the social, the thesis reveals the complexity of social forms, which becomes apparent and yet often misrepresented or oversimplified in sustainable development policy and project processes.

As to policy concerns, this thesis argues that we need to move away from ideological debates on 'how to conserve the Amazon rainforest' to empirically-informed debate on the significance of social development for the people who live in the Amazon. Most NRM strategies applied to the Amazon cannot be successful without involving local actors, whereas there are few attempts that truly try to grasp the complex social processes that relate these actors to the forest. In this respect social researchers have a significant contribution to make to an elaboration of socially-oriented approaches to sustainable development in the Brazilian Amazon.

Samenvatting

Paradijs in een Braziliaanse Notenbegraafplaats: Duurzaamheids-Discourses en Sociale Actie in Pará, Braziliaanse Amazone

Het concept “duurzame ontwikkeling” heeft sinds de jaren ‘90 het ontwikkelingsbeleid in de Braziliaanse Amazone vorm gegeven. Zowel academische als beleidsdebatten over duurzame ontwikkeling richten zich op de vraag ‘hoe ontbossing tegen te gaan’ in het Amazonegebied; Dit heeft geleid tot de ontwikkeling van verschillende strategieën van management van natuurlijke hulpbronnen (NRM strategieën). Desondanks blijft de ontbossingsgraad hoog, en enkele centrale kwesties betreffende duurzame ontwikkeling en de effectiviteit daarvan in het Amazonegebied zijn onvoldoende verkend. Dit boek tracht ontbossing te zien als een sociaal proces. Het handelen van de inwoners van het Braziliaanse Amazonegebied wordt centraal gesteld in het analyseren van processen van duurzame ontwikkeling.

Dit boek is het product van etnografisch veldwerk als ook van de ervaringen van de onderzoeker in haar functie als ontwikkelingswerker in de staat Pará, gelegen in het oostelijke deel van het Braziliaanse Amazonegebied. Deze praktische betrokkenheid heeft ertoe geleid dat de onderzoeker het sociale leven van kolonisten in een vestigingsproject genaamd Grotão dos Caboclos in het zuidoosten van Pará heeft kunnen onderzoeken. Case studies verkennen hoe kolonisten zich flexibel identificeren met hun gemeenschap, maar ook met formele organisaties en verschillende sociale groepen in relatie tot het natuurlijke milieu en ontwikkelingsinterventies van overheid en niet-overheid. Deze identificatieprocessen zijn geanalyseerd door middel van observatie van het alledaagse handelen en individuele arrangementen in verschillende lokaliteiten als ook door de reconstructie van levensgeschiedenissen. De aldus verkregen verhalen dienen om inzicht te geven in de veranderlijke aard van collectieve actie en vooral ook van de sociale, economische en politieke velden in het vestigingsproject. Dit leidt tot een herziening van en discussie over NRM modellen die gestoeld zijn op geïnstitutionaliseerde uitzettingen over duurzame ontwikkeling. Er wordt beargumenteerd dat er, met de huidige focus voor instituties in NRM debatten, weliswaar méér aandacht is voor de complexiteit en fluïditeit van de

'gemeenschap'. Dezelfde debatten worstelen echter nog steeds met het begrijpen van verschuivende sociale velden en variabele gemeenschapsgrenzen. Verwijzend naar case studies in Grotão, beschrijft dit boek de gemeenschapsinstituties voor NRM als, in essentie, gebaseerd op veranderende processen, die analytisch niet gescheiden kunnen worden van de 'agency' van *settlers* in de Amazone en van de meervoudige sociale en politieke ruimtes die zij creëren in het bos.

Dit boek conceptualiseert de natuurlijke omgeving als 'landschap'. Daarbij gaat bijzondere aandacht uit naar de wijze waarop praktijken van *settlers* sociale en politieke ruimten creëren, waarbinnen uiteenlopende ontwikkelingsinterventies kunnen worden gelokaliseerd. Deze praktijken wijzen op '*counter-tendencies*', i.e. het geheel van acties dat 'ingaat tegen datgene wat ontwikkelingsdeskundigen als optimaal veronderstellen' (Arce and Long 2000: 182). In hoofdstuk 2 introduceer ik praktijktheorieën ontwikkeld door Giddens en Bourdieu als een theoretische basis voor het begrijpen van *counter-tendencies* die landschapsverandering in de Braziliaanse Amazone beïnvloeden.

