

CONFERÊNCIA

THE LAND LAW OF 1850 IN GOIÁS*

*David McCreery**

Efforts to define and assert rights to land have prompted centuries of confusion and violence in Brazil's vast interior. For this reason the Land Law of 1850,¹ the country's first effort at comprehensive land legislation, continues even today to attract attention, attention from lawyers who seek in it proof of title and attention from historians and political scientists who see it as part of the "nation building" strategies of the Empire². Most academic interest has focused on the law's origins, however, and on the debate that it provoked in the national government.³ There has been much less concern about how it worked when actually put into effect in the provinces.⁴ This paper will use the experience of Goiás to examine how the law, widely seen to have been enacted for the coffee areas, played out away from the coast, on the country's center-west frontier. After briefly reviewing the history of Portuguese/Brazilian property law and the genesis of the 1850-54 legislation, we will use provincial archives to look at how it was implemented in Goiás, its impacts on the province in the half century after 1850, and how the law and land situation changed, or did not change, in Goiás after the declaration of the Republic.

Control of land in Brazil developed initially based on *sesmarias*.⁵ Sesmarias became important in late medieval Portugal as part of an effort to spur agricultural production in the wake of war and epidemic disease. Elites with the resources necessary to exploit land productively, i.e., capital

* Conferência proferida no Mestrado em História da UFG em 10 de junho de 2000.

** Historiador brasileiro e professor da Georgia State University (EUA).

and control of labor, could apply to the Crown for grants of *devoluta* ["returned" land = land that had reverted to the public domain]. In Brazil "devoluta" as such had no meaning — unless one considered indigenous rights, to which the colonial regime normally gave scant attention — but the term continued in use, coming to mean simply unoccupied or state land. Because of the costs and risks of tropical agriculture and because of the large amounts of land available in the colony, sesmarias in Brazil typically were enormous. The basic unit was a grant of one by three leagues [league = 6km.], and often the sesmarias were much larger, particularly in cattle ranching areas. Several patterns developed. Applicants for sesmarias sometimes had in fact occupied the land for years or decades and only applied for legalization for reasons of sale or inheritance. In other instances, well-connected speculators sought sesmarias they never intended to occupy in order to sell them to others.

But much of the land in colonial/early independent Brazil, and most of that in the center-west, was never part of sesmarias. Instead it was held in simple possession, *posse*. This was true even for most of those who claimed sesmarias. Under the law, the Crown had to confirm grants initiated by governors, and continued possession depended on measuring and marking the boundaries of the sesmaria, as well as on effective use. Rarely did any these conditions obtain on the frontier. Of the more than 1000 sesmaria applications known for the Captaincy General of Goiás, for example, the Crown confirmed less than two hundred, and none of the recipients of these adequately measured or marked their land.⁶ Thus, for practical purposes they all were squatters; the province, with most of Brazil, had a land holding but not a land owning elite. During the eighteenth century most applications were for land around mining centers and along the trade routes that linked these to São Paulo and Minas Gerais/Rio de Janeiro. The decay of mining after the 1770s had two effects: in many cases squatters simply abandoned their claims and moved on to new and more promising areas; in other instances, failed miners retreated to the countryside and to small scale agriculture and cattle production to survive.⁷ Land that had little or no value in its own right, and an inability or unwillingness of those who controlled it to pay for measurements, together with swidden agriculture and extensive cattle raising, virtually guaranteed vague boundaries and overlapping claims. But it hardly mattered.

In 1822-3 the Empire abolished the old *sesmaria* system⁸ preparatory to writing a new constitution and a new land law, but the process soon became bogged down in political disputes and no new land regulations emerged. Over the next three decades the only way to appropriate public land was by squatting. For reasons suggested, this was a less dramatic change than sometimes imagined. Few at the national level cared who possessed what in the new country's apparently limitless interior nor were they interested in looking too carefully at the basis of possession. Such attitudes only began to change, and then chiefly around Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, as the shift to the export production of coffee after mid-century pushed the frontier of commercial agriculture inland.⁹ Because coffee bushes took three to five years to begin to produce commercially, but could remain profitable for twenty years or more, the new crop required long term, relatively large scale, capital investment that only clear ownership of land could guarantee. Such security was of growing concern too because of British attacks on the slave trade that not only were raising labor costs but threatening the traditional use of slaves as collateral for loans.

Conscious efforts at state building and recentralizing the Empire under Pedro II responded in large part to the concerns of the new export elites, concerns that included comprehensive land legislation.¹⁰ Drawn up initially in 1842 and debated into the next year, a new land law nevertheless languished for almost a decade in the Senate because of Liberal resistance to centralization. Only in 1850 when the Conservatives returned to power did the law emerge.¹¹ Its chief provisions included:

1. public land could only be acquired by purchase;
2. all *Sesmarias* had to be revalidated and all *posses* legitimated; the permissible area could include the amount currently exploited and as much again as reserve, with the total not exceeding a *sesmaria* customary for the area;
4. all land purchased/revalidated/legitimated had to be adequately measured and marked;
5. communities could own land;
6. the government could set aside land reserves for Indians and for colonization.

Not until 1854 did the state issue the regulations [*regulamento*]¹² necessary to actually implement the law, allowing ample time for those with land potentially at risk to take necessary measures. And the regulations guaranteed private property, however obtained and without regard to any size limitations: “Every possessor of land that has a legitimate title for the acquisition of his domain, whether this land was acquired by posse of his ancestors, or by concessions of sesmaria that were never measured, confirmed or cultivated, are guaranteed their property whatever its area”

Anyone who lacked legitimate title could obtain this by demonstrating “peaceful” possession for an unspecified period and then measuring and marking the land. Properties in the hands of a second or third generation, whether these were acquired by sale, inheritance, or gift, constituted legal property and did not require legitimation. And despite the usual requirement that *cartórios* [notary offices] validate contracts, the 1854 regulations specifically recognized private transactions as acceptable evidence of ownership. The state could at its option initiate measurement of public lands but could not measure or mark of private property without the specific request of the holder. In the law’s most far reaching stipulation, all those with rights to land, regardless of title, were to register their property(s) with the state. The law charged the priest of each community with this task, hence the label *registros paroquiais* [parish registries] by which the books came to be known. Because registration required only a declaration it could not constitute basis for title. In fact, though, and in the absence of more systematic surveys, these parish registries quickly became, and remain today, one of the chief instruments for weighing rural land claims.

