

Appendix 1. Definitions of key terms and concepts

Table A1.1 Overview of definitions of key terms and concepts used in this study (alphabetical)

Term	Definition
Biocultural system	A linked biological and cultural system as found in indigenous contexts (Bond et al. 2019), whose focus lies on place-based cultural perspectives that integrate values, needs, and knowledge and recognizes feedback between ecological state and human well-being (Sterling et al. 2017). Underlying cultural processes are rooted in the biological necessities of the human life cycle and human biological processes are constrained, organized, and developed by culture (Carroll et al. 2017).
Cultural-ecological resilience	The capacity of a cultural-ecological system (CES) to absorb the effects of external drivers without losing the potential to provide ecosystem services (ES) (considering those species, resources, and functions relevant for cultural traditions) and for cultural traditions, to adapt to changes without losing essential (place-based and universal) traditional knowledge, experiences, and practices that have evolved and were passed on through generations. Similar to ecocultural resilience (Pretty 2011, Arora-Jonsson 2016), cultural-ecological resilience is a transdisciplinary understanding of a CES considering different scientific disciplines, cultures (including arts, craftsmanship, and music), paradigms, worldviews, languages, and institutional frameworks.
Cultural-ecological system (CES)	A social-ecological system (SES) that explicitly focuses on culture, the foundation of a society (Chun et al. 2006). CESs tackle the interlinkage of people and the environment including worldviews, cultural identities, values, cultural practices, and behaviors corresponding to a certain society, community, or group. CESs address ES delivered by intact ecosystems for the benefit of culture, thereby stressing cultural ES.
Cultural-ecological tipping point	Level of one or several interlinked key ecological and/or cultural system variable(s) that, when crossed (similar to a tipping point defined by Chapin et al. 2009 and Folke et al. 2010) cause an abrupt change in the structure and function of a cultural-ecological system moving it to a new regime.
Cultural ecosystem services	Contributions of ecosystems to immaterial benefits for human well-being (Chan et al. 2012, Fish et al. 2016) depending on material (<i>provisioning-cultural services</i> , see definition below) and non-material (cultural ecosystem services) nature's contributions to people (NCPs) (Díaz et al. 2018); their valuation is determined by people's values of nature (Kenter 2018) and by the perceived values of culture.

Cultural heritage	A subcategory of cultural ES (MEA 2005); humans created and shaped it in the past and presence in material (cultural goods) and immaterial (cultural practices and expressions) forms; it includes ideas and beliefs of societies and the resulting cultural objects represent material evidence of essential norms and values (Rusalić and Radojičić 2009).
Cultural keystone species	They deliver several material and non-material elements with crucial, irreplaceable systemic functions and services for human well-being, hence they are essential in maintaining system integrity (Platten and Henfrey 2009) and depend on intact natural ecosystems.
Cross-scale interactions	Interactions within a hierarchically structured system spanning different scales (e.g. within the spatial, temporal, jurisdictional, institutional domain); they may change over time regarding their strength and direction; changes of interactions refer to dynamics of cross-scale linkages (Cash et al. 2006).
Dependence	It refers to well-being (physical, mental, social, and cultural) of key actors of the CES depending on a set of clearly defined ES (after Martín-López et al. 2019); in the case of pau-brasil: (a) direct and partial (economic) dependence on pau-brasil for livelihoods, (b) social, cultural, mental dependence on ES provided by pau-brasil beyond livelihoods, and (c) low dependence by actors potentially replaceable (e.g., scientists and environmental NGOs work for and with pau-brasil; policy makers are eager to approve protection laws for pau-brasil) (Fig. 6).
Driver	External (exogenous) factors to a system that may cause changes in slow/controlling variables. They cannot be managed and are often related to specific events (of climate, markets, legislation, among others) and trigger local or cross-scale changes in the focal SES or CES (Walker et al. 2012).
Ecocultural system	"Complex dynamic systems of interactions between humans and the environment" (Rapport and Maffi 2010) that extend beyond social institutions and culturally diverse contexts of communities to include distinctive worldviews, values, diverse cultural practices, behaviors and identity (Pretty 2011). In contrast to CESs, ecocultural system thinking focuses mainly on local scales (Soini and Birkeland 2014).
Ecosystem services	Provision of goods and services by ecosystems of natural environments for human well-being (Costanza et al. 1997, Groot et al. 2002).
Feedback	Result of an interaction between two or more system components that causes them to change, either in the same direction (amplifying feedback), ultimately destabilizing the system, or in the opposite direction (stabilizing feedback), thereby reducing fluctuations (Chapin et al. 2009).

