

Aalborg University

Culture, Communication and Globalisation

Master's Thesis – Specialization in Latin American Studies

Legitimization of Extractivism under Bolsonaro

Jens Okkels Andersen (20192237)

02 January 2023

Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Historic overview of exploitation in the Brazilian Amazon	2
2.0 Key Concepts & Theoretical Framework	4
2.1 Environmental change and social conflict – Extractivism and ‘Development’ in the Brazilian Amazon	4
2.2 Critical Alternative Development	7
3.0 Methodology	10
3.1 Ontological and Epistemological Considerations:	10
3.2 Research Strategy	11
3.3 Research Design	12
3.3.1 Case Study	12
3.3.2 Data Collection	13
3.3.3 Application of Theoretical Framework	14
3.4 Limitations	16
5.0 Analysis	16
5.1 Discourse as Text	17
5.2 Discursive Practice	24
5.3 Social Practice:	25
6.0 Discussion	30
7.0 Conclusion	31
Bibliography:	33

Abstract

Amid political crisis and economic recession Brazil witnessed a radical right-wing change of government. Through a campaign with vows of drastic societal change, President Jair Bolsonaro promised to significantly change the course of Brazilian politics and economy by bringing conservative values back into Brazilian society. Through criticizing political opposition, foreign interference, and the indigenous community for the insolvency of Brazil a new economic development agenda was underway.

Shortly after the instatement of President Jair Bolsonaro, Brazil gained international attention as images of smoke from the amazon burning turned day into night in São Paulo, 3000 kilometers away from the fires. Tensions grew as the international community witnessed the detrimental effects of Brazil's environmental governance. A governance that sought to systematically dismantle environmental preservation institutions and reduce the area of indigenous territories. A handful of legislative acts dubbed the 'death agenda', aimed to integrate the protected indigenous lands into the national economy. By weakening environmental regulations, rolling back demarcation of indigenous lands, and opening up the amazon for commercial mining, oil exploitation and hydroelectric dams. The 'death agenda' promoted extractivism as the driver of change for the Brazilian people. Simultaneously, leaving marginalized people of Brazil to deal with the consequences. In particular, the indigenous communities, key players in terms of climate mitigation, has felt the consequences of Brazil's economic development agenda.

This paper seeks to explain how the Bolsonaro administration has sought to legitimize an increase in extractivism which brings forth socio-environmental consequences for marginalized peoples in Brazilian society. By utilizing Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional concept of discourse to operationalize the theoretical framework of development and extractivism, this paper analyses speeches by the now former president Jair Bolsonaro addressed to both a national and international audience. The paper finds that through rhetorical traits Bolsonaro seeks to justify an increase of extractivism based on a development idea in sharp contrast with that of the indigenous peoples. Where opposition is villainized, extractivism is necessary for economic development and autonomy for the indigenous communities is incompatible with national sovereignty.

1.0 Introduction

Exploitation of natural resources as a mode of accumulation, since coined extractivism, has been practiced for more than 500 years (Acosta 2013: 62) and is deeply ingrained in the Brazilian society. In Brazil, the exploitation traces back to the second expedition to Brazil in 1501, with the expectation of attaining an abundance of emerald and gold that rumors had promised the fleet they would be met with, the expedition found nothing of particular interest, except for dyewood. Dyewood quickly became interesting in a time where textiles and dye in Europe was becoming a lucrative venture. The Portuguese named the wood pau-brasil, giving name to the entire country while at the same time becoming a lucrative enterprise (Meade 2010: 16). Speculations say that the Portuguese relied on the skill of the Tupi People in order to identify and fell the trees in exchange for metal tools that gave rise to contentment. The Portuguese met the Tupi's unwillingness to engage in distinctly accumulation of goods and their overall contentment as a sign of inferiority (Ibid.: 17). Shortly hereafter, the trade was monopolized to keep the lucrative venture inside the colonial revenue system (ibid.).

A tale that resonates into the contemporary weakening of territorial and environmental institutions that complicates the rights for land for the indigenous peoples in Brazil.

The Amazon rainforest contains roughly half of the planet's remaining tropical forest. With one in ten known species on earth it is likewise the most biodiverse tropical forest in the world. Spanning across nine countries the majority of 60% resides within Brazilian territory. The Brazilian Amazon is part of the Brazilian Legal Amazon, which is an administrative division of territory comprised of the Brazilian part of the Amazon Rainforest and parts of the Cerrado and Pantanal biome.