Linked to the 1850 land law in popular imagination, and by most subsequent commentators, was the abolition of Brazil’s international slave trade in the same year pressed upon the country by Great Britain.¹³ Given a high slave mortality, an end to the importation of Africans doomed the system just as planters in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo were beginning to realize coffee’s potential. A law that restricted the access of the rural poor to land by requiring that they buy it promised to cheapen free labor by cutting off alternative employments and to make workers more available to the large growers. National elites anticipated too that they would be able to use the proceeds of government land sales to subsidize European immigration, increasing the number of workers available and

improving the nation's "blood". According to many at the time, the 1850 law was a law "for Rio de Janeiro."¹⁴ Contemporary measures complimenting the land law included a refounding of the Banco do Brasil, passage of a new commercial code to give business transactions more security and to make capital more readily available, and, in the next decade, promulgation of a new mortgage law.¹⁵

But Brazil's center-west in the 1850s was a world apart for the booming commercial economy of the coast. Expeditions from São Paulo had criss-crossed the region in the seventeenth century in search of slaves and precious metals and stones, making their first reported gold strikes in Goiás a decade after those in Minas Gerais. Immigrants initially bypassed much of the southern part of the captaincy when they found no mineral deposits there, forming instead a series of small mining towns in the North [today, the state of Tocantins]. Around these settlements modest agricultural and cattle raising establishments grew up to supply the miners' needs, but one after another the towns collapsed or simply withered away when placer mines played out or Indian attacks made the miners' position untenable. Despite occasional new strikes,¹⁶ by the 1780s mining in the province was in terminal decay, but a population that equated prosperity and status with the extraction of gold and diamonds was slow to recognize or admit this. The efforts of several governors to reorient the economy toward agriculture foundered on the lack of interest, as well as on problems of distance and of competition from provinces closer to urban areas and to the coffee frontier. Early experiments with cotton, for example, showed that the crop grew well in Goiás but was profitable for planters only in exceptional times.¹⁷

Not until the 1830s did the province begin to emerge from a half century of depression, with the development of cattle production for sale to neighboring provinces.¹⁸ Cattle raising had several advantages for Goiás. A system of extensive production maximized the province's resources of cheap land and scarce labor. Cattle were practically "free goods," demanding little day-to-day attention and almost no capital investment, and they readily walked themselves to market. The region also escaped most of the droughts that plagued the interior Northeast. Cattle developed first in the North, where buyers came from the *sertão* of Bahia and Maranhão to purchase animals for fattening and resale in coastal markets. But, although the North remained throughout the century

a major exporting area, it continued to be by very primitive stock raising practices and low levels of productivity and by general poverty.¹⁹

The South, by contrast, developed a cattle and agricultural economy more slowly than did the North but one of generally, if only relatively, higher quality and more profitable production.²⁰ Settlers entered the southeast of the province from Minas Gerais, while others from São Paulo migrated to the area around Rio Verde and Jataí in the southwest. They introduced cattle and, secondarily, initiating commercial production of foodstuffs and market crops such as tobacco.²¹ Agriculture and better quality cattle made the land more valuable and prompted closer attention to property boundaries. In 1836 Goiás's President addressed municipal authorities in the South about problems caused by "vagrants and criminals" who, he claimed, were invading the property of recently established ranchers and farmers and attempting to take it over or to force the settlers to buy from them the land they already occupied.²² The following year the provincial legislature looked at the problem, noting that because of the absence of a land law since 1823 "there are no legitimate titles and no measurements, so that each one extends his domain wherever he wishes with the result that there are conflicts, disagreements and even crimes."²³ The members, hoping to clear up some of these problems and, perhaps, to gain more local control over the province's chief resource, petitioned the Imperial government to allow the President to grant sesmarias from public lands. This brought no reply, prompting Goiás's President again to visit the land situation in 1838. Referring to the South of the province, he noted that presently it was "inhabited by many mineira families, and other parts [were] not yet settled but claimed, almost all of it divided into posses by rural inhabitants accustomed to do as they wish, without a clear area and indicated only by marks on trees and creeks. Because such a claim can easily be challenged, as has often happened, ... conflicts and murders have resulted from possession of land called *devoluta* in this *sertão*".²⁴ Because the national government had failed to take action, he went on, he decreed that no posse could be larger than three square leagues for cattle or one half square league for agriculture, that squatters were to apply to the government to have their land measured, and that settlers would lose their rights if they did not develop their properties within three years. Such a law conflicted with existing lack of an Imperial policy and never took effect, but the intent was clear.

There was little hope of bringing the settlements and the cattle economy of the North under effective state control any time soon,²⁵ but the economy of southern Goiás already was attracting the provincial government's closer attention, both for its potential as a revenue source and in order to limit real or potential conflict in the region.

Complicating the difficulties of settlement and state control were a number of provincial border disputes. In the southeast, Minas Gerais not only had taken control of the Araxá-Desemboque area [the Triângulo] in 1816, but continued to dispute the resulting boundary, claiming as its western limit the São Marcos River rather than the Paranaíba River that Goiás recognized.²⁶ This fostered a no mans land that harbored bandits and cattle rustlers and frustrated Goiás's attempts to halt interprovincial smuggling or to impose order in the area. To the southwest, Mato Grosso claimed the area of Goiás from the Caiapó River to the municipality of Rio Verde. Both provinces sent settlers, civil officials, and armed detachments into the region and clashes repeatedly erupted.²⁷ In neither area could the provincial government enforce the civil authority necessary to resolve land conflicts. For economic, fiscal, and political reasons the governments of Goiás, if not necessarily those local elites that thrived on contraband, cattle rustling, and land encroachment, had much to gain from a modern land law backed by a functioning provincial government apparatus.²⁸

The first evident impact of the 1850 land law on Goiás appeared early in 1855, in the form of a circular from the Ministry of Imperial Affairs.²⁹ Article 28 of the 1854 *regulamento* had provided that

Upon publication of the present regulations, the Presidents of the Provinces will require of the Judges of Law, Municipal Judges, Police Deputies, and Justices of the Peace detailed information on posses subject to legitimation, on sesmarias and on other government concessions in their districts subject to revalidation.

But information on property in rural Goiás proved difficult to obtain, as a series of provincial presidents and government ministers would learn.³⁰ Virtually no municipality in Goiás was willing to provide a detailed listing or description of posses in its jurisdiction, and only a few even mentioned sesmarias [Appendix A]. Since almost everyone's title was to some degree defective, local government would have met strong

resistance had it attempted a close examination of the land situation. And since in most areas the land holding elites controlled local government, the municipality was unlikely to press the question.