Hoofdstuk 3 bespreekt zaken van methodologische aard, die van belang zijn bij een onderzoek naar *non-established* situaties in een gemeenschap en '*multi-sited*' ontwikkelingsbeleidsprocessen. In dit boek heb ik vooral sociale situaties gevolgd die de natuur van het bewegende sociale veld van de *settlers* illustreren. Hoofdstuk 4 verkent de sociale en politieke eigenschappen van de nederzetting Grotão als een sociaal veld dat de bewegende en veranderende sociale associaties die *settlers* onderhouden met betrekking tot de grotere maatschappelijke en historische context representeert. De analytische concepten 'sociaal domein' en 'arena' worden geïntroduceerd om onderdelen van het sociale leven van de *settlers* te specificeren binnen hun sociale veld.

Hoofdstuk 5 en 6 tonen sociale gebeurtenissen (*social events*) die karakteristiek zijn voor het sociale veld van Grotão dat, empirisch gezien, de Fazenda Bamerindus en de regio van de Rio Preto, bijna 300 km van Grotão, omvat. Waar eerdere studies het proces van de bewegingen van *settlers* identificeren als 'grensuitbreiding', probeert dit boek het proces te begrijpen als een 'bewegend sociaal veld'. Binnen dit veld geven de *settlers* nieuwe vormen aan sociale praktijken die de geplande doelen van ontwikkelingsprocessen en -projecten lokaliseren en wijzigen.

De in deze hoofdstukken gegeven casussen illustreren een lokale ontwikkelingsstijl en vormen van lokale politiek en machtsstrijd die nauw

gerelateerd zijn aan landschapsverandering en ontwikkelingsinterventies. Dit maakt dat hoofdstuk 6 zich richt op *interface* situaties waarin de kennisprocessen van actoren worden beschreven. De kennisprocessen van *settlers* individualiseren hun collectieve *arrangementen*. Deze individualisering wordt door ambtenaren en NGO-medewerkers vaak omschreven als 'ongeorganiseerd'. 'Ongeorganiseerd' heeft een negatieve connotatie, in het bijzonder voor het implementeren van NRM modellen die goed geplande systemen veronderstellen om het gebruik van natuurlijke hulpbronnen aan de basis te institutionaliseren. Dit boek suggereert dat de *settlers* hun eigen rationaliteiten hebben om zichzelf en het gebruik van hulpbronnen te organiseren en dat wij, ontwikkelingsexperts en sociale wetenschappers, onze aandacht moeten verplaatsen ván het institutionaliseren van NRM náár het incorporeren van deze gevarieerde collectieve *arrangementen* in beleidsdebatten.

In hoofdstuk 7 bespreek ik een ketenmodel dat is ontwikkeld door een lokale NGO in Pará. Met dit model werd gepoogd een specifiek NRM arrangement te rechtvaardigen dat nauwelijks of zelfs geheel niet overeenstemt met de lokale realiteit. Hier geef ik mijn eigen ervaringen weer als een NGO expert die het model presenteert op globaal niveau. Door mijn eigen interacties met internationale ontwikkelingsdeskundigen kon ik mijn begrip van epistemische gemeenschappen in internationale ontwikkeling verdiepen. Deze gemeenschappen vertroebelen in toenemende mate de *discourses* van duurzame ontwikkeling en NRM die ze mede genereren.

De algemene conclusie van dit boek is dat het bos in de Braziliaanse Amazone niet als een 'structuur' gezien zou moeten worden die bepaalt hoe de bewoners handelen. Hoofdstuk 8 behandelt dan ook het belang van een focus op 'agency' in relatie tot het structuralistische begrip van het woud en haar mensen, dat gemeengoed is onder ontwikkelingswerkers en natuurbeschermers. Vanuit dit perspectief laat deze thesis zien dat het woud in de Amazone een proces is en dat pogingen om dit woud te behouden ook een begrip van de sociale positie en ontwikkeling van haar bewoners moet omvatten. In methodologisch oogpunt suggereert deze these derhalve de noodzaak van een actor oriented approach voor het begrijpen van uiteenlopende sociale relaties en *counter tendencies*.