The Brazilian Legal Amazon (BLA) inhabits the largest concentration of indigenous peoples in the world with approximately 355 thousand people spread between 150 ethnic groups (Rorato et al. 2020: 1). The BLA covers all of the nine states within the amazon basin and is one of Brazil's socio-geographic divisions. Originally established in order to incorporate the Brazilian Amazon into the Brazilian economic development while preserving the social well-being of the region (Planalto 1966). Covering close to 1.2 million km², indigenous territories stretch across 22% of the area. The indigenous territories are territories protected under the Brazilian constitution article 231 stating that

"Lands traditionally occupied by Indians are those on which they live on a permanent basis, those used for their productive activities, those indispensable to the preservation of the environmental resources necessary for their well-being and for their physical and cultural reproduction, according to their uses, customs and traditions." (Brazil Const. 2022: art. 231. par. 1)

The indigenous territories are administered through the process of demarcation which under the 1988 constitution is the responsibility of the union for “[...] demarcating such lands, protecting and ensuring respect for all of their property” (ibid. art. 231). The demarcation process of indigenous territories sets forth clearly what territories belongs to Indigenous peoples and ensures legal rights over these territories (HRW 2021). The process is administered by the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI) through a multistep process that identifies, approves within FUNAI, addresses disputes in the area before declaring the physical limits of the indigenous territory which then will be physically demarcated if it gets homologated by the President of the Republic (PIB 2018). Since the impeachment of former President Dilma Rousseff, no indigenous lands have been demarcated and environmental governance in Brazil has been drastically weakened while extractivist activity has soared (Deutsch 2021; Artaxo 2019).

1.1 Historic overview of exploitation in the Brazilian Amazon

Since the colonization of Brazil, The Brazilian Amazon has undergone a variety of boom-and-bust cycles, the most memorable being the Amazonian rubber boom that attracted a national and international trade incentive throughout the mid-19th century up until 1911, 40% of Brazilian exports in the period consisted of rubber (Bratman 2020: 46). Up until and during the 19th century, indigenous territories were seized by farmers as needed, reconfiguring the state-building process as mass migration of indigenous peoples occurred based on fear for excessive force, resulting in both disappearance of some ethnicities and the construction of ethnogenesis as peoples would be displaced into unknown territories (Le Tourneau 2015: 214).

In the early 20th century, the project of incorporating the Brazilian Amazon into the Brazilian economy blossomed. The *Estado Novo* led by then president Getúlio Vargas developed the *Marcha para o Oeste* (March to the West) project, seeking to protect the northern frontier of Brazil, enhancing extractivism through agricultural production, while at the same time served to ‘civilize’ the indigenous population of the north and centre-west regions of Brazil to bolster Brazilian nationalism (Meade 2015: 152; Ferreira 1999).

However, it wasn’t until the 1964 coup d’état that the Amazonian development project escalated. In a quest for economic growth a process of large-scale exploitation of resources and hitherto unseen large construction projects began to emerge through state-led interventions (Loures 2018). The development paradigm that conquered during this time was based upon modernization, where the Brazilian Amazon once again blossomed to an El Dorado like state that attracted industrial investment (Bratman 2020; Loures 2018: 3). During the 1964 military dictatorship, the view of the indigenous peoples in the Brazilian Amazon was to ‘integrate’ them into the rest of Brazil. With a national security discourse, the military called for a unified Brazil. Foreign interference in the amazon was a key concern during the time, which gave breeding

ground to the motto of then President Castelo Branco of 'Integrate so as to not turn over' (*Integrar para não entregar*) (Peixoto 2009). This proclamation sums up the following decades of the socio-environmental conflict within the BLA and sow the seeds for what is known as "'Operation Brazil" (Raftopolous & Morley 2020: 1625) the 1964-1985 military dictatorships project to assimilate indigenous peoples into the rest of Brazil while focusing on economic development projects in the region (ibid.). The establishment of the National Integration Program (Programa de Integração Nacional (PIN)) sought to occupy the lands of the amazon region by immigrating people from the south to the north and focused on the construction of infrastructure projects, such as the Trans-amazonia highway (Rohter 2010; Rodrigues N/D).

Since the instatement of Jair Bolsonaro, a weakening of the territorial and environmental monitoring institutions has occurred (Rorato et al. 2020: 1). One example is the weakening of the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI). Which has previously been the administrative unit responsible for guaranteeing indigenous peoples rights and processing the demarcation procedure for IL's (Indigenous Lands). The demarcation, delimitation, identification, and titling process of lands traditionally occupied by indigenous peoples became the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture (MEDIDA PROVISÓRIA Nº 870), a Ministry that has a history of imposing indigenous peoples demands (Abessa 2015: 511).

The Indigenous peoples in the Brazilian amazon are considered key players in terms of constraining deforestation and climate change mitigation (Le Tourneau 2015: 213). However, since the far-right Brazilian president Jair Bolsonaro took office in 2019, the socio-environmental conflicts in the Brazilian amazon have escalated. With a decrease in participatory decision-making institutions, and an economic development model that seeks to legitimize enhanced extractivism (Menezes & Barbosa 2020; Rorato et al. 2020) and has brought about the highest deforestation rate in 15 years (PRODES 2022). Indigenous people face a challenge that goes beyond the right for land. With an aggressive rhetoric, Jair Bolsonaro took office with a promise to "give FUNAI a blow to the neck" (Silva 2018) explaining that the institution hinders the economic development by maintaining the rights of indigenous territories. It wasn't until the summer of 2019 that Bolsonaro faced international criticism due to the crumbling environment protection policies that was unveiled in August of 2019 through the images of the Amazonian wildfires that wreaked havoc to both the ecosystem and the communities in the amazon region. In February 2020 the Brazilian president submitted a bill to the National Congress, the PL 191/2020, which aims to set aside protection of indigenous territories as established by the Brazilian constitution. It does so by seeking to allow pending mining requests in protected territories, further supporting extractivism through exploration of oil, gas and hydroelectric dams (Ferrante and Fearnside 2020; Senado.leg.br 2020; PL 191/2020).