Heritage	“A set of material or immaterial elements to which are attached specific values and rights that are linked to a social group and are inherited and transmitted from one generation to the next“ (Michon et al. 2012); consequently the concept of heritage is a patrimonialization process of social, cultural, and political construction and as Olwig (2005) states, the role of nature or culture in shaping heritage identity depends on time and place. In contrast to ES, heritage has intergenerational relevance.
Influence	Influence of actors and actor groups (after Martín-López et al. 2019), where: (a) procedural equity or inequity refers to the direct control or decision-making power over management and policy decisions that affect ES. Procedural equity refers to the potential of different people/groups to influence decision making or having their perspectives incorporated or represented (Leach et al. 2018); and (b) distributional equity is the control over or power to influence management decisions that affect the access to ES. Distributional equity refers to how resources, benefits, and costs are distributed or shared among people and groups.
Intangible cultural heritage	It encompasses the knowledge required and acquired for creating crafts (e.g., traditional bow making craftsmanship), languages, and traditions (Lowenthal 2005), which often includes tangible aspects (van Zanten 2004, Barthel-Bouchier 2016) such as musical instruments in music traditions and natural resources used in craftsmanship. Its focus is on traditional understandings and expressions, basically of “what people do and how they express themselves within their social context” (Dorfman 2011).
Metacoupled system	“A set of two or more coupled systems that interact internally as well as nearby and far away, facilitated by agents affected by various causes with various effects” (Liu 2017). A metacoupled system encompasses “human-nature interactions within a system (intracoupling) between adjacent systems (pericoupling) and between distant systems (telecoupling)” (Liu 2017).
People’s values of culture	Cultural values shared by a group/community or through legitimacy obtained by a socially accepted way of assigning value (e.g. disciplinary ‘experts’) attributed to be traditionally part of ‘culture’ (Stephenson 2008).
People’s values of nature	Societal importance/values assigned to nature shaping the perception of its ES/NCP (Kenter 2018), thus leading their decisions and behavior beyond a merely utilitarian perspective (Chan et al. 2016).
Regime	A desirable regime/stability domain of a SES or CES encompasses a set of alternative system states (Folke et al. 2010) each delivering a certain set of ES.

Social-ecological system	A “system with interacting and interdependent physical, biological and social components, emphasizing the ‘humans-in-nature’ perspective.” (Chapin et al. 2009).
System variable	A system is defined by its inherent system variables and the relationships among them (Walker et al. 2012); they encompass ‘slow’ and ‘fast’ variables that control the system resilience: ‘slow’ variables basically control ecological resilience, while either ‘slow’ or ‘fast’ variables control social (and cultural) resilience (Walker et al. 2012). For example, composition, musical instrument making, and societal structures are ‘slow’ variables, while crop cover controlled by ‘slash and burn’ and shifting agricultural practice is a ‘fast’ variable.
Tangible cultural heritage	It includes both moveable cultural objects and built monuments or heritage sites. Tangible heritage emerges from intangible/immaterial knowledge, therefore “the immaterial heritage needs to be regarded as the larger framework within which material heritage takes on shape and significance” (Rusalić and Radojičić 2009).
Telecoupled CES	Extending the definition of telecoupled SES by Liu et al. (2013) , telecoupled CES consist of strong (socio-)cultural, socio-economic, and environmental interconnections and flows coupling cultural and natural subsystems to one integrated CES over large geographic distances.
Telecoupled SES	Hierarchically structured SES characterized by strong socio-economic and ecological/environmental interactions and flows, thereby coupling human and natural systems over large distances (Liu et al. 2013).
Threshold / tipping point	Degree of one or several system variables (elements) that, when crossed, cause an abrupt change in the structure and function of the SES/CES shifting the system to a new regime (Chapin et al. 2009, Folke et al. 2010).
Trigger event	An internal or external punctual event, e.g., disturbance (storm, fire, etc.) or human activity (discovery, invention, decree, etc.) that triggers change in one or several system variables subsequently causing a change in system state or, when crossing a threshold or tipping point to a regime shift.
UNESCO cultural heritage	Refers to an outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, arts/aesthetics, ethnology, anthropology and/or science (UNESCO 1972). It consists of tangible cultural heritage (monuments, groups of buildings, sites) (UNESCO 1972) and intangible cultural heritage (oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events; knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe and traditional craftsmanship) (UNESCO 2018).

