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The essays included in Land Without History are the result of a long trip Euclides da Cunha made to the Amazon in 1905 as a member of a joint Brazil–Peru expedition to determine the borders between the two nations. This trip had a profound impact on Euclides, who became obsessed with the idea of writing a long book on the region entitled Lost Paradise, which would do for the Amazon what his celebrated Os sertões did for the northeastern sertões: introduce the educated urban populations of the south to tropical backlands of Brazil they knew little about. However, Euclides never completed this project. He produced instead a series of separate essays, most of which (the ones translated here) he later turned into the first part of the book A margem da história, published soon after his tragic death in 1909.

What gives these texts their edge is in part the cultlike status their author enjoys in Brazilian intellectual history. Even though Brazil has produced several writers more important than Euclides, few (if any) have been so prominently featured in exhibitions, special conferences, political and academic discourse. Not only has the cabin where he wrote Os sertões been preserved as an object of cultural pilgrimage, but it has also been covered with a protective structure resembling a shrine. He is revered by critics on the right and the left as a writer who penetrated the soul of his nation as no other before or after him. Yet commentaries on his most important book, Os sertões, have from the start been hedged by...
justification and excuse. Critics say that he sometimes adhered too closely to positivist models of science and knowledge, but he also was able to subvert and contradict such models. His style—a disconcerting mixture of the scientific jargon of the day and hyperbolic literary image (imitated by minor writers for decades after his death)—verges on bad taste, though, as critics are also quick to observe, it never quite crosses that line. Dramatic events in his biography have also helped feed the Euclides da Cunha myth: in 1909 he was killed by his wife’s young lover, as was his son, years later, when attempting to avenge his father’s death.

Of course Euclides’s writing style and personal life are not enough to explain the fascination he exerts in Brazil and beyond. Perhaps the main reason for such fascination is Euclides’s problematic self-location within his own texts, which resembles, one might add, the position sustained today by many Brazilian intellectuals with regard to the poor and uneducated masses of the country. This problematic position makes the essays in Land Without History an important landmark in Latin American writing. They hardly provide us with a thorough or detailed account of the Amazon in the early twentieth century. Rather, what these essays offer us is a compelling testimony to the Brazilian colonial enterprise in the Amazon, and to its imperialist tendencies with regard to neighboring nation-states.

In order to understand Euclides’s position in these Amazonian essays we have to take a brief look at the text that made him famous overnight: Os sertões. Published in 1902, it is an account of how a community of supposed monarchists in the backlands of Bahia was repressed by republican Brazil. Euclides, who was an engineer by formation, went to the site of Canudos as a reporter for the newspaper O Estado de São Paulo. He had already published an article about the monarchist revolt in the same paper, entitled “A nossa vendéia” (Our Vendée)—effectively incorporating Canudos into the European scheme of the French Revolution. The Canudos rebellion was in the news constantly at the time: headlines fed the panic of urban readers by exaggerating the size of the revolt and its political significance as an antirepublican movement. Euclides wrote Os sertões immediately after returning from the field. The opinions expressed in the book differ considerably from the Vendée article: the monarchist motivation is replaced with a portrait of the sertanejos that oscillates between deploiring them as confused religious fanatics and sympathizing with them as poverty–ridden mestizos left out of the newly created republican dream. The latter position made Os sertões an enlightening study of Brazilian society that allowed literate urban Brazilians, especially southerners, to contemplate another Brazil inland and far north: a Brazil that was not—and did not want to be—part of the elites’ modernizing project. Eulersted to the Brazilian Literary Academy just one year after publishing Os sertões, Euclides da Cunha became one of Brazil’s most celebrated writers, even though his book could scarcely be classified as “literature” in any conventional way. As critics have repeatedly pointed out, Os sertões mixes several genres: “scientific” report, sociology, history, military record, journalism, and poetic prose. What makes it extraordinary is the author/narrator’s oscillation, the “scientific” prejudices he embraces against the “backward sertanejos” and his perplexed admiration of their capacity to resist; his enduring support of the military campaign and his denunciations of it as a brutal massacre.