Not only does the proposed legislation constitute a constitutional right violation. It further removes the possibility of vetoing decisions on the construction of extractivist ventures past notifying the affected communities (Rorato et al. 2020). Which creates a paradoxical violation of the ILO-169 convention, the UN Human Rights Declaration (UNHRD 1948) as well as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

With an agenda of the expansion of extractivism which has been proven to have dire consequences for the indigenous peoples (HRW 2019; Raftopolous & Morley 2020: 1633; Le Tourneau 2015), representing the most marginalized peoples of Brazilian society. Leaves the question of how is this new political agenda based on economic growth justified?

Therefore, this paper seeks to answer the question:

How has the Bolsonaro administration sought to legitimize an increase in extractivism with enhanced socio-environmental consequences for marginalized peoples of Brazilian society?

2.0 Key Concepts & Theoretical Framework

2.1 Environmental change and social conflict – Extractivism and ‘Development’ in the Brazilian Amazon

As stated above, for more than 500 years, the indigenous territories have been subject to exploitation on the basis of accumulation (Acosta 2013: 62). This section seeks to explain the notion of extractivism and how the concept has been expanding since the mid-20th century as a goal for economic development in the Brazilian Amazon.

Extractivism can be said to be the practice of exploiting non processed natural resources in large quantities for economic growth by metropolitan centres with the objective of export. The exploited resources are seldom distributed to the domestic market (Acosta 2013; Gudyanas 2010). Thus, generally not benefitting the territories where the activities take place. Extractivism includes not only oil and minerals but forestry and farming as well (Acosta 2013: 63). Extractivism is also categorized as taking places in remote areas, that are traditionally seen as vast, and unproductive making these areas valued by capital while disregarding the socio-environmental dimensions of destruction of ecosystems and displacement of people (Svampa 2019).

During the 20th century, the Brazilian government pushed for opening up the Amazon for exploitation in order to incorporate the abundance of resources in the area into the national economy. An economic development project that went more or less unchallenged up until the mid-2000s and that has been

framed by Brazilian governments for decades as the solution to economic struggles although the social and environmental consequences are devastating (Gudyanas 2010).

In the beginning of the 21st century enhanced international value of commodities began a period of economic growth throughout Latin America. Alongside the commodity boom, leftist-governments resurged throughout the region with criticism of the dependence of exports, the minimal state and the favoring of redistributing policies started a “Progressive cycle” spreading up until 2015. (Gudyanas 2010; Blanco & Grier 2013: 72; Svampa 2019: 1). Despite the blossoming of a progressive cycle, the extractive sector remained the frontrunner for development in the region. With an increase rather than decrease of extractive activities (Gudyanas 2010: 2) inevitably resulting in conflict between the extractive model on one side and indigenous groups and socio-environmental groups on the other (Svampa 2019). The reason being, with a window of opportunity in the commodity market, progressive governments in the region seized the opportunity to expand both mining venture and mega-dam projects to benefit from the profitability and then to capture surplus from the resource reliant development model previously established and place it into public service and social policies. A process that has been dubbed *Neo-extractivism* (Andrade 2022; Gudyanas 2010; Acosta 2013). With neo-extractivism, progressive governments in Latin America enabled the social legitimacy of land exploitation by redistributing surplus into social spending while concealing environmental consequences.

In the Brazilian case, former president Luiz Inácio ‘Lula’ da Silva advanced the conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs that became center pieces in Brazilian social policy since the democratization process in the 1990s. The expansion of the CCTs most popularly included Fome Zero (Zero Hunger) and Bolsa Família both poverty alleviation programs inspired by the Millennium Development Goals’ aspiration of reducing hunger and extreme poverty (Hall 2006). Placing Brazil into the alternative development paradigm (Parpart & Veltmeyer 2004). Concurrently, Brazil was converting into a mining power with the introduction of new mines, a more than threefold increase in mining and quarrying exports and a 40% increase in copper production during the first term of Lulas Workers Party administration (Gudyanas 2010: 2). Furthermore, the discovery of oil deposits offshore in the late 2000’s raised the expectations of the international role of Brazil, where Lula called the the discovery of the tupi off-shore oil field a ‘second independence’ for Brazil (Cabral 2010; Meade 2010: xix).