The problem of public land was equally complicated. Some have suggested that for Brazil broadly it was in the interest of municipalities and local elites to identify public land that could then be used for colonization and immigration, to improve local agriculture and boost labor supplies.³¹ Perhaps this made sense in the South or on the coast but not in 1850s Goiás. Given the declining availability and rising cost of slaves, labor supply for the large land holders seemed to depend on denying the rural free population independent access to land, so that they would be forced to work on the ranches under conditions set by their employers. Too, the extensive nature of frontier cattle ranching pushed land claims up to those of neighbors,³² leaving few or no interstices into which small producers could insinuate themselves. Much of the land remained unoccupied but most of it had claimants. The lords of Goiás's *sertão* never succeeded entirely in cutting off alternative employments,³³ but by combining control of land with political and judicial power and social prestige they managed to reduce most of the rural poor to the dependent state of *agregados* or *camaradas* [workers bound by economic and social ties to large properties].³⁴

After delays of several years, and in response to repeated orders, some municipalities did provide information on public lands available in their areas. Apart from Goiás, which enthusiastically pointed to vast open areas toward the south — at that time the municipality of Goiás included most of the South/southwest of the province — town councils typically reported either no public land remaining in their districts or only small, residual amounts, and this despite the province's population of perhaps 160,000 spread over more than 600,000 square kilometers.³⁵ Much of what they did identify bordered rivers and lakes, areas settlers shunned because of fevers.³⁶ Other towns, such as Natividade, responded that there was no public land left, except perhaps for some small pieces between private properties, pieces that could be determined only by measurement.³⁷ Santa Maria Taguatinga reported that all of the land of the municipality was in the hands of *posseiros* except for parts of the "Gerais," a desolate area along the border with Bahia useless for cattle.³⁸ At Santa Cruz the only Crown lands said to be available were two tracts

originally set aside to support now-abandoned fiscal checkpoints on the Corumbá River.³⁹ Open land, or at least land open to outsiders, did not serve the ranchers' interests and for this reason was not to be found.

In the long run, however, the most significant part of the 1850 law was the system of registries. The government picked the priest for the task of registration both because in many interior areas he was almost the only literate person available and because it was hoped that he would not be directly involved in local land disputes. A provincial Department of Public Lands supervised registration from 1858 until 1860, when President took over.⁴⁰ The last official deadline for registering properties was September of 1862, fully twelve years after the enactment of the law, by which point land holders in Goiás had registered approximately 6,000 properties [Appendix B]. But registration actually continued for several more years.⁴¹

Each entry in the registry books was supposed to include the name of the owner(s) and of the property and its location, limits, area, value, and the basis of possession. This attempt at bureaucratic standardization had not more effect than did most such efforts in nineteenth century Brazil, and in fact there was tremendous variation among the way owners described and the priests reported properties from one municipality to the next. Most importantly, not all the information the law required appeared in each entry, making comparisons between properties or municipalities difficult or impossible. Registrants almost always referred to the limits of their properties, but at best these referred to local accidents of geography, e.g., creeks or hills which could and did change, and more commonly they simply noted neighbors; none indicated surveyors's markers. In many cases the priests failed to report the areas of properties, and few noted values, and when they did they did not separate land prices from the costs of improvements and stock.

Some differences seem to have resulted from either local custom or from the particular priest's conception of property. Take, for example, the question of land held in common by families or groups of relatives. Brazilian laws of equal partible inheritance among children, if obeyed, would tend to force landholding families in marginal areas into poverty in two or three generations.⁴² A common response was to leave properties intact as producing units, with the descendants sharing in the income. In Goiás the registros for some municipalities listed multiple owners for most

of the properties, while in other instances the common pattern was a single name for each listing. Either property holding patterns varied widely between even adjacent municipalities, and there is no other evidence to support this, or different vicars applied different criteria. Only detailed, municipal level research could sort out this apparent anomaly.

Perhaps most frustrating for historians is the failure of many priests to report property sizes. Where they did provide this information, however, and even admitting the problems of inadequate measurements and fraud, the results go a long way toward helping us understand nineteenth century rural Brazil.

This sample makes it clear that older municipalities, such as Bomfim, Corumbá, and Meia Ponte, typically had more properties of generally smaller size than did those on frontier, e.g., Rio Bonito. Preservation strategies might slow but apparently could not stop the fragmentation of property over time. By contrast, Rio Bonito reported fewer properties but with sizes on the average four to six times larger than those of the older municipalities; on the frontier the first immigrants tended to claim large areas, areas subsequently whittled down by sales and gifts, and by the mechanisms of inheritance. The apparent exception to this trend might appear to be the colonial mining center of Santa Luzia with the second largest number of properties but also with the second largest average size for these. At this time Santa Luzia still included much of the province's southeast, where the larger holdings of recent immigrants tended to elevate the municipal average. Finally, the ratio between mean and medium indicates a strong inequality of landownership, with a few holding large properties and many more possessing relatively smaller ones.

A second way to approach this data is on the basis of possession.

Under the 1850 law, land possessed by purchase or inheritance did not require legitimization or revalidation. This helps explain, one imagines, the relatively few *posses* reported despite the fact that a generation without a land law would have made movement into the new cattle raising regions impossible on any basis but *posse*. Indeed, a careful reading of the registration entries shows a remarkable number of the properties said to have been bought or inherited in the years 1850-54. The apparent oddity is Meia Ponte, which, given that it was an early and important settlement, could hardly have been expected to report almost

all of its properties as posse. Of course, what here apparently reflected simply the vicar's whim in fact more accurately reflected the legal situation of most of rural Goiás than did the other registries.

In addition to providing for private and family ownership, the 1850 law allowed land holding by communities. We usually associate communal ownership in Latin America with the indigenous populations of the Andes and Mesoamerica, or sometimes with runaway slave communities, but Europeans too had a strong tradition of common lands. For nineteenth century Goiás this manifested itself most dramatically in the phenomenon of the "lands of the saint." Original settlers, as we have seen, commonly sold off pieces of their primitive posses to newer immigrants, because they needed the money and because it helped solidify their position and build support for their own land claims. For similar reasons, they often endowed chapels with land. A chapel drew traffic, served as a center for commerce and social life, and raised the value of surrounding properties. Over time the original donation tended to become part of local myth and others endowed the chapel with additional property, and the sum of these gifts and acquisitions came to be associated in the popular mind with, or "belong to," the patron saint of the community's chapel and, by extension, the people of the community. They used the land for wood for fuel or construction or to temporarily pasture cattle, or the poor might be allowed to cultivate a parcel for subsistence. An example of this pattern of development was the history of the municipality of Flores de Goiás, commercial capital of the rich but pestilential Vão de Paraná and the province's most important cattle raising center in the 1830s and 1840s. By the end of the nineteenth century the saint's land had come to total almost half the municipality, watched over and carefully guarded by a committee elected from among the local population. The land provided not only an economic "safety net" for local inhabitants but the ideological glue that bound the community together.⁴³