Euclides’s position with regard to the Canudos massacre expresses what Renato Rosaldo refers to as “a particular kind of nostalgia, often found under imperialism, where people mourn the passing of what they themselves have transformed” (69). This “imperialist nostalgia,” an unavoidable element in colonial enterprises, is also seen in the trajectory of ethnographers who unwittingly contribute to the destruction of the very cultures they devote themselves to. A project of and for the elites, the Brazilian nation at independence incorporated by force several groups that had no wish to be part of it; revolts in different parts of the country—like the Cabanagem in Pará and the Farroupilha in the south—had already demonstrated that national unity was by no means guaranteed. Canudos was the last of these major regional revolts, and a particularly remarkable one for the southern elites because it was apparently sparked by the declaration of the federal republic. The Brazilian state assault on Canudos is in that sense a colonialist enterprise: an attempt to forcibly dominate a group that it saw as unwilling to join the national project. As an “embedded” journalist accompanying the last of the military expeditions and a former army man himself, Euclides devotes dozens of pages of his long book to describing, with undeniable fascination, the war and its strategies. At the same time, his growing admiration for what he calls the “backward sertanejos” leads him to risk modifying scientific theory of the time to explain how, racially mixed as they may have been, the sertanejos were well adapted to their environment—a rare case of an
“inferior race” (the Indian) that nonetheless had prevailed. In spite of his praise for the bravery and resilience of the sertaneses, and in spite of his final condemnation of the military invasion, Euclides had participated in the destruction of Canudos. Not only that, he also belonged to and identified himself with the urban elites who took it upon themselves to civilize, by force, the rest of the country. There can be no better expression of imperial nostalgia than his famous sentence from Rebellion, “We are condemned to civilization” (54). The paradox of his formulation is perfectly congruent with Rosaldo’s definition of imperialist nostalgia: “Imperialist nostalgia revolves around a paradox: A person kills somebody, and then mourns the victim. In more attenuated form, someone deliberately alters a form of life, and then regrets that things have not remained as they were prior to the intervention” (68–69).

As Euclides moved from Rebellion in the Backlands to the Amazonian essays, his imperialist nostalgia seemed to give way, almost entirely, to straightforward imperialism: instead of blaming himself or his own country for eliminating cultures and the environment, he blamed other countries or the victims themselves. Yet the paradox that defines imperialist nostalgia is still present in these essays in the way Euclides uses the sertaneses to condemn and promote Brazil’s activities and involvement in the Amazon.

Euclides went to the Amazon heading the Brazilian party in the bina- tional border expedition, and as such he was inevitably compromised by his country’s official position with regard to the region. Less than two years before his journey, Brazil and Bolivia had signed the Petrópolis Treaty of 1903, with Bolivia ceding to Brazil her undeniable rights (according to international law) to a great proportion of Acre in exchange for 2 million pounds sterling and the perpetual right of free transit on the Amazonian system in Brazil. For its part, Brazil took on the border questions between Bolivia and Peru. Many Brazilians and most of Brazil’s neighbors saw the treaty as a heavy-handed diplomatic intervention backed by unreasonable military threats.6 The treaty consolidated the Brazilian imperialist position in the Amazon and, to a certain degree, in the rest of South America. It resulted from several years of bitter negotiations between the two nations, which included two revolutions in Acre (one of which won it a temporary independent status as the Republic of Acre), several military battles with many deaths on both sides, and an array of diplomatic exchanges not only between Brazil and Bolivia, but also between these two nations and the United States (which was accused, in the aftermath of 1898, of trying to take control of the region), Peru, Great Britain, Chile, and Argentina. The main argument used at the time by those who defended Brazil’s right to Acre was the concept of uti possidetis—the idea that the territory should belong to those who occupy it productively. In those years Acre was economically important because of its large production of rubber, an extremely valuable commodity in international trade. This production attracted immense numbers of migrant workers from the drought-ridden region of Ceará in the sertão. The cairenses occupied a sizable part of the territory that belonged legally to Bolivia, and when the Bolivians tried to assert fiscal control over it, the newcomers initiated a revolt backed in part by the large rubber companies of Manaus.

Less than two years after the treaty was signed, Euclides traveled to Acre with the responsibility of settling the borders between Brazil’s newly acquired territory and Peru. It was a tense trip, full of nationalistic bravado, that ended unsatisfactorily for both sides.7 Euclides’s view of the Amazon is thus colored by his official position and will seem most unfamiliar to contemporary readers. Images nowadays associated with the world’s largest rain forest—the diversity of the fauna and flora, the presence of indigenous populations, traditions of native and local knowledge—are conspicuously absent. Instead, the Amazon is presented in Land Without History as a new land whose function and destiny is to be colonized.