Contrary to the traditional extractivism in Latin America where the state presence was at a minimum, as the liberalization of capital flows created an advantage point to the businesses involved in especially mining and oil, neo-extractivism relied on increased state presence within the extractive sector turning the export-driven development model into a beneficial wealth redistribution scheme that helped to alleviate poverty

and combat inequality (Andrade 2022). Neo-extractivism being an export driven economic model produces a quagmire effect, It did so by the effect of leaving the indigenous peoples, who are considered “the most vulnerable people on earth” (Havemann 2016: 334) to deal with the consequences of the extractive activity

A problematic that aid to explain why self-determination for indigenous peoples in export driven countries can be seen as a threat to the state that challenges sovereignty and internal stability (Haveman 2016: 334). Which becomes both visible and articulate with the right-wing turn in Brazil.

As the progressive political cycle has come to a halt, the reduction of commodity prices has resulted in an intensification of extractive activities in order to compensate for the loss of revenue, but not the loss of the narrative of extractivism being the solution to economic downfall (Svampa 2019: 22). This is visible when looking at the numbers from INPE, the national institute for space research where the deforestation rate in the Brazilian Legal Amazon has almost double since 2018 (PRODES 2022).

As his predecessors, Bolsonaro looks towards extractivism. However, with a further push towards intensifying the activity in the Brazilian Legal Amazon the Brazilian President has submitted a set of bills to congress that could have dire effects on the environment, the indigenous territories and seeks to enhance extractivist activities in the BLA. through legalizing mining and hydroelectric activity inside indigenous territories

For Jair Bolsonaro, economic development has been a priority whereas environmental policies have stagnated. With an aspiration of destabilizing environmental protection in Brazil, the president submitted a set of bills that could be detrimental to the environment, the indigenous communities and an international obstruction to the carbon dioxide emission target set out by the Paris Agreement.

The socio-environmental detrimental legislative initiatives have been nicknamed both “the project of death” (Moncau 2022) or the “death agenda” (Ferrante & Fearnside 2019: 216) in opposing groups and consists of numerous legislative acts.

They include, amongst others, bills that aims to weaken regulation of pesticide use in Brazil and enhance the maximum acceptable limits for pesticides in water (PL 6299/2002), that seeks to end the demarcation process of indigenous lands (PL 490/2007), reduce the necessity for environmental licenses for infrastructure projects (PL 3729/2004) and a bill seeking to regulate indigenous territories by allowing commercial mining, exploration of oil and hydroelectric generation in protected territories (PL 191/2020) (Rorato et al. 2020; Abessa, Famá & Buruaem 2019; Ferrante and Feanside 2020).

The PL 191/2020 has been estimated to potentially increase the mining area within indigenous territories by 306% if the 2760 already pending mining requests in Indigenous Lands were given (Rorato et al. 2020). Furthermore, the bill states that indigenous communities affected would be consulted prior to the beginning of the mining activities affecting their territory but will not be able to veto any of the projects (Ibid.). Although there is a history of avoiding strategically avoiding consultation with indigenous peoples regarding the construction of extractivist projects in Brazil most visible through the construction of the Belo Monte Dam (Loures 2019). As mentioned above the PL 191/2020 is in violation of both the ILO 161 Convention, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the UN Human Rights Declaration.

2.2 Critical Alternative Development

Development as a concept is a concept that is often used as a self-evident one. It is assumed that it has to do with doing good in the sense of positive social change, poverty alleviation or climate change mitigation (Ziai 2016: 1). Nonetheless development as a concept should be seen as part of the social imaginary and should not be considered a definitive 'one size fits all' concept. Rather, it is useful as a concept to identify and understand the actions of dominant ideologies, politicians or government agencies, NGOs and so forth. Cornwall & Brock (2005: 1057) finds that this development discourse is filled with buzzwords like "Participation, Empowerment and poverty reduction" used in order to "make the world that the neoliberal model would have us all inhabit".

Development ideas and practices have been subject to a series of changes since the post WWII era, where the 'development project' started as a geopolitical project striving to push previously colonized countries away from communism and pulling them towards the western capitalist model (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 39). Ever since, development ideas have been subject to an ideological expansion (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 2004; Tipps 1973: 200).

Initially, Modernization theory dominated the development paradigm. The development project had its focus on "problems of economic development, political stability, and social and cultural change" (Tipps 1973: 200) in 'third world countries' referring to what was considered as the economically backward countries of non-western parts of the world.

In the midst of an East/West ideological crisis the introduction of the developing countries to the global capitalist market was based on the idea that that financial and technical assistance to 'underdeveloped third world countries' sought to shift 'traditional' societies develop into 'modern' societies (Ibid.) adopting western values and institutional practices (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 42). Thereby, disregarding the significance of non-Western societies prior to the adoption of the western modernization project.

Critiques of the Modernization theory appeared as a consequence of the economic production crisis in the 1970s (Ibid: 43). The modernization thought failed to account for the stagnation of the economic growth leading to a concurrent development thought ascending on the idea of a need for “a participatory, people-centred approach to development problems in the third world” (Ibid). This led to a leftist thought on the development project. Inspired by Marxism and focused on Latin America, critique of the capitalist system led to the uprising of dependency theory (Ayres and Clark 1998; Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 43).