Civil municipalities also could own land. As of 1850, however, only the provincial capital Goiás did, possessing four square leagues around the town, based on an eighteenth century royal grant.⁴⁴ Other towns that sought municipal land before 1850 learned that neither the President nor the provincial assembly had the power to make grants of Crown land.⁴⁵ But article 77 of the 1854 land regulations allowed the granting of "lands ... for the formation of towns."⁴⁶ The intent was to provide for

new settlement colonies of European immigrants, but at least in Goiás existing towns took it as an opportunity for them too to seek a grant. The province's president apparently agreed with this interpretation and in July of 1857 sent a circular to the municipalities soliciting land applications.⁴⁷ The results were interesting. While a few town's ideas were deemed "excessive," most sought only a sesmaria of one by three leagues or less, and this, given existing settlement patterns, usually at some distance from the settlement itself. Others, for example, Arraias, Pilar, Conceição, and Palma, saw this as an opportunity for the town government to take over control of the local saint's land. Santa Cruz and Catalão, reflecting the recent explosion of the cattle economy there, reported that there was no public land available in those municipalities, and others found they did not know what existed or what to request because local properties had never been measured.⁴⁸

Nothing came of this circular, but in the 1870s the Ministry of Agriculture returned to the idea. It circulated requests to the provincial presidents for information on land owned by municipalities and on what might be suitable for a community endowment for those that had no land. Not surprisingly, Goiás's towns reported less public land available than two decades before. Several repeated earlier complaints about inadequate measurements, and others tried again to get at the saint's land.⁴⁹ The government again did nothing with the information. By the early twentieth century even the town of Goiás's community land had disappeared, divided now into individual properties and posses.⁵⁰

Finally, the 1850/1854 law provided for the registration and preservation of lands belonging to state-settled Indian villages, or *aldeas*.⁵¹ Over the course of the nineteenth century Brazil's national indigenous policy alternated between conciliation and violence, but on the frontier de facto violence predominated. During the 1830s hostilities exploded in the North between the Canoeiro Indians and the expanding cattle ranches, provoking a series of fierce raids met by reprisal and slaving expeditions by local settlers. And the Caiapó raided the southwest well into the 1890s.⁵² Provincial governments created a series of military garrisons [*presídios*], particularly in the North, to guard against Indian attacks.⁵³ The counterpoint to these on again/off again hostilities was Goiás's efforts since the eighteenth century to attract and settle Indians peacefully in villages, supervised by lay and religious directors.⁵⁴ Neither

presídios or aldeas met with great success. Both depended on agriculture for survival, but most never gained clear or secure control of land.

The most famous of the aldeas was São José de Mossâmedes, located thirty kilometers southeast of Goiás.⁵⁵ Although the colonial government endowed the mission with land and constructed elaborate buildings for the Indians and the administrators in the late eighteenth century, the Caiapó Indians settled there generally preferred to live in their own shelters in the surrounding countryside, and the last of these deserted São José altogether after the death of the dynamic leader Damiana da Cunha in the 1830s.⁵⁶ Goiás's provincial Director of Indians registered the settlement's land, and that of aldeia Maria, under the 1850 law, but in 1878 the provincial President ruled the land abandoned and put it up for sale.⁵⁷ This was one of the few areas in the province where the government managed to sell land under the 1850 law, small plots to agriculturalists anxious to produce for the capital market.⁵⁸

Indian settlements in other areas of Goiás suffered similar problems, and it seemed to not matter greatly whether they had registered their land or not. For example, the village of Duro, in the east/north central part of the province, had its origins in an eighteenth century Jesuit mission settled with Cherente Indians.⁵⁹ When these died or fled, a mixed Indian population replaced them. By the 1830s these were complaining of intrusions into their lands by non-Indians, and the resulting conflicts continued for half a century.⁶⁰ The community apparently registered its claims under the 1850 law, but this availed little. By 1874 the police delegate at Duro was describing the town as existing on the land of the "extinguished" aldeia of the same name, noting that "the remainder of the ancient indigenous race today is confused and dispersed among the [non-indigenous] mass of the population".⁶¹ Indians, or mixed bloods who found that it served their purposes to describe themselves as Indians, however, continued to refer to Duro as a "mission" and to claim land based upon this a assertion of ethnicity and colonial heritage. Local "Brazilians" responded that "there is no aldeia of Indians here but instead citizens, voters, and [National] Guards."⁶² Similar conflicts after mid-century set the Cherente Indians of the aldeia of Piabanhas [near Pedro Afonso] against local cattle ranchers.⁶³

A recent study by Professor Maria Amélia de Alencar, of the Federal University of Goiás, provides a preliminary look at land

transactions in the province from the 1850s to the early 1900s, based on sales, purchases and inheritances recorded by notaries in three municipalities. The results are instructive, though they suffer the problem that many exchanges were never notarized and, therefore, do not appear in these records.⁶⁴ What she found were striking differences between municipalities. The provincial capital was little involved in the emerging commercial cattle industry — particularly as its southern/southwestern areas separated after mid-century to become new municipalities — and local power rested more on politics and commerce than land; generally land holdings continued to fragment over the course of the half century, becoming *chácaras* [weekend retreats], small plots producing food for the town market, and subsistence plots of the *agregados* subordinated to the remaining large, and largely traditional, estates. Rio Verde, by contrast, was on the leading edge of the southwestern commercial cattle raising frontier after 1850. Immigrants from São Paulo and Minas Gerais acquired huge tracts of land and developed vast cattle estates; there was no room or role here for small producers. Finally, in the Southeast the town of Morrinhos prospered based on a combination of good soils and a location on major trade routes. Properties here were smaller but more highly capitalized than in the Southwest, and the tendency was for owners to acquire a number of smaller or medium sized properties, structured on the basis of capitalist rationality, rather than a single huge, sweeping tract. Morrinhos, too, provided the clearest example of political power based on land. It was a leading member of Morrinhos's elite that backed the temporarily successful overthrow of the Bulhões oligarchy at the turn of the century.⁶⁵