UNESCO natural heritage Refers to an outstanding universal value as viewed by science, conservation or due to the natural beauty/aesthetics for humanity (UNESCO 1972), it includes: (1) natural features (biotic and abiotic formations); (2) geologic or physiographic formations and precisely delineated areas, which constitute the habitat of threatened species, and (3) natural sites.

Literature cited

- Allen, A. S. 2011. Prospects and Problems for Ecomusicology in Confronting a Crisis of Culture. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64(2):414–424.
- Arora-Jonsson, S. 2016. Does resilience have a culture? Ecocultures and the politics of knowledge production. *Ecological Economics* 121:98–107.
- Barthel-Bouchier, D. 2016. Cultural heritage: Tangible and intangible makers of collective memory. Pages 221–232 in A. L. Tota, and T. Hagen, editors. *Routledge international handbook of memory studies*. Routledge, London, New York.
- Bond, M. O., B. J. Anderson, T. H. A. Henare, and P. M. Wehi. 2019. Effects of climatically shifting species distributions on biocultural relationships. *People and Nature* 1(1):87–102.
- Brémaud, I., and N. Poidevin. 2013. Approches culturelles et mécaniques dans le choix des bois en facture: cas des archets anciens: Cultural and mechanical approaches in the choice of woods in instrument making the case of early bows. Pages 1–27 in M. Castellengo, and H. Genevois, editors. *La musique et ses instruments*. Editions Delatour France, Sampzon.
- Brockhaus, editor. 1993. *Der Brockhaus in fünf Bänden*. 8. edition. F.A. Brockhaus GmbH, Mannheim.
- Bueno, E. 2002. *Pau-Brasil*. Axis Mundi Ed, São Paulo.
- Bunn, J., and L. R. Seiber. 1997. Music, makers and markets. *The Strad*.
- Buono, A. J. 2012. Crafts of Color: Tupi *Tapirage* in Early Colonial Brazil in A. Feeser, M. D. Goggin, M. A. Feeser, and A. M. E. Yonan, editors. *The Materiality of Color: The Production, Circulation, and Application of Dyes and Pigments, 1400-1800*. Taylor and Francis, Florence.
- Buono, A. J. 2016. Representing the Tupinambá and the Brazilwood Trade in Sixteenth-Century Rouen in R. R. Felix, and S. D. Juall, editors. *Cultural Exchanges between Brazil and France*. Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana.
- Carroll, J., M. Clasen, E. Jonsson, A. R. Kratschmer, L. McKerracher, F. Riede, J.-C. Svenning, and P. C. Kjærgaard. 2017. Biocultural theory: The current state of knowledge. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences* 11(1):1–15.
- Cash, D. W., W. N. Adger, F. Berkes, P. Garden, L. Lebel, P. Olsson, L. Pritchard, and O. Young. 2006. Scale and Cross-Scale Dynamics: Governance and Information in a Multilevel World. *Ecology and Society* 11(2).
- Chan, K. M., T. Satterfield, and J. Goldstein. 2012. Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and navigate cultural values. *Ecological Economics* 74:8–18.
- Chan, K. M. A., P. Balvanera, K. Benessaiah, M. Chapman, S. Díaz, E. Gómez-Baggethun, R. Gould, N. Hannahs, K. Jax, S. Klain, G. W. Luck, B. Martín-López, B. Muraca, B. Norton, K. Ott, U. Pascual, T. Satterfield, M. Tadaki, J. Taggart, and N. Turner. 2016. Opinion: Why protect nature? Rethinking values and the environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113(6):1462–1465.
- Chapin, F. S., G. P. Kofinas, and C. Folke, editors. 2009. *Principles of ecosystem stewardship: Resilience-based natural resource management in a changing world*. Springer, New York, NY.