Dependency theory seeks to explain development, especially in Latin America, through the thought that the capitalist system divides the world into a center, the metropole, or the industrialized countries that benefits economically from the periphery, being Latin America that creates a subordinate role of Latin American countries where the economic development of the industrialized west depends on the underdeveloped periphery (ibid.) resulting in a vicious cycle that makes capitalist development in the periphery impossible.

Dependency theory fostered a revolution within the field of development. On one side were the advocates of a socialist revolution, while on the other side the discarding of modernization theory thinking, with the state in focus as the main actor of the private sector shifted into the idea that a global free market would drive the development process (Ibid.: 45). Rather than a development process, this neo-liberal free market process was focused on globalization by integrating national economies into one system that wouldn't rely on planned economy (Ibid.; Gwynne & Kay 2000: 142). Through structural adjustment programs 'underdeveloped' countries would be guided into a new free market world order. With the aim of making economies more competitive a call for foreign investment were predominantly argued (ibid.). Structural adjustment programs ended up being a conditionality for being allowed to gain access to belt-tightening austerity policies that would keep especially Latin American economies running (Rohter 2010; Gwynne & Kay 2000). However, financial rescue packages and austerity policies had both a negative effect on both health and social policy (Gwynne & Kay 2000: 50) and with an export oriented economic approach it sparked a development issue in terms of increased extractivism and shortsightedly approach to environmental protection and marginalized groups such as indigenous peoples (ibid.)

Sidelining the uprising of the new economic world order of neo-liberalism, the shortcomings of the development thinking up until the 1970s revived the development ideas, seeking alternatives for reformist capitalist development (Parpart & Veltmeyer 2004: 44). Promoting “a widespread search for a new or alternative form of development that would be more equitable, participatory and sustainable, more human in scale and form, and socially inclusive” (Parpart & Veltmeyer 2004: 48). The alternative development paradigm became favorable as it challenged traditional development thinking by raising awareness with

popular participation, environmental sustainability, and involvement of marginalized groups in the development agenda (ibid.).

With a focus on development as being “not from above (by government within the state apparatus) or the outside (multilateral and bilateral ODAS), but from within and below” (Ibid.). The alternative development paradigm gained entrée sidelining neo-liberalism and became a key paradigm in guiding both the UN system and international conventions (Ibid.; Chase 2019). The former in particular through the sustainable livelihoods approach helping to guide the Brundtland report and adopted in the Agenda 21 and later in the Sustainable Development Goals (Shen et al. 2008; Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004; Ziai 2016). The sustainable livelihoods approach consists of five components namely: natural, physical, financial, social and political (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 48) with the attention on “social assets of the rural poor” also understood as ‘social capital’ (ibid.). As an alternative development the sustainable livelihood approach focus’ on “capacitating individuals and groups to actively participate in making decisions that affect their livelihoods” by utilizing an already known skillset and knowledge in order to reach a social transformation and development from within rather than through the application of outside interference (ibid.) Furthermore, The Alternative development paradigm helped to guide international conventions as the ILO convention 169 (ILO 1989) seeking to promote autonomy of traditional communities by ensuring consultation on legislative decisions impacting them (Chase 2019: 2).

In the midst of Neoliberal reform throughout Latin America, the ideas behind the development practice were condemned for having Eurocentric connotations not considering the difference in development thought between north and south (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 51; Ziai 2013: 124). Development as a concept was questioned altogether. First and foremost, for being the “religion of the west” (Rist 1990 as cited in Pieterse 2000: 175) reducing poverty to commodity dependence measured through accumulation and for understanding non-modern and technologically backwards lifestyles as poorer lifestyles in need of development (Ziai 2007; Pieterse 2000: 177). This change of thought in the development ideas set off for the post-development paradigm. Within post-development the concept development is questioned altogether (Ziai: 2013; Ziai 2007; Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004; Pieterse, 2010).

The post-development paradigm claims that the term development favors the constructors of the development discourse, namely western institutions and the thinkers within the paradigm tend to maintain the focus on language and discourse. Encouraging a post-structuralist approach concerned with development discourse and the analysis of power relations within development (Ziai 2013; Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 51). Simplified, post-development can be divided in two theoretical frameworks 1. Anti-development whose intent can be understood as a complete abandonment of the term development

claiming that development is unreliable as it stems from the point of view of a capitalist rationality unable to consider social transformation as independent depending on which society affected (Ziai 2007; Pieterse 2010) and 2. Critical Alternative Development calling for an alternative to development rather than an alternative development.

Critical Alternative Development like anti-development is concerned with the power of discourse and how it shapes development processes and is thus focused on “[...] a bottom-up, participatory approach where development experts become or give way to facilitators who work with the poor rather than simply directing them from a position of expert knowledge” (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 52).