With the end of the Empire in 1889, the new national government gave over control of public lands to the individual states. These, in turn, enacted their own land laws, which typically differed little from that of 1850.⁶⁶ Goiás passed a new law in 1893.⁶⁷ Although this provided for the sale of state land, and even allowed installment payments, an innovation over 1850, there continued to be scant interest in the purchase of public lands. Rather, the key points remained those of the rights of squatters. As might be imagined from a government even more in the control of local interests than had been that of the province, the law was extremely accommodating to large holders with defective titles or plagued by vaguely, or even grossly, illegitimate possession. In addition to

recognizing sesmaria grants and all registrations made under the 1850 law, even where none of the subsequent requirements had been met, the law accepted as legitimate all subsequent possessions still in the hands of original occupants. Anyone who had acquired property since post-1854 and held it in undisputed possession could legalize it, as could anyone who owned a pre-1850 tract still not legitimized. In effect, the 1893 law extended the date for legal squatting from 1850 to the early 1890s, but its provisions for legalization proved just as ineffective as had been those of the 1850. Land was just not worth the cost of the proceedings. The state legislature passed a revised version in 1897 meant to remedy the law's failings, but it too was largely ignored.⁶⁸ By the next decade the governor was lamenting the worthlessness of the province's land law, pointing specifically to its failure to clear up the problem of squatting and squatters rights and calling for yet more reforms.⁶⁹

The original proposals for what became the 1850 law had included a land tax, for revenue and to encourage rational use of land, but the deputies struck these provisions before enacting it.⁷⁰ In May of 1879 Goiás's provincial assembly, desperate for revenue and searching for a replacement for an earlier, failed tax on cattle and horse production, revived the idea of a land tax, or *imposto territorial* for the province.⁷¹ All rural properties⁷² were to be liable for a tax of one percent of their value, excepting only those worth 200\$000 or less and state or church-owned properties; local panels made up of representatives of the owners and the Treasury would set the values. Rancher hostility quickly doomed this effort.⁷³

But after the declaration of the Republic the government of the new state of Goiás, as ever short of funds, returned to the idea of a land tax. The new republican constitution removed from states the right to collect duties on interstate trade, including the cattle export tax which had sustained the province under the Empire, leaving state leaders scrambling for revenue. Even a ranching oligarchy saw little alternative to a land tax, and the state legislature in 1892 imposed one that required an annual payment of 100 reais per square kilometer.⁷⁴ Again, the tax met with widespread resistance, but this time the state persisted, though it is clear from lists of debtors that many owners failed or refused to pay the new levy.⁷⁵ Only a few of the comprehensive tax digests prepared for the 1892 law survive, but if we return to some of the municipalities surveyed in 1850, we find familiar patterns.

In older settlements such as Bomfim and Corumbá land holdings had continued to fragment. In Corumbá the fall in mean/median size with a stable number of holdings probably resulted from the creation of new municipalities and the redrawing of municipal boundaries. A similar phenomenon explains the opposite developments in Santa Luzia and Meia Ponte, where the number of properties fell dramatically while the mean/median sizes did not vary greatly. On the frontier, the total of properties in Rio Bonito had more than tripled while the sizes had fallen significantly, though these still exceeded those of the older settled areas. And, again comparing the mean to the median reveals an even greater inequality of land distribution than evident in 1850. Actually, these numbers tended to understate fragmentation, remembering that many of these properties had multiple owners and supported growing numbers of family and dependents.

These patterns become clearer if we look in more detail at a single municipality, in this case Rio Bonito. Sixty properties in the 1850s had become 196 a half century later, while the average size had fallen some forty percent and the median by seventy percent. Clearly property was subdividing rapidly. But at the same time some *fazendas* were getting larger: in 1850 the largest registered was 756 sq. km, and most were considerably smaller, whereas fifty years later at least two exceeded 1000 sq. km and a half dozen other owners reported multiple properties totaling well over a thousand kilometers. If we look at individual properties we see these diverging patterns: Fazenda Arcias in the 1850s was 270 sq. km. but by the 1890s doubled to 552.3, though seven individuals now claimed part of it; Fazenda Bocaina had gone from 18 sq. km to 431 sq. km, with three owners, and, most dramatic of all, Fazenda Perdizes had increase from 72 sq. km. to over a thousand, with a single owner listed. Characteristic of the opposite trend were properties such as Fazenda Galicia, 270 sq. km. in the 1850s, fallen to 65 sq. km. in the 1890s with four owners, Fazenda Bom Jardim reduced from 162 sq. km. to 60 sq. km., and Fazenda Morrinhos, 540 sq. km. in the 1850s but only 483 sq. km. fifty years later, and this divided among thirteen owners. Marriages, and the Brazilians' sometimes odd naming patterns, make it difficult to be precise, but only about half of the family names present in the initial *registros* were still evident in the 1890s, while some of the new names were among the large holders, suggesting high rate of circulation among elites. In all, a clear pattern of polarization emerges from the data.

But the 1850 law was as much about labor as it was about land. If enforced, it would have denied access to public lands on any basis but purchase, which most of the rural poor could not afford, and even recent immigrants would have found it difficult or impossible to gain land without years of saving. The law, however, did provide that the government could allocate land to immigrants in colonies, and allowed it to subsidize foreign immigration. There was to be no land and no subsidies for Brazil's poor. Apart from the southern part of Brazil, the immigration provisions of the law came to little, and Goiás was no exception. When European immigration picked up in the 1870s, the Imperial government funded it out of general revenues not from the very limited returns from land sales. With slavery visibly faltering, interest in immigration in Goiás increased,⁷⁶ but overseas immigrants avoided the province. Schemes to bring in Italians and Portuguese came to naught in the 1880s and 1890s because there were better opportunities elsewhere.⁷⁷

Over the course of the nineteenth century immigrants did swell the population of Goiás, but these were not the stout hearted, "white," European yeomen Brazilian elites hoped for. Rather, most were migrants from neighboring provinces. As we have seen, families came from Minas Gerais and São Paulo to squat on land in the South. By local standards this was seen as a comparatively good quality immigration that brought capital and modern techniques to the province. From the neighboring *sertão* of Bahia, Piauí, and Maranhão came waves of poorer, and, to elites, ethnically less desirable, mixed blood migrants. They came seeking opportunities or perhaps fleeing from drought or from the police; most found work as cowboys or as boatmen on the Tocantins River or as thugs in the region's political struggles.⁷⁸ Of course, extensive cattle raising did not generate the same labor needs as did the expanding coffee economies of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. Landholders in Goiás continued to complain about the quality of the local lower orders but adequate numbers were not really a problem, nor was control.