Like Os sertões, this collection of essays begins with a physical description of the territory that mixes scientific jargon with passionate and highly personal views. The aim of such descriptions is, in both books, to establish a topographic grounding for the arguments that the author goes on to develop. Os sertões, for instance, presents the plants and land of the sertão as resilient and strong, capable of enduring the worst hardship—a description that prefigures that of the sertaneses themselves later on in the book. In Land Without History, the first essay describes nature as incomplete, imperfect, unfinished. The great rivers, especially the Amazon, are said to be always destroying their own banks and spreading into new beds elsewhere. The only type of human adaptation that has worked in the region is, according to Euclides, nomadic, because nature is inconstant and eliminates, through self-destruction, all traces of its own history. By presenting Amazonian nature this way, Euclides makes land practically nonexistent as a physical concept, replacing it with territorial
definitions based on human action. In describing physical borders as inherently unstable, Euclides prepares the way for the later essays in the book, when he gives the sertanejo settlers full credit for the territorial definition of Acre: “But they [the sertanejos] did not disappear. On the contrary, in less than thirty years the area that was a vague geographical term, a swampy wilderness stretching out limitlessly to the southwest, has suddenly defined itself, contributing substantially to our economic development” (57). In other words, borders can stabilize only after the Brazilian workers arrive and found towns and villages. The spatial logic of the Amazon here, for Euclides, is the logic of uti possidetis.

It is not only land that is denied physical stability in this essay. As the title of the book tells us, history is also marginal or nonexistent in the Amazonian region. When describing the Amazon River, for instance, Euclides claims that the banks seen in the sixteenth-century by Francisco Orellana, the first European to sail down it, have been destroyed by the river itself—history, in other words, has been washed away physically. This reference becomes even more significant when we recall Fray Gaspar de Carvajal’s account of Orellana’s expedition, which describes the banks of the Amazon as being massively populated by native peoples. The fact that Carvajal’s accounts are now being corroborated by the archaeological excavations led by Anna Roosevelt seriously weakens Euclides’s arguments, for no excavation would be possible had the river banks been destroyed as definitively as he claimed. Euclides’s destruction of the banks of the Amazon River in the first of his Amazonian essays is a way of eliminating all history prior to the arrival of the Europeans in the region, and therefore any possible land claims by the only truly legitimate owners of the Amazon, the original native American inhabitants. This helps us understand why native Americans are mostly absent in Land Without History, and overwhelmingly so in the first essays in the book, precisely those essays that define the region historically and geographically. The first essay, for instance, mentions native peoples only in passing, as part of a discourse that highlights how most attempts to bring “progress” to the region had failed. For the most part, after reading the first three essays in the book one could be forgiven for believing that Acre was originally an empty territory that became populated only after the arrival of the cairense. This is the case, for instance, in Euclides’s reference to the area having been occupied for “three centuries” (14)—an explicit denial of human life in the Amazon prior to the Europeans; or in his comments on Amazonian landscape as inimical to human occupation: “The topographic forms most associated with human existence are absent. There is something unearthly about this amphibian nature, this mixture of land and water” (32). Such references contradict awareness of prior and present occupation in the Amazon generally and in Acre specifically, which he shows elsewhere in his book, as well as an established bibliography about the Amazon that he must have been well acquainted with: Couto de Magalhães’s O selvagem (1876), Barbosa Rodrigues’s Poranduba amazonense (1890), and Ermano Stradelli’s Jurupari (1890), for instance, all of which affirm the primary significance not just of native occupation of the region but of native accounts of that occupation.

The first appearance of live indigenous people in Land Without History is quite curious and comes only at the end of the third essay, “This Accursed Climate.” Among the foreigners (non-Brazilians) who have been settling in the Purus region, Euclides includes the “adventurous, artistic Italian who spends long months traveling the rivers with photographic equipment collecting the most typical faces of the Indians in the forest and scenes of the wild countryside” (42). For the first time the reader is made aware of the present existence of indigenous peoples in the region, but even so they are phantasmagoric, captured in the “wild” through the lenses of an “artistic” European traveler.