- Chun, C.-A., R. H. Moos, and R. C. Cronkite. 2006. Culture: A Fundamental Context for the Stress and Coping Paradigm. Pages 29–53 in P. T. P. Wong, L. C. J. Wong, and W. J. Lonner, editors. *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping*. Springer, New York.
- Costanza, R., R. d'Arge, R. de Groot, S. Farber, M. Grasso, B. Hannon, K. Limburg, S. Naeem, R. V. O'Neill, J. Paruelo, R. G. Raskin, P. Sutton, and M. van den Belt. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 387(6630):253–260.
- da Silva Gomes, E. C. B., G. C. Jimenez, L. C. N. da Silva, F. B. de Sá, K. P. C. de Souza, G. S. Paiva, and I. A. de Souza. 2014. Evaluation of antioxidant and antiangiogenic properties of caesalpinia echinata extracts. *Journal of Cancer* 5(2):143–150.
- Dapson, R., and C. Bain. 2015. Brazilwood, sappanwood, brazilin and the red dye brazilin: from textile dyeing and folk medicine to biological staining and musical instruments. *Biotechnic & Histochemistry* 90(6):401–423.
- Dean, W. 1996. *A ferro e fogo: A história e a devastação da mata atlântica brasileira*. 6. edition. Companhia das letras, São Paulo.
- Díaz, S., U. Pascual, M. Stenseke, B. Martín-López, R. T. Watson, Z. Molnár, R. Hill, K. M. A. Chan, I. A. Baste, K. A. Brauman, S. Polasky, A. Church, M. Lonsdale, A. Larigauderie, P. W. Leadley, A. P. E. van Oudenhoven, F. van der Plaats, M. Schröter, S. Lavorel, Y. Aumeeruddy-Thomas, E. Bukvareva, K. Davies, S. Demissew, G. Erpul, P. Failler, C. A. Guerra, C. L. Hewitt, H. Keune, S. Lindley, and Y. Shirayama. 2018. Assessing nature's contributions to people. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 359(6373):270–272.
- Dickason, O. P. 1984. The Brazilian connection. A look at the origin of French techniques for trading with Amerindians. *Revue française d'histoire d'outre-mer* 71(264):129–146.
- Dorfman, E. 2011. Intangible Natural Heritage: An introduction. Pages 1–15 in E. Dorfman, editor. *Intangible natural heritage: New perspectives on natural objects*. Routledge, London.
- Femke, C. 2014. A Challenge to tradition. *Accessories* October:4–7.
- Fish, R., A. Church, and M. Winter. 2016. Conceptualising cultural ecosystem services: A novel framework for research and critical engagement. *Ecosystem Services* 21:208–217.
- Folke, C., S. R. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Chapin, and J. Rockström. 2010. Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society* 15(4):20. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art20/>.
- Fraga Campos, F., P. A. Sales Junior, A. J. Romanha, M. S. S. Araújo, E. P. Siqueira, J. M. Resende, T. M. A. Alves, O. A. Martins-Filho, V. L. dos Santos, C. A. Rosa, C. L. Zani, and B. B. Cota. 2015. Bioactive endophytic fungi isolated from *Caesalpinia echinata* Lam. (Brazilwood) and identification of beauvericin as a trypanocidal metabolite from *Fusarium* sp. *Memorias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz* 110(1):65–74.
- Gerbeth, T. M. 2002. *Pernambuco Sonderausgabe*, Wien.
- Grangeiro, A. R. S. 2009. Avaliação do potencial toxicológico e farmacológico de *Caesalpinia echinata* Lam.
- Groot, R. S. D., M. a. Wilson, and R. M. Boumans. 2002. A typology for the classification, description and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services. *Ecological Economics* 41(3):393–408.
- Halbscheffel, B. 2010. *Lexikon Musikinstrumente Instrumente, Spielweisen, Begriffe*. Halbscheffel Verlag, Leipzig.
- Hume, D. 2008. Quality and Quantity. *The Strad* October:38–42.
- Kenter, J. O. 2018. IPBES: Don't throw out the baby whilst keeping the bathwater; Put people's values central, not nature's contributions. *Ecosystem Services* 33:40–43.
- Kommission für Musikforschung. 2013. *Österreichisches Musiklexikon*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.