Together with facilitating immigration, the chief goal of the 1850 land law was to convert rural land from essentially a free good into a capitalist commodity that would respond to market forces. This effort failed generally in Brazil, and specifically in Goiás, for several reasons. Apart from the main export production areas, land was not worth the cost of measuring and marking it, but precisely because it was not marked

and legitimately titled it could not be traded in a regular manner and could not serve as a basis for credit. More than this, in nineteenth century Goiás, and in much of the interior of Brazil, viable large scale economic activities did not demand titling or lend themselves to the commodification of land. Slash and burn agriculture was destructive,⁷⁹ but with vast quantities of land, a small population, low capital inputs, primitive technologies, and long distances to market, it was the most rational form of agricultural exploitation for the time and place. Extensive cattle production militated against the logic of clearly marking land boundaries. Your land was where your cattle were, and herds of different owners commonly intermixed, making precise pasture boundaries irrelevant. On Brazil's western frontier land was not a commodity and laws alone could not make it one. Too, the absence of precise boundaries served the interests of local elites. Not only did these allow for future expansion, and the easy abandonment of used up land — cattle, no less than coffee, were examples of the so-called “hollow” frontier — it guaranteed the locally powerful economic and social/political control over wide areas of the countryside. It served their interest and the workings of a law imagined in Rio de Janeiro did not.

In the key areas of asserting central state control over the countryside, of regularizing land ownership, and of promoting immigration the 1850 law met nationally, and in Goiás, with little success. Not until the 1930s did the national government achieve much purchase over the interior, land titles continue today to be chaotic, and the idea of selling land to subsidize colonization failed because few cared to buy, as opposed to squat on, public lands. Perhaps the idea of depressing labor costs by restricting access to land could have been made to work, but in Brazil cheap labor this was an effect above all not of land prices or of the policies of the central regime but of the power of local elites.

Appendix A⁸⁰

Devoluta, Sesmarias and Posse Goiás, 1850s

| <i>Município</i> | <i>sesmarias</i> | | <i>posses</i> | |
|------------------|---|----------|---------------|--|
| Sta Cruz | 1 | | <i>posses</i> | in hands of 2nd/3rd generation |
| Bomfim | | | <i>posses</i> | all subject to legitimation |
| Villa Bela | | | <i>posses</i> | in hands of 2nd/3rd generation |
| Sta Luzia | 1 | | <i>posse</i> | only title |
| Capital | | | <i>posse</i> | only title/some 2nd generation |
| Sta Rita | | | <i>posse</i> | only title |
| Jaragua | 11 | | <i>posses</i> | subject to legitimation |
| Pilar | various | many | <i>posses</i> | subject to legitimation |
| Meia Ponte | 11 | some | <i>posses</i> | few 1st generation |
| Trahiras | "no scsmarias, <i>posses</i> , or other concessions subject to legitimation or revalidation" | | | |
| Cavalcante | | some | <i>posses</i> | |
| Arraias | "no devolutas or <i>posses</i> or concessions that fall under article 24 and 27 of the <i>reglamento</i> ; all measured/marked and in hands of third generation | | | |
| Formosa | on land of chapel of community - used in common | | | |
| Palma | | many | <i>posses</i> | subject to legitimation |
| Peixe | | many | <i>posses</i> | subject to legitimation |
| Conceição | nothing subject to legitimation/revalidation | | | |
| Taguatinga | nothing subject to legitimation/revalidation | | | |
| P Imperial | sesmarias | | <i>posses</i> | to be reconfirmed |
| Carmo | 1 | many | <i>posses</i> | subject to legitimation vs others in hands of 2nd-4th generation |
| Natividade | | many | <i>posses</i> | to be reconfirmed |
| Boavista | | all land | <i>posses</i> | in hands of 2nd/3rd generation |

Appendix B⁸¹

Properties Registered, Goiás, 1850s

| <i>Municipality</i> | <i>Num. registered</i> | <i>Municipality</i> | <i>Num. registered</i> |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| Capital | 73 | Corumba | 275 |
| Ourofino | 115 | Bomfim | 411 |
| Barra | 45 | Campinas | 206 |
| Mossamedes | 72 | Pouso Alto | 74 |
| Currallinho | 204 | Sta Luzia | 333 |
| Sta Rita | 91 | Morrinhos | ? |
| Rio Claro | 59 | S Rita Paranaiba | 76 |
| Anicuns | 200 | Vaivem | 245 |
| Rio Bonito | ? | Catalao | 697 |
| Rio Verde | 91 | Formosa | ? |
| Jaragua | 290 | Pilar | 136 |
| Meiaponte | 234 | Crixas | 38 |
| Cavalcante | 167 | Amarao Leite | 34 |
| Arrais | 200 S | Joao Tocantins | 11 |
| Chapeo | 63 | Trahiras | 103 |
| Flores | 275 | Natividade | ? |
| S Domingos | 147* | P Imperial | ? |
| Palma | ? | Carmo | ? |
| S Miguel/Almas | ? | Boa Vista | ? |
| Taguatinga | ? | S Felix | 64 |
| Chapada | 38 | | |
| Conceição | 181 | | |

* as of 1860

Notes

- 1 ALENCAR, Maria Amélia Gracia de. *Estrutura Fundiária em Goiás Goiânia*, 1993, Anexos I and II.
- 2 The *registros* for Goiás, for example, are in the Goiás state administration building, not the state historical archives with other nineteenth century documents, and access to them remains severely restricted. The 1850 law specifically denies that the registrations are valid for title claims.
- 3 COSTA, Emilia Viotti da. *The Brazilian Empire: Myths and Histories* (Chicago, 1985), Chap. 4; DEAN, Warren. "Latifundia and Land Policy in Nineteenth Century Brazil," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 51:4 (November, 1971), 606-625; CARVALLO, José Murilo de *Teatro de Sombras: A Política Imperial* (Rio de Janeiro, 1988), Chap. 3; LIMA, Ruy Cirne. *Pequena História Territorial do Brasil: Sesmarias e Terras Devolutas*, 2nd, ed. (Porto Alegre, 1954), Chap. 4; GUIMARÃES, Alberto Passos. *Quatro Séculos de Latifúndio* (São Paulo, 1964); Lígia Osorio Silva, *Terras Devolutas e Latifúndio: Efeitos da Lei de 1850* (Campinas, 1996).
- 4 SILVA, *Terras Devolutas* and Vilma Eliza Trindade de Saboya, "A Lei de Terras (1850) e a Política Imperial - seus Reflexos na Província de Mato Grosso," *Revista Brasileira de História* 15:30 (1995), 115-136, for example, rely on published reports and include no provincial or local archive materials.
- 5 SILVA, *Terras Devolutas*, Chaps. 1-3; 1-3; LIMA, *Pequena História*, Chap. 2.
- 6 For a catalog of sesmarias in Goiás, see, SILVA, Edma José. "Sesmarias: Capitania de Goiás, 1726-1770," Mestrado, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 1996. On the failure of sesmaria holders to develop their land, see TELES, José Mendonça. *Vida e Obra de Silva e Souza* (Goiânia, 1978), 143-44, 165.
- 7 MATTOS, Raymundo José Cunha. *Chorographia Histórica da Provincia de Goyáz (1824)*, Goiânia, 1979 and *Itinerário de Rio de Janeiro ao Pará e Maranhão pelas Províncias de Minas Gerais e Goiás* Rio de Janeiro, 1836; FUNES, Euripedes Antônio. *Goiás 1800-1850: um Período de Transição da Mineração a Agropecuário*, Goiânia, 1986.
- 8 SILVA, *Terras Devolutas*, 73.
- 9 STEIN, Stanley. *Vassouras: A Brazilian Coffee County* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957; DEAN, Warren. *Rio Claro: A Brazilian Plantation System, 1820-1920* (Stanford, 1976).