Theoretisch laat dit boek het belang zien van een analytische focus op het 'sociale', dat in heuristisch opzicht wordt opgespannen door de sociale handelingen van de actoren en de *arrangementen* van individuele actie met

anderen. Door op het sociale te focussen, laat dit boek de complexiteit van sociale relaties en vormen zien, die in het ontwikkelingsbeleid toch te vaak verkeerd en te simplistisch worden voorgesteld. Wat het beleid betreft, stelt dit onderzoek dat we ad moeten van ideologisch georiënteerde debatten over 'hoe we het regenwoud moeten behouden'. Het is van groot belang dat we ons gaan baseren op een empirisch geïnformeerde theorie over het belang van de sociale ontwikkelingen voor de mensen die in de Amazone leven. De meeste NRM strategieën die worden toegepast in de Amazone kunnen niet succesvol worden zonder de lokale actoren erbij te betrekken. Tegelijkertijd worden er weinig pogingen ondernomen om de complexe sociale processen te begrijpen die deze actoren verbinden en vervlechten met het regenwoud. Zo gezien moeten onderzoekers een belangrijke bijdrage leveren aan de uitbreiding van sociaal gerichte benaderingen voor duurzame ontwikkeling in de Braziliaanse Amazone.

Sumário

Paraíso no Cemitério das Castanheiras: Discursos sobre Sustentabilidade e Ação Social no Estado do Pará na Amazônia Brasileira

O conceito de desenvolvimento sustentável tem norteado políticas de desenvolvimento na Amazônia Brasileira desde os anos 90. Tanto os debates acadêmicos como políticos sobre desenvolvimento sustentável enfatizam questões relativas a “como reduzir o desmatamento” na Amazônia; isso tem levado ao desenvolvimento de várias estratégias de gestão de recursos naturais. A taxa de desmatamento permanece elevada – e certos elementos-chave relativos ao desenvolvimento sustentável e sua eficácia na Amazônia permanecem insuficientemente analisados. Esta tese procura considerar o desmatamento como um processo social e ressalta a importância de se focalizar a atuação dos habitantes da Amazônia e suas práticas sociais; também analisa o processo de desenvolvimento sustentável e nele se engaja.

A tese é produto de uma pesquisa etnográfica e da experiência da pesquisadora como agente de desenvolvimento no Estado Pará, situado na porção leste da Amazônia. O engajamento prático levou à análise da vida social dos assentados em um projeto de assentamento chamado Grotão dos Caboclos, no sudeste do Pará. Os estudos de caso exploram como os assentados flexibilizam suas identidades com as ‘comunidades’, organizações formais e diferentes grupos sociais relacionados ao meio ambiente e ao desenvolvimento de intervenções governamentais e não-governamentais. Este processo é analisado através de observações e da narrativa da história de vida dos assentados, de suas práticas cotidianas e do arranjo de ações individuais em diferentes localidades. As narrativas contribuem para elucidar a natureza mutável da ação coletiva nos campos social, econômico e político no projeto de assentamento, o que leva a uma revisão e a uma discussão sobre os modelos de gestão dos recursos naturais presentes nos discursos sobre desenvolvimento sustentável.

Discute-se o foco atual sobre as instituições na gestão de recursos naturais e a complexidade e a fluidez das ‘comunidades’ no debate sobre gestão de recursos naturais; ao mesmo tempo, analisa-se o caminho ainda incerto para se entender analiticamente o mutável campo social (*social field*) e as fronteiras físicas variáveis das comunidades. Com base nos estudos de casos

no Assentamento Grotão, a tese descreve as instituições comunitárias criadas para a gestão dos recursos naturais como um processo mutável, que não pode ser analiticamente separado da atuação dos assentados na Amazônia, nem dos múltiplos espaços sociais e políticos criados na floresta.