In the fourth essay, “The Caucheros,” Euclides ingeniously distinguishes the Indians he meets on Brazilian territory from those who appear on the Peruvian side. To begin with, Brazilian Indians are mentioned, once again, only in passing, in order to be contrasted with the truly dangerous peoples that inhabit the Peruvian lands of Madre de Dios:

Anyone going up the Purus and observing, in the area around Cachocira, the Paumaris, ever decreasing in number and hardly recalling the old masters of those lands, or further upstream, the peaceful Ipurinás, or even past the Yaco, the Tacunas, born looking old, so much is the decrepitude of their race reflected in their stunted aspect, will be surprised when he comes face-to-face with the singular savages who populate the [Peruvian] headwaters. (45)

If the adjectives used to refer to Brazilian Indians describe them as creatures on their way to extinction or docile observers of the colonization
of the region, the description of the natives on the Peruvian side is quite different in tone:

The bronzed Piros, with shiny teeth stained with a dark resin that give their faces an indefinable aspect of grave threat when they smile. The bearded Caxibos, inured to extermination after two hundred years of attacks against the remains of the Pachita missions. The Conibos, with deformed craniums and chests frighteningly striped red and blue. The Setebos, the Sipibos, the Iurimanas. The corpulent Maschcos of the Manú, recalling in their great size the giants imagined by the first cartographers of the Amazon region. And above all others, supplanting them in valor and renown, the warlike Campas of the Urubamba. (45)

While the Brazilian Indians, as Euclides describes them, do not pose any present threat to his country's economic exploitation of the region, the natives on the Peruvian side elicit fear. Although Brazil has achieved the domination of its own territory, Peru has yet to "conquer the savages," has as yet no rightful control over the territory it wants to claim. In a halfhearted attempt at imperialist nostalgia, Euclides then laments the destruction of the Indians, and this time includes Brazilian and Bolivian settlers among the aggressors: "Civilization, barbarously armed with its lethal rifles, completely besieges here the cornered savage. The Peruvians from the west and from the south; the Brazilians in the entire northeastern sector; and on the southeast the Bolivians, shutting off access to the Madre de Dios Valley" (46). But it is the Peruvian <i>caucheros</i>, according to him, who are most responsible for the present extermination: "And the <i>caucheros</i> appear as the most advantaged intruders in this sinister catechism of fire and sword that, off in this remote backland, continues to exterminate the most interesting native peoples of South America" (50). The uncharacteristic weakness and vagueness of the adjective ("interesting") used to describe the native peoples who are being exterminated signals how unconvincing the author's nostalgia actually is—and this is mostly because he can blame the present killing on the Peruvians. In the same essay, he describes how the binational expedition encountered an ailing native abandoned by the Peruvian <i>caucheros</i>: "In one of the better preserved of the outlying buildings, the last inhabitant awaited us. Piro, Amauca, or Campa, his provenience was indistinguishable. His repulsive appearance transformed the very features of the human species: a huge trunk bloated with malaria dominated, in obvious contrast to thin arms and thin, withered legs, like those of a monstrous fetus" (55). Though referring here to someone left behind in an abandoned <i>caucho</i> extraction complex, "last inhabitant" can also be read, in line with a popular literary trope of the time, as the last representative of a race that has been exterminated. In most of its literary appearances, the concept of the "last inhabitant" is tied to sentimental imperialist nostalgia, and it betrays a degree of wishful thinking, for seldom is the "inhabitant" actually the last one. In Euclides's case, the poignancy of the scene suggests imperialist nostalgia, as we are meant to feel pity for the poor Indian who is being killed by our own "civilization." But not for long; once again, Euclides points to the "true cause" of the Indian's demise, the Peruvian <i>caucheros</i>: "opening up with rifle balls and machete strokes new paths for their frenetic coming and going, and revealing other unknown areas, where they would leave behind, as they had here, in the fallen-in buildings or the pitiful figure of the sacrificed Indian, the only fruits of their tumultuous undertaking, fruits of their role as builders of ruins" (55). The <i>caucheros</i> are "builders of ruins" because, unlike the Brazilian <i>sertanejos</i>, they do not settle in a permanent place. Again, the logic of <i>uti possidetis</i> permeates the essay: Brazil has acquired the right to Acre through the activities of its <i>sertanejo</i> settlers. Peru, on the other hand, is still fighting its Indians, and through men (the <i>caucheros</i>) who cannot settle or build anything, just destroy.