- Leach, M., B. Reyers, X. Bai, E. S. Brondizio, C. Cook, S. Díaz, G. Espindola, M. Scobie, M. Stafford-Smith, and S. M. Subramanian. 2018. Equity and sustainability in the Anthropocene: a social–ecological systems perspective on their intertwined futures. *Global Sustainability* 1.
- Liu, J. 2017. Integration across a metacoupled world. *Ecology and Society* 22(4).
- Liu, J., V. Hull, M. Batistella, R. DeFries, T. Dietz, F. Fu, T. W. Hertel, R. C. Izaurralde, E. F. Lambin, S. Li, L. A. Martinelli, W. J. McConnell, E. F. Moran, R. Naylor, Z. Ouyang, K. R. Polenske, A. Reenberg, G. de Miranda Rocha, C. S. Simmons, P. H. Verburg, P. M. Vitousek, F. Zhang, and C. Zhu. 2013. Framing Sustainability in a Telecoupled World. *Ecology and Society* 18(2). [online] URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05873-180226>.
- Lockett, M., and C. R. Littler. 1983. Trends in Chinese enterprise management, 1978–1982. *World Development* 11(8):683–704.
- Lowenthal, D. 2005. Natural and cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* Vol. 11(No. 1):81–92.
- Macedo, T. M. 2015. *Variação intraespecífica do lenho e dendrocronologia de Caesalpinia echinata Lam na Floresta Atlântica*. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ).
- Macedo, T. M., C. G. Costa, H. C. d. Lima, and C. F. Barros. 2020. Wood anatomy of historic French violin bows made of Pernambuco wood. *International Association of Wood Anatomists (IAWA Journal)*:1–13.
- Martín-López, B., M. R. Felipe-Lucia, E. M. Bennett, A. Norström, G. Peterson, T. Plieninger, C. C. Hicks, F. Turkelboom, M. García-Llorente, S. Jacobs, S. Lavorel, and B. Locatelli. 2019. A novel telecoupling framework to assess social relations across spatial scales for ecosystem services research. *Journal of environmental management* 241:251–263.
- MEA. 2005. *Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Michon, G., B. Romagny, L. Auclair, and M. Deconchat. 2012. Forests as Patrimonies? From Theory to Tangible Processes at Various Scales. *Ecology and Society* 17(3):7. [online] URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-04896-170307>.
- Mnatzaganain, S. 2002. Objects of desire. *The Strad* 8:816–820.
- Moore, J. W. 2002. The Crisis of Feudalism. *Organization & Environment* 15(3):301–322.
- Nehren, U. 2011. Historische Landschaftsdegradation und aktuelle Nutzungsproblematik in der Serra dos Órgãos Rio de Janeiro. Pages 11–25 in Neuburger, Martin Coy & Martina, editor. *Global Change: Herausforderungen für Lateinamerika*. Bd. 38. Innsbrucker Geographische Studien.
- Olwig, K. R. 2005. Introduction: the nature of cultural heritage, and the culture of natural heritage—northern perspectives on a contested patrimony. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(1):3–7.
- Peterson, G. 2000. Political ecology and ecological resilience: An integration of human and ecological dynamics. *Ecological Economics* 35:323–336. [online] URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800900002172>.
- Pfeifer, E. 2002. Violin Bows Go High Tech. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Pinheiro, A. 1991. Tradução científica, tradução cultural, tradução poética. *Revista USP*.
- Platten, S., and T. Henfrey. 2009. The Cultural Keystone Concept: Insights from Ecological Anthropology. *Human Ecology* 37(4):491–500.
- Pretty, J. 2011. Interdisciplinary progress in approaches to address social–ecological and ecocultural systems. *Environmental Conservation* 38(02):127–139.
- Rapport, D., and L. Maffi. 2010. The dual erosion of biological and cultural diversity: implications for the health of ecocultural systems. Pages 103–122 in S. Pilgrim, and J. N. Pretty, editors. *Nature and culture: Rebuilding lost connections*. Earthscan, London, Washington D.C.
- Retford, W. C. 1964. *Bows and Bow makers*. 1. edition. Strad, London.