Here, development is to be understood as the resistance of the contemporary development discourse, by supporting marginalized peoples in constructing their own understanding of development and define their own “problems, goals and solutions” (Ibid.). The concept development should not be abandoned but rather an understanding of the fact that there is no ideal societal model for development (as for example the European) instead by defining own problems, goals and solutions enables development to include other form of obtaining a ‘good life’ (ibid.; Pieterse 2010).

Within Critical Alternative Development, empowerment plays a vital role in order to enable participation. Development is unable to be given to marginalized groups. It should consider cultural and social differences and focus on empowerment and participation as they are “essential building blocks for a grassroots, people-oriented, transformative form of development” (Ibid.).

Drawing its attention on the power of discourse “to shape and define the way people think, and the possibility that development discourse can make certain ideas/discourses unthinkable” (ibid.). Critical Alternative Development seeks to demolish the idea of power in society as something solely belonging to authority figures or through institutional power. Drawing on the notion of the capillarity of power Critical Alternative Development aids the understanding of how power and empowerment affects the development process within communities (ibid.).

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Ontological and Epistemological Considerations:

In social research, two factors that impact the research process is the ontological and epistemological nature of social phenomena. The purpose of the following section is to explain both the ontological and epistemological position for this paper.

Ontology relates to the “nature of social entities” (Bryman 2016: 28) meaning what we understand about “the existence of the real and objective world” (Della Porta and Keating 2008: 21). Different standpoint of ontology represents a different view of the world. The contrast between different ontological stances is whether social entities ought to be seen and understood as objective and can exist in a reality independently of social actors or if they take form as social constructions based on the actions, values, and perceptions of social actors (Bryman 2016: 28). This paper follows the ontological position of constructivism wherein the existence of the real and objective world is understood through social phenomena being constructed and molded by the social actors as a result of meanings being in constant progress, suggesting that there is no definite, graspable truth (Bryman 2016: 29). The social world can thus be said to be shaped through the interaction of social actor. herein, researchers participating in constructing realities and knowledge (ibid.).

As previously mentioned, this paper is concerned with how development is utilized by the Bolsonaro administration in order to justify extractivism and the socio-environmental consequences hindering the right for land for the indigenous population in Brazil. Bryman (2016: 29) asserts that “the research always presents a specific version of social reality, rather than one that can be regarded as definitive”. Which is applicable to the research at hand by investigating how the concept of development is constructed through interactions of various social actors, and dependently of the constructor of the development discourse the concept is constructed and applied in different circumstances by the Bolsonaro administration to obtain legitimacy for socio-environmental disaster.

Epistemology on the other hand, relates to the possibilities of knowing the social and objective world and what should be understood as acceptable knowledge within social research (Bryman 2016: 24; Della Porta and Keating 2008: 22). Epistemology thus refers to way of gathering, interpreting, and producing knowledge (Lamont 2015: 24). This paper follows the epistemological stance of interpretivism. This is visible as Interpretivism has its focus “on understanding social meanings embedded within international politics” (Lamont 2015:19). Contrary to observation and hypothesis testing, this research seeks to unravel the meaning behind social and power structures arising through the discourse of development towards extractivism in Brazil that marginalizes the indigenous population, hence seeking to discover meanings that motivates actions (Della Porta and Keating 2008: 24) which is of key concern within interpretivism.

3.2 Research Strategy

As it has been established that this paper holds the ontological stance of constructivism and the epistemological stance of interpretivism. The following section will elaborate on the research strategy being the “general orientation to the conduct of social research” (Bryman 2016: 32). Rather than quantitative

research the research strategy used to analyze the data collected in this paper, is that of qualitative research. As this paper has its focus on the construction of development discourses that justifies socio-environmental damage it requires a research strategy emphasizing words rather than a quantification of data (Bryman 2016: 33-34). By utilizing a qualitative research strategy makes way for giving attention to the focus of meanings and processes of the construction of development discourses (Lamont 2015: 78). The qualitative research strategy will rely on an inductive reasoning as the concept of development, as mentioned in the concepts and theory section, can be understood both as a paradigm and theory. Therefore, the aim will be to produce a contribution to the theory of post-development.

Although this paper will utilize a qualitative research strategy, it will also include elements of quantitative research through the usage of statistical work such as deforestation statistics to develop the understanding of the development discourses applied. This, however, does not necessarily transform the strategy into a mixed methods research as Bryman (2016: 34) explains that qualitative research may have a characteristic of quantitative research.

3.3 Research Design

A research design can be characterized as “The framework for the generation of evidence that is chosen to answer the research question(s)” (Bryman 2016: 40). Within the research design a distinction between research design and research method should be found. The following section will elaborate firstly on the the framework for the collection and the analysis of data known as the research design (Bryman 2016: 40). Secondly, it will elaborate collection of data, known as the research method (Ibid.).

The research design will consist of a single-case study with a research method of examining interviews or speeches either made by Bolsonaro or reflecting the opinion of the Bolsonaro administration towards development, extractivism, the environment or indigenous peoples paired with an archival and document-based research.