This is probably the main argument in <i>Land Without History</i>, and Euclides makes it again and again. In "Brazilians" he claims that the colonization of what is now the Peruvian Amazon was actually achieved by Brazilians. It was a Brazilian, according to him, who "discovered <i>caucho</i> or, at least, established the industry of its extraction" (70). In 1841 a Brazilian was given exclusive license to run a steam fleet to carry goods from eastern Peru down the Amazon River. And finally, Brazilian <i>sertanejos</i> were responsible for the only successful settlements in the Peruvian Amazon—which fell into ruin once these Brazilians were forced out. Incidentally, the activities of <i>sertanejos</i> in Peru included killing Indians, but since this happened in the past as part of attempts to settle the region, the killings are described as a heroic struggle against peoples such as the Caxibos, the "wildest of the tribes of the Ucayali Valley" (74).

In making these claims, Euclides never explicitly states that Brazil should demand rights to parts of the Peruvian Amazon. Rather, he tries to legitimize what was, by most accounts, Brazil's dubious claim to Acre.
He also wants to affirm Brazil's superior position with regard to its neighbors. That his discourse was imperialist (with regard to other South American nations) and colonialist (with regard to Amazonia, which, according to him, should be "civilized" by Brazil) becomes even clearer in the explicit and frequent comparisons with the English and French colonial enterprises in India and Africa. And in the last essay in this collection he makes a plea for the construction of a railway linking Cruzeiro do Sul to Acre because, besides the obvious economic reasons, it would allow Brazil to defend its territory in case of war.

Euclides's hero in the Brazilian colonization of the Amazon is the sertanejo, the migrant worker who fled the drought-ridden Ceará. In this sense Land Without History is a continuation of Os sertões: the strong and brave sertanejos who ended the first book under attack from the Brazilian army reappear now in Acre, expanding Brazilian frontiers. As in the first book, the sertanejo of Land Without History is an unlikely hero who is described in contradictory terms. On the one hand he is the protagonist of what Euclides calls "haphazard colonization" (colonização à gandaria), an unplanned and disorganized process of colonization that produced better results than the well-planned enterprises of Britain in India or France in Indochina. Poor, ailing, with no help from the Brazilian state, the sertanejo, according to Euclides, went to the Amazon and killed Indians, founded towns, started the economic development of the region, conquered Acre, and stimulated the "civilizing" enterprises in the Peruvian territory, as we just saw. On the other hand, the same sertanejo is presented as a pathetic figure who sought his own slavery and had no sense of controlling his own destiny.

In the first essay, for instance, Euclides gives a detailed account of the sertanejo's economic endurance and the unfairness of the rubber-tapping system that enslaves him. At the end of the essay he makes a strong social claim: "What comes definitively to the fore, however, is the urgent need of measures to rescue this hidden and abandoned culture: a work law that would ennoble human effort; an austere justice that would curb excesses; and some form of homestead provision that would definitively link man and the land" (47). Powerful and clear as they are, the provisions Euclides demanded would require nothing less than a revolution, and have yet to be implemented. It is not obvious how the sertanejo's lack of perspective can become, in other passages, a strong agency and capacity to make his own history, since he is a "portentous anomaly: he is the man who toils in order to enslave himself" (14). The problem is not so much Euclides's description of rubber tapping as an unjust economic system, as "the most heinous organization of labor ever conjured up by human egotism unbound" (14)—which is basically true—but his simultaneous celebration of that system as crucial to the Brazilian economy and as a guarantee of power over Brazil's neighbors. This contradiction is at the core of his Amazonian essays, and, as with Os sertões, is probably what makes these texts so compelling. As an unlikely hero, the sertanejo is fit to represent Brazil as the unlikely modern nation. In other words, the sertanejo is a hero in spite of his mixed race (a clear problem for Euclides, who believed in the scientific precepts of his time), his lack of education, his poor health, and the unjust economic system that does not help him—precisely the conditions that many national and international analysts of the time thought would keep Brazil from entering modernity.