- Rocha, Y. T. 2004. *Ibirapitanga: história, distribuição geográfica e conservação do pau-brasil (Caesalpinia echinata Lam., Leguminosae) do descobrimento à atualidade*. Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Rocha, Y. T., A. Presotto, and F. Cavalheiro. 2007. The representation of *Caesalpinia echinata* (Brazilwood) in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth-Century Maps. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências* 79(4):751–765.
- Rusalić, D., and D. Radojičić. 2009. *Making the intangible tangible: The new interface of cultural heritage*. Institute of Ethnography SASA, Beograd.
- Rymer, R. 2004. Saving the music tree: Artists and instrument makers have banded together to rescue Brazil's imperiled pernambuco, the source of bows for violins, violas and cellos. *Smithsonian Magazine* April.
- Rymer, R. 2007. A fight for survival. *The Strad* June:28–32.
- Sadler, N. 2007. Endangered species: Naomi Sadler reports on a recent conference to decide whether to restrict the trade in pernambuco wood, and looks at what is being done to save Brazil's imperilled national tree. *Double Bassist*(43):29–32.
- Silva, A. J. d. R., and L. d. H. C. Andrade. 2006. Cultural Significance of Plants in Communities Located in the Coastal Forest Zone of the State of Pernambuco, Brazil. *Human Ecology* 34(3):447–465.
- Siqueira, E. P., C. L. Zani, T. Maria, A. Alves, M. Patrícia, O. A. M. Filho, M. S. S. Araújo, E. M. Teixeira, M. Melo, R. Serákides, and B. B. Cota. 2014. Evaluation of the In vitro leishmanicidal and In vivo acute oral toxicity of the *Caesalpinia echinata* L extracts as source of natural products against leishmaniasis. *Journal of Natural Product and Plant Resource* 4(3):30–38.
- Skeaping, K. 1955. Some Speculations on a Crisis in the History of the Violin. *The Galpin Society Journal* Vol. 8:3–12. [online] URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/842152>.
- Soini, K., and I. Birkeland. 2014. Exploring the scientific discourse on cultural sustainability. *Geoforum* 51:213–223.
- Stephenson, J. 2008. The Cultural Values Model: An integrated approach to values in landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 84(2):127–139.
- Sterling, E. J., C. Filardi, A. Toomey, A. Sigouin, E. Betley, N. Gazit, J. Newell, S. Albert, D. Alvira, N. Bergamini, M. Blair, D. Boseto, K. Burrows, N. Bynum, S. Caillon, J. E. Caselle, J. Claudet, G. Cullman, R. Dacks, P. B. Eyzaguirre, S. Gray, J. Herrera, P. Kenilorea, K. Kinney, N. Kurashima, S. Macey, C. Malone, S. Mauli, J. McCarter, H. McMillen, P. Pascua, P. Pikacha, A. L. Porzecanski, P. de Robert, M. Salpeteur, M. Sirikolo, M. H. Stege, K. Stege, T. Ticktin, R. Vave, A. Wali, P. West, K. B. Winter, and S. D. Jupiter. 2017. Biocultural approaches to well-being and sustainability indicators across scales. *Nature ecology & evolution* 1(12):1798–1806.
- UNESCO. 1972. *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*.
- UNESCO. 2012. Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage: Decisions. *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
- UNESCO. 2018. Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Living Heritage*.
- van Zanten, W. 2004. Constructing New Terminology for Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Museum International* 56(1-2):36–44.
- Varty, N. 1998. *Caesalpinia echinata*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*:1–10. [online] URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.1998.RLTS.T33974A9818224.en>.
- Walker, B. H., S. R. Carpenter, J. Rockstrom, A. S. Crépin, and G. D. Peterson. 2012. Drivers, "Slow" Variables, "Fast" Variables, Shocks, and Resilience. *Ecology and Society* 17(3):30. [online] URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05063-170330>.
- Zanin, J. L. B., B. a. de Carvalho, P. S. Martineli, M. H. dos Santos, J. H. G. Lago, P. Sartorelli, C. Viegas, and M. G. Soares. 2012. The genus *Caesalpinia* L. (Caesalpinaceae): phytochemical and

pharmacological characteristics. *Molecules (Basel, Switzerland)* 17(7):7887–7902. [online] URL: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22751225>.