3.3.1 Case Study

The research design of this paper is that of a single- case study. A case study enables the possibility of analyzing a single case in depth. It typically refers to a specific community, location, organization or an event or phenomenon (Bryman 2016: 60). In this paper the Bolsonaro administration and its environmental stance relating to development has been chosen as the case at hand.

This paper seeks to utilize a case study in order to investigate the causal mechanisms of development discourse in contemporary Brazil. Seeking to understand the factors that explain why development

discourses are constructed in particular instances. This could raise the question of how come development discourses are used to justify extractivism that could be said to hinder the development of communities affected by the same phenomena.

There are several cases throughout Latin America that could potentially be relevant as a case study for a similar research question. Such as the Gran Chaco Americano currently witnessing one of the highest deforestation rates recorded in history in the name of development (Jobbágy et al. 2015). Contemporary Brazil is a relevant case as it is governed by a far-right president known for denying climate change and disregarding indigenous peoples' rights. Furthermore, it is relevant as Jair Bolsonaro took office in 2018 and has experienced international backlash on the topic of extractivism and indigenous rights through the 2019 amazon wildfires and the 2022 murder of indigenous peoples advocates Bom Philips and Bruno Pereira (Lakhani 2022).

The aim of utilizing a case study is to generate "an intensive examination of a single case" (Bryman 2016: 64). This brings us to the question of validity. While validity is arguably easier proven in quantitative research, it is nonetheless an important aspect within this case, being a qualitative research. The case at hand falls into the category of a representative case (Bryman 2016: 62). This is visible as the problems arising on the basis of extractivism regarding socio-environmental impact and the oppression of indigenous peoples' rights is applicable to other potential cases such as the aforementioned Gran Chaco Americano. However, as every case is unique, the strategic use of development for the Bolsonaro administration towards legitimizing extractivism may not be applicable in similar cases. Nonetheless, the methods and theoretical approach could be applicable to other cases in order to address the question of validity through replicability.

3.3.2 Data Collection

The research design of this paper is that of a representative case study. The research method for the case study will be that of an archival and document-based research (Lamont 2015: 80) paired with interviews or speeches either made by Bolsonaro or reflecting the opinion of the Bolsonaro administration towards development, extractivism, the environment or indigenous peoples. The archival and document-based research consist of both primary and secondary source documents of both virtual and official documents from mainly public sources. The use of document-based research is utilized as an auxiliary to the interviews and speeches of the Bolsonaro administration. The primary source documents consist of official documents publicly available. They include documents from governmental organizations including documents from the United Nations, The Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as documents from the Brazilian National Indian Foundation (FUNAI).

Regarding the interviews or speeches reflecting the Bolsonaro administration the sampling approach utilized is that of purposive sampling. Bryman (2016: 410) states that “ purposive sampling approach is that the sampling is conducted with reference to the research questions so that units of analysis are selected in terms of criteria that will allow the research question to be answered”. Therefore, the material utilized are explicitly material consisting elements of sustainability, environment, development or indigenous peoples, which will aid in answering the research question at hand and contribute to the understanding of development discourse regarding justification of extractivism.

3.3.3 Application of Theoretical Framework

3.3.3a Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a useful approach to gain insight into ideological foundations of power relations and marginalization of indigenous peoples.

Rather than utilizing Critical Discourse analysis as a theory, this paper utilizes critical discourse analysis as a mode of instrumentalizing the aforementioned analytical approach which aids in understanding the phenomena of development and extractivism and how these phenomena affect the Bolsonaro administrations legitimization of extractivism and stance towards the indigenous population residing in Brazilian territory.

CDA can be utilized as a method for examining the links between “discourse and social and cultural developments in different social domains” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 60). According to Bryman (2016: 540) CDA has its focus on “Language as a power resource that is related to ideology and socio-cultural change”. Where Ideology according to Fairclough (1992: 87) is understood as the way reality is being constructed through the meanings of discursive practices which contributes to the “production, reproduction or transformation of relations of domination” (ibid.) Or as summed up by the definition by Van Dijk (2011: 6) as “the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members”.

This paper understands discourse as the use of language as a social practice (Fairclough 1992: 63). People react on the world through the use of language and in relation to each other thereby shaping dominant ideologies, opinions and actions through the reproduction of discourses (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 61).

Central to CDA is the concept of discursive practices which can be understood as which communicative events are created and received which helps to understand how the social world, social identities and social

relations are understood and created. (ibid.). In this sense, the understanding of reality should not be seen as definitive but as subjective based on interaction.

The aim of utilizing CDA as a methodological approach is to be able to understand power relations and identify “Who uses language, how, why and when” (Bryman 2016: 540). This paper seeks to investigate how extractivism is justified despite socio-environmental consequences, therefore it seeks to utilize CDA as a way of identifying relations of power and discrimination and how they are expressed through discourse as CDA “aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, legitimized and so on, by language use (or in discourse)” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 10).