A tese conceitua o ambiente natural como 'paisagem', em referência à forma como as práticas dos assentados moldam os espaços sociais e políticos e servem para 'localizar' as intervenções voltadas para o desenvolvimento. Estas práticas indicam a existência de 'contra-tendências', um conjunto de ações que correm 'contra o que as especialistas em desenvolvimento consideram ser opcional' (Arce e Long 2000: 182). No Capítulo 2, introduzo as teorias da prática desenvolvidas por Guiddens e Bourdieu como uma base teórica para a compreensão das contra-tendências que influenciam as mudanças de paisagem na Amazônia brasileira.

O Capítulo 3 discute aspectos metodológicos relacionados à pesquisa nas situações em que não existem comunidades estabelecidas e nos processos multidimensionais de desenvolvimento de políticas. Nesta tese, acompanho principalmente as situações sociais que ilustram a natureza mutável do campo social dos assentados. O Capítulo 4 explora as características sociais e políticas do Assentamento do Grotão enquanto um campo social que desloca e modifica as organizações sociais que os assentados estabelecem em relação a contextos históricos e societários mais amplos. Os conceitos analíticos de 'domínio social' e de 'arena' são introduzidos para especificar as áreas da vida social dos assentados em seu campo social.

O Capítulo 5 e 6 analisa eventos sociais que caracterizam o campo social do Grotão, algo que, empiricamente, inclui a Fazenda Bamerindus e a região de Rio Preto, a cerca de 300 km de Grotão. Enquanto estudos anteriores identificam o processo de movimentação dos ocupantes como uma 'expansão de fronteiras', essa tese procura interpretar esse processo como um 'deslocamento e renovação de campo social' no qual os assentamentos redefinem práticas sociais efetuadas para 'localizar' e modificar os objetivos almejados pelas políticas e projetos de desenvolvimento.

Os casos apresentados neste Capítulo ilustram um estilo local de desenvolvimento, de ação local e de confronto político que estão bastante associados à mudança de paisagem e às intervenções voltadas para o desenvolvimento. Isso leva o Capítulo 6 a focalizar as situações de interface nas quais os processos de conhecimento dos atores são descritos. O processo de conhecimento dos assentados individualiza seus arranjos coletivos e esta

individualização é freqüentemente descrita pelos agentes governamentais e de ONGs como 'desorganizadas' ou como 'desorganização'. Desorganização tem uma conotação negativa, especialmente para a implementação de modelos de gestão de recursos naturais, que requer sistemas bem planejados para institucionalizar o uso dos recursos naturais no nível local. Esta tese sugere que os assentados possuem racionalidades próprias para organização e uso de recursos – e nós, denominados especialistas e pesquisadores sociais precisamos, para debater a gestão dos recursos naturais, sair de uma ênfase sobre como organizar instituições adequadas para a gestão dos recursos naturais no nível local para uma outra que incorpore esses diversos arranjos coletivos nos debates sobre as políticas dos recursos naturais.

No Capítulo 7, avalio os modelos de 'cadeia produtiva' desenvolvidos por uma ONG local no Pará para elucidar o processo de justificação de um modelo particular de gestão de recursos naturais mesmo quando isso não representa propriamente a realidade local. Eu sublinho minha experiência como especialista de uma ONG que apresenta um modelo em um nível global. Face à minha interação com especialistas internacionais em desenvolvimento, fortaleci a compreensão das fronteiras de comunidades epistêmicas em desenvolvimento internacional, que tornam-se crescentemente confusas quando generalizam discursos sobre desenvolvimento sustentável e modelos de gestão de recursos naturais.

A conclusão geral desta tese é a de que a floresta na Amazônia brasileira deve ser considerada não como uma 'estrutura' que determina como seus habitantes agem. A conclusão no Capítulo 8 enfatiza a importância do foco sobre a atuação humana frente a uma compreensão estrutural da floresta e de seus povos, como promovido por agentes de desenvolvimento e conservacionistas. Neste sentido, a tese demonstra que a floresta amazônica é um processo e sua conservação precisa incluir uma compreensão do desenvolvimento social de seus habitantes. Metodologicamente, a tese sugere que precisamos levar em conta uma perspectiva orientada para ação dos atores para lidarmos com diferentes modalidades de relacionamentos e contra-tendências. Teoricamente, isso evidencia a importância da análise do 'campo social', heurísticamente ligado às práticas dos atores sociais e pelos arranjos entre as ações de uns com as ações de outros. Ao focalizar o social, a tese revela a complexidade das formas sociais, que tornam-se aparentes e freqüentemente mal representadas ou simplificadas na elaboração de políticas de desenvolvimento e implementação de projetos.