"Judas Ahasverus," which most critics consider the best text in this collection and the most rounded of Euclides's writings, is a good example of how these contradictions play out. Centered on the common folkloric festivity of beating Judas, which happens throughout Brazil the Saturday before Easter Sunday, Euclides discusses the special local characteristics it acquired in Amazonia, among the sertanejo rubber tappers. Instead of an unspecified straw doll, in Amazonia Judas is made, according to Euclides, to resemble the rubber tapper (sertanego) himself. The doll is then placed in a small boat that is sent down river, and the sertanejos shoot at it as it passes by. For Euclides, this particular manifestation of Judas beating is an expression of self-hatred:

It is a dolorous triumph. The sertanejo has sculpted the accused figure in his own image. He has taken revenge on himself. In the final analysis he has punished himself for the accused ambition that brought him to this land and takes revenge on himself for the moral weakness that shatters his impulse to rebel, pushing it even further onto the lower plane of this degenerate life where infantile credulity has tied him to this swampy realm controlled by scoundrels who deceive him (60).

"Judas Ahasverus" comes close to being poetic prose, if at times a little too precious. At the same time, it maintains the analytical voice that marks all of Euclides's essays. Clearly the narrator sees the sertanejo
rubber tapper as an object of study with no voice of his own; a large part of the essay describes the Judas doll going down river as if he were the rubber tapper. In that role, the *sertanejo* hardly resembles the hero of Amazonian colonization described by Euclides elsewhere in these essays. Melancholy, tied to a brutal system he cannot escape, the *sertanejo* in "Judas Ahasverus" can only resort to his yearly festival of self-hatred. But if we look beyond Euclides's seductive construction of the *sertanejo* doll man, we will see that his whole argument rests on the care that the *sertanejo* puts into making the doll, even giving it his own hat. On the other hand, both facts are common to the custom of making Judas dolls all over Brazil, and not necessarily synonymous with self-hatred (after all, what hat would the *sertanejo* give the doll other than his own?). Because the *sertanejo* is never given a voice, we can never hear about the fun that he and his children must find in those festivities, even less about the sense of community implicit in the fact that all *sertaneiros* recognize the Judas dolls that pass by as objects of play in a shared game.

Euclides's Judas may be the object of the *sertaneiro*’s self-hatred, but it could also represent the boat salesmen who travel up and down river, the owners of the *seringais*, or indeed the biblical Judas. And even if Euclides’s description of the festivity as an expression of self-hatred, what would be the cause of that self-hatred if not the colonization of the Amazon that Euclides urges and celebrates? By choosing to describe the *sertaneiros*’ Judas beating as self-hatred, Euclides blames the victims of a colonization process that he is helping promote. Imperial nostalgia is therefore transferred to the weaker perpetrators of the colonizing process, victims of an unjust economic system that is the heart and staple of all colonizing enterprises in the world.

The essays in *Land Without History* open a rare window onto the process of consolidation of the South American nation-states. At a time when rubber was one of the most desired commodities in the world, the Amazon naturally occupied a central role in this process. Euclides’s peculiar mixture of strong literary imagery and positivist scientific argumentation (brilliantly translated into Victorian English by Ronald Sousa) brings us into the heart of early twentieth-century Latin American thought. If “scientific truths” were made to serve the interest of the racist and colonialist elites, poetry, on the other hand, offered sentimental compensation and compassion. Imperialist nostalgia helped define, in other words, Euclides’s famously idiosyncratic style. Brazilian

 colonialism and imperialism have never since found expression in a voice more eloquent and talented than his.

**Notes**

1. In Brazilian cultural history and criticism, the author is generally referred to as Euclides.

2. *Os sertões* has a magnificent translation by Samuel Putnam entitled *Rebellion in the Backlands*. I refer to the original title to maintain the specificity of the place sertão, which means not “backlands” in general but a particular area in the northeastern interior often plagued by drought. People from the sertão, the *sertanejos*, are an important presence in *Land Without History*, as we will see.

3. A few other essays Euclides wrote about the Amazon are included in, for example, *Relatório da comissão mista brasileiro-peruana de reconhecimento do alto purus* (1906), *Contrastes e confrontos* (1907), and *Peru versus Bolívia* (1907). I chose to include only the essays from *A margem da história* because they were put together as a unit by the author. A compilation that included all of his Amazonian texts would include considerable repetition and some highly technical texts. Such a compilation was made, in Portuguese, by Heldon Rocha, entitled *Um paraíso perdido: Reuniao dos ensaios amazônicos* (1976). For an excellent analysis of Euclides’s Amazonian essays, see Hardman.


7. See *Relatório da comissão mista and Tocantins*.

8. See, for instance, Márcio José Lauria, “Judas-Ahasverus,” in *Enciclopédia de estudos euclidianos*, vol. 1 (Jundiaí: Jundiaí, 1982).