- 10 CARVALHO, Murilo de. *Teatro de Sombras*; MATTOS, Ilmar Rohloff de. *Tempo do Saquarema: A Formação do Estado Imperial* 2. ed. São Paulo, 1990.
- 11 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, Anexo I.
- 12 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, Anexo II.
- 13 CONRAD, Robert. *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 1850-1888* Berkeley, 1972, Chap. 2.
- 14 CARVALHO, Murilo de. *Teatro de Sombras*, nt. 9, p. 104.
- 15 LOBO, E. M. L. *História Político-Administrativa da Agricultura Brasileira, 1808/1889* Rio de Janeiro, n.d., 120.
- 16 Arquivo Histórico do Estado de Goiás [AHEG], Documentação Diversa [Diversa], Volume [vol.] 3, f. 76v-77, Captain General-Lieutenant Dragoons, 15 April, 1809 regarding the “blind rage” with which agriculturalists are abandoning their plantings for the new gold strike at Anicuns.
- 17 COSTA, Lena Castello Branco Ferreira. *Arraial e Coronel: Dois Estudos de História Social*, 54; *Matutina Meiapontense* (Meia Ponte) [Pirinópolis], 1 February, 1832.
- 18 FUNES; *Goiás 1800-1850*; MCCREERY, David. “Smuggling and the ‘Internal Economy’ of Nineteenth Century Brazil: The Case of Goiás,” *The Americas* 53:3 (January, 1997), 333-51.
- 19 See, for example, GARDNER, George. *Viagem ao Interior do Brasil (1836-1841)* Belo Horizonte/São Paulo, 1975 and WELLS, James. *Three Thousand Miles Through Brazil* London, 1886.
- 20 FRANÇA, Basileu Toledo. *Pioneiros: Romance Histórico da Fundação de Jataí e Contribuição ao Estudo do Povoamento de Goiás* Goiânia, [1954] 1995.
- 21 BERTRAN, Paulo. *Formação Econômica de Goiás*, Goiânia, 1978, 88-91; Johann Emanuel Pohl, *Viagem no Interior do Brasil* Belo Horizonte/São Paulo, 1976, 296; Cunha Mattos, *Itinerario*, I; Funes, *Goiás 1800-1850*, 87.
- 22 AHEG, Diversa, Juiz de Paz, 1835-1852, Volume 126, President Goyáz-Justice of the Peace, Campinas, 9 June, 1836 and Justice of the Peace, Anicuns, 9 July, 1836.
- 23 AHEG, Diversa, Livro de Registro de Propostas Apresentadas ao Conselho Geral, 1829-1838, vol. 108, 5 July, 1837.

- 24 AHEG, Diversa, Resoluções da Presidência da Província, 1835-1846, vol. 135, 15 February, 1838.
- 25 MCCREERY, "Smuggling;" *Palacin Coronelismo*
- 26 *Relatório que à Assembleia Legislativa de Goyáz Apresentou na Sessão Ordinaria de 1836 O Exm. Presidente de Mesma Província José Rodrigues Jardim* Goyáz, 1844, 50-51; AHEG, Documentação Avulsa [Avulsa], Box 109/package 1, Ministério de Negocios do Império-Presidente de Goiás, 28 September, 1855; AHEG, Municípios, Box 1, Collector of Taxes, Rio Verde-Inspector, Treasury of the Provincial *Fazenda*, 12 January, 1871.
- 27 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 90, Subdelegate of Police, District, Rio Verde-Chief of Police, Goiás, 28 September, 1852; *Relatório-Mato Grosso, 1879*, 113-123
- 28 MCCREERY, David. "State Structure and State Power on Brazil's Western Frontier: Goiás Under the Empire," MS
- 29 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 109, Ministerio de Negocios do Império, circular, 26 February, 1855; repeated various times, eg. 30 November, 1855.
- 30 AHEG, Diversa, Juiz da Paz, 1852-1863, Box 258, President Goyáz - circular to Justices of the Peace, 1 August, 1856.
- 31 SILVA, *Terras Devolutas*, Chap. 10.
- 32 MCCREERY, "Smuggling".
- 33 A frustrating number of men, for example, continued to survive at subsistence diamond miners, *garimpeiros*: BERTRAN, *Formação Econômica*, 66; MATTOS, Cunha. *Chorographia*, 79-82.
- 34 On life in rural nineteenth century Goiás see RAMOS, Hugo de Carvalho. *Tropas e Boiadas*, 6th edition (Goiânia, Goiás: 1984) and ELIS, Bernardo. *Veranico de Janeiro*, 6th edition (Rio de Janeiro: 1987).
- 35 *Correio Oficial* (Goiás), 28 July, 1852.
- 36 For example, AHEG, Diversa, Presidente Goiás-Ministerio de Negocios do Império, 1851-57, Vol. 246, 11 January, 1856.
- 37 AHEG, Municípios, Natividade, Box 1, Subdelegate of Police-President Goiás, 1 October, 1858
- 38 AHEG, Municípios, Taguatinga, Box 1, *Vigario*-President Goiás, 3 November, 1858 [Responding to a presidential circular of 27 July, 1858].