Politicamente, a tese argumenta que precisamos, por um lado, salientar os limites de debates ideológicos sobre 'como conservar a floresta amazônica' e, por outro, aprofundar os debates informados empiricamente sobre o significado do desenvolvimento social para as pessoas que vivem na Amazônia. Muitas das estratégias de gestão de recursos naturais implementadas na Amazônia não se realizam sem o envolvimento dos atores locais, mas há poucas iniciativas que lidam com o complexo processo social destes atores na floresta. Com relação a isso, pesquisadores sociais têm uma significativa contribuição a oferecer na formulação de abordagens socialmente orientadas para o desenvolvimento sustentável na Amazônia Brasileira.

Curriculum Vitae

Kei Otsuki was born in Chigasaki, Japan on 20 July 1975. In 1999, she obtained BA degree in Sociology from the University of Tokyo and started master's course at Graduate School of Agricultural Sciences, the University of Tokyo. In 2000, she moved to the southeast of Pará in Brazil and conducted her fieldwork on community and sustainable development in settlement areas. In 2001, she obtained her MSc degree and, after a year of internship at the Federal University of Pará in Brazil, she was awarded a full scholarship from the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs to realise her PhD project at Wageningen University. In the end of 2002, she moved to Wageningen, and in 2003-2005, she resumed her fieldwork in Pará and also started to elaborate small-scale sustainable development projects with local professionals affiliated with the Federal University of Pará. During this period, she made various presentations about the community-based sustainable development projects in the Amazon at international organisations and development agencies. She also organised seminars and workshops for local researchers, practitioners and producers in Belém, Pará.

In 2005, she moved back to Wageningen to dedicate herself to write up her PhD thesis. Meanwhile, she continued to work as a consultant for a NGO in Brazil. In 2006-2007, she worked as a consultant and teaching assistant at Rural Development Sociology Group at Wageningen University. Currently, she is working on publications and research reports on social theory and sustainable development.

Completed Training and Supervision Plan by Kei Otsuki

Description	Department/Institute	Month/year	Credits
<i><u>I. Orientation</u></i>			
Literature review and proposal writing	Wageningen University	2002/2003	8
Presentation of research proposal	Wageningen University	March 2003	1
Introductory Course: The Sociology of Farming and Rural Life	Wageningen University	November - December 2002	4
Course on food chain and policy debate: Globalisation and sustainability of food production and consumption	Wageningen University	January – March 2003	4
<i><u>II. Research Methods and Techniques</u></i>			
Mansholt Seminars: Rural Sociology meetings	Wageningen University	2002/2003	1
CERES Seminars: methodological debates of Rural Development Sociology/ Anthropology	Wageningen University	2003/2005	1
CERES Advanced Research Seminar Program: Rural Development Sociology Group	Wageningen University	September 2005 – July 2006	1
CERES Master Class: Activist Research (Charles Hale)	Utrecht University	September 2005	1
<i><u>III Seminar Presentations</u></i>			
International Congress: Globalisation, Localisation, and Tropical Forest Management: “Partnerships for Sustainable Development in the Brazilian Amazon”	University of Amsterdam	October 2003	4
CERES Seminar: mid-fieldwork report	Wageningen University	November 2003	2
CERES Advanced Research Seminar: methodology and theoretical overview of sustainable development in Brazil	Wageningen University	April 2004	2
CERES Advanced Research Seminar: theory of development sociology	Wageningen University	October 2005, March 2006	2
International Conference of the Land, Poverty, Social Justice and Development: “Agrarian Reform in the Brazilian Amazon”	Institute of Social Studies	January 2006	2
CERES Summer School: “Sustainable Development Projects and Expert Systems in the Brazilian Amazon”	Wageningen University	June 2006	2
Total			35