- 39 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 127, Collector of Taxes, Santa Cruz-President Goiás, 27 December, 1858; for devoluta in several additional communities, see the lists in AHEG, Avulsa, Box 129.
- 40 AHEG, Diversa, Box 331, Registro de Correspondência da Delegacia Geral das Terras Públicas com o Governo, 1858-1860.
- 41 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 35.
- 42 WELLS, *Three Thousand Miles*, vol 1, 127, 371.
- 43 ATAÍDES, Heloisa Selma Fernandes Capel de. “Flores de Goiás: Tradição e Transformação,” Mestrado, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 1990, 63-66. The land was claimed by church in 1930s and sold in 1980.
- 44 *Correio Oficial*, 11 May and 22 February, 1840; AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 308, Correspondência da Presidência-Ministerio de Negócios do Império, 20 April, 1858. Includes a copy of the 1736 Crown grant of land.
- 45 *Correio Oficial*, 28 December, 1853; AHEG, Avulsa, Box 32/package 1, Comissão de Fazenda Municipal, Assembleia Legislativa, 19 June, 1841.
- 46 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 123.
- 47 AHEG, Diversa, Box 308, Correspondência da Presidência Provincial-Ministerio de Negócios do Império, 9 March, 1858.
- 48 AHEG, Diversa, Box ??? Correspondência Presidência-Ministério de Negócios do Império, 20 December, 1858.
- 49 AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 532 Ministerio de Agricultura, President Goiás-Ministry of Agriculture, 10 May, 1874 and 5 March, 1875.
- 50 Governor of Goiás, *Relatório-1905*: “Relatório, Secretaria de Instrução, Industrias, Terras e Obras Publicas;” See also *Relatórios-1917*, 18 and *1918*, 25-27.
- 51 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 109.
- 52 MCCREERY, “State Structure;” see any presidential *Relatório* for the 1830s and 1840s.
- 53 See, for example, *O Tocantins* (Goiás), 22 November, 1855; Biblioteca Nacional (Rio de Janeiro), BN I-32, 14, 13 “Presídios coloniais em Goyáz, 1856”.
- 54 KARASCH, Mary. “Catequese e Cativoiro: Política Indigenista em Goiás: 1780-1889,” 397-412, *História dos Índios no Brasil*, Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, ed., São Paulo, 1992.

- 55 Various travelers reported on Mossâmedes in the first half of the century: e.g., Pohl, *Viagem*, 151-55; ST-HILAIRE, Augusto. *Viagem à Província de Goiás* Belo Horizonte-São Paulo, 1975, 62-72.
- 56 KARASCH, Mary. "Damiana da Cunha," in *The Struggle for Survival in Colonial America*, David Sweet and Gary Nash, eds. (Berkeley, 1981).
- 57 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 61.
- 58 Museo da Bandeira (Goiás Velho), Package 1715, Ministerio de Agricultura-Presidente Goiás, 10 May, 1875; AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 532, Presidente Goiás-Ministerio de Agricultura, 20 April, 1876.
- 59 CHAIM, Marivone Matos. *Os Aldeamentos Indigenas na Capitania de Goiás* (Goiânia, 1974).
- 60 *Correio Oficial*, 25 November, 1837
- 61 AHEG, Municipios, Duro [Dianopolis], Box 1, Subdelegate of Police-Chief of Police, 17 March, 1874 and 3 June, 1874
- 62 AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 645, Correspondência da Presidência da Província Relativa a Catequese do Indios, 1878-1885, President Goiás - Director General of the Indians, 19 March, 1879; "Restaurar", 1879-1883, Livro de editais, termos, President Goiás-Ministry of Agriculture, 3 Nov., 1879.
- 63 *Correio Oficial*, 6 October, 1858; AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 429, Registro de Correspondência do Governo com os Juizes de Direito, 1866-1872, President Goiás-Justice of Peace, Porto Imperial, 19 October, 1867.
- 64 Compare AHEG, Avulsa, Box 224, "1873 Relação de Terras Posses Sujeitos a Legitimação" [Santa Maria Taguatinga].
- 65 ROSA, Maria Luiza Araújo. *Dos Bulhoes aos Caiados: Um Estudio da História Política de Goiás, 1899-1909*, Goiânia, 1984.
- 66 SILVA, *Terras Devolutas*, Part III.
- 67 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 128-132 and 134-148.
- 68 ALENCAR, *Estructura*, 149-170.
- 69 Governor of Goiás, *Relatório-1902*, 39-40 and *1905*, 24.
- 70 CARVALHO, Murilo de. *Teatro de Sombras*, 86-93.
- 71 *A Tribuna Livre*, 15 Feb., and 17 May, 1979; *Coleção das Leis da Província de Goiás* Tomo 45 (1879), 68-72.

- 72 Urban properties paid a separate tax called the *dizimo urbano*
- 73 *A Tribuna Livre*, 12 July, 1879; AHEG, Municipios, Piracanjuba, Box 2, Collector of Taxes-Inspector, Treasury of Provincial *Fazenda*, 12 December, 1879; *O Commercio* (Goiás), 27 March, 1880.
- 74 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 420, various drafts and discussion the proposed law; *Goyáz* (Goiás), 21 October, 1892.
- 75 AHEG, Municipios, Parana, Box 1a, Municipal Council-President [sic] Goiás, 7 April, 1896; Morrinhos, Box 2, Collector of Taxes-Chief, Directory of State Finances, 15 October, 1897; Avulsa, Box 501, "Requerimentos"; and evidence in dozens of lists of overdue tax payments/debtors reported by the municipalities.
- 76 *O Publicador Goyano* (Goiás), 11 July, 1885 and 9 October, 1886; AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 429, Registro de Correspondência do Governo com os Juizes de Direito, 1866-1872, circular to Judges of Law, 7 July, 1871.
- 77 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 497, various correspondence regarding Portuguese immigration; Governor of Goiás, *Relatório-1897*, 9; MORAES, Maria Augusta Sant'anna. *História de uma Oligarquia: Os Bulhoes Goiânia*, 1974, 145-46; FRANÇA, Maria de Sousa. "Povoamento do Sul de Goiás: 1872-1900," Mestrado, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 197?, 148-50.
- 78 AHEG, Avulsa, Box 184, Municipal Council, Conceição-President Goiás, 10 January, 1868.
- 79 On destructive agricultural practices in general see DEAN, Warren *With Broadax and Firebrand: The Destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest*, Berkeley, 1995.
- 80 AHEG, Diversa, Vol. 308, Correspondência Presidente-Ministerio de Negocios do Império, 27 July, 1858.
- 81 Compiled from various sources. For lists that vary slightly from this see: AHEG, Diversa, [no number], Repartição, 1858 [in fact this has inscriptions through 1860]; President, *Relatório-1905*, 119-120.