3.3.3b Fairclough’s Three-dimensional Model

In order to establish a framework for the following Critical Discourse Analysis, this paper will apply Fairclough’s Three-dimensional conception of discourse (Fairclough 1992)

Fairclough uses the term discourse in various ways. Firstly, as “language use as a social practice”. Secondly, it refers to the type of language used within a particular field and lastly, as “a way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective” (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 67) meaning discourses which can be distinguished from one another, such as marxist discourse (ibid.).

To Fairclough, discourse provides the building blocks for social identities, systems of knowledge and meaning as well as social relations (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 67).

Fairclough’s Three-dimensional conception of discourse consists of three aspects of a communicative event also referred to as a ‘text’, ‘discursive practice’ and ‘social practice’

The first dimension of the model is **Discourse as Text**. Within this dimension text production is of essence. The focus is on deconstructing the analyzed text and focus on the textual and linguistic features of the text or communicative event. A linguistic analysis of rhetoric devices including “[...] ‘vocabulary’, ‘grammar, ‘cohesion’, and ‘text structure’” (Fairclough 1992; 75) gives an insight into the formation of social identities and the beliefs and systems of knowledge of the textual producer (ibid.).

Secondly, the **Discursive Practice** revolves around the production and consumption of the communicative event. Texts or communicative events are produced in certain social contexts. Producers of text relies on preexisting discourses in order to produce a new text, consumers of texts will likewise draw upon other known discourses and genres in the consumption process of a text. (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002).

Lastly, **Discourse as Social Practice** is concerned with “the wider social practice to which the communicative event belongs” (ibid.) it functions as an interpretive analysis, shedding light on “whether

the discursive practice reproduces or, instead, restructures the existing order of discourse and about what consequences this has for the broader social practice (the level of social practice).” (ibid.). It helps to understand how specific discourses become dominant and whether they express a transformation in social relations between consumers and producers of texts.

By using the three-dimensional model, the objective is to understand representations of reality as it stresses that social context is necessary in order to understand texts.

3.4 Limitations

As this paper focuses on the Bolsonaro administrations strategy for legitimization of extractivism that causes socio-environmental consequences for marginalized people, specifically indigenous peoples, in Brazilian society. It is important to mention that the author of the paper is aware of the fact that there are numerous indigenous communities throughout Brazil, and opinions of one indigenous community might not reflect the opinion of all communities affected by the effects of extractivism.

Moreover, a limitation of language and the possibility of travelling forces the paper to rely on already existing data. Therefore, a priority of the paper has been to establish trustworthiness on sources utilized in order to conduct the research. Lastly, due to an intermediate knowledge of Portuguese reliance on interviews, speeches and documents written or translated into English has been prioritized albeit Portuguese sources have also been utilized.

5.0 Analysis

During the transitional period of 2016 to 2018, with enhanced investment efforts towards the exploration of hydrocarbons, the Brazilian government anticipated the same sense of euphoria as witnessed with the discovery of oil fields during the Lula administration (Svampa 2019: 25). Brazil witnessed a change in the dominant development model which would turn out to reconfigure territorial understanding within the country (ibid.). Shortly hereafter, prior to Jair Bolsonaro being elected as president, the development discourse began to be constructed. In August of 2018 Bolsonaro explicitly addressed what appeared to be the stick to the wheel for economic growth in Brazil, namely indigenous rights and FUNAI for upholding them “For the love of god, today an indigenous person builds a house in the middle of the beach, and FUNAI will come and say that now it is going to be an indigenous reserve” (Silva 2018*). Five months later Bolsonaro took office and became the 38th president of the Federative Republic of Brazil. The years prior to the far-right turn in Brazil can be described with discontent of both social policies and failure to uphold the

* Own translation

sustainable development path that was paired with dismantlement of neo-liberal policies that had soared the country throughout the 1990s (Menezes and Barbosa 2021; Teixeira et al. 2021). Although a sustainable development discourse with a focus on social policies rose to be dominant throughout Lula's PT administration, extractivism grew (Loures 2019). The new development paradigm focused on a disruption of neo-liberal structural adjustment policies and a focus on sustainability, social change and economic growth with respect for the environment (Clemente 2022). The new development paradigm dubbed "Neodevelopmentalism" (Clemente 2022), had its focus on agroindustrial exports and the aspiration to be international competitive. Paradoxically, assisting in the rise of the far-right in Brazil (Loures 2019; Menezes and Barbosa 2021; Clemente 2022). The controversial 'sustainable' development paradigm that conquered during the PT era has arguably become an instrument for the legitimization of an increased export-oriented economy, largely disregarding indigenous peoples and other marginalized groups of the Brazilian society. Brazil ended in economic recession which together with political graft infuriated Brazilian voters. In a search of a reconstruction of the Brazilian political scene Bolsonaro appeared advocating societal change through economic growth (Filomeno & Vicino 2021).

The following section seeks to analyze how the Bolsonaro administration sought to legitimize an increase in extractivism with enhanced socio-environmental consequences for marginalized peoples in Brazil. It will do so by utilizing Fairclough's three-dimensional model as explained in the methodology section.

5.1 Discourse as Text

As a first step, it is necessary to conduct a linguistic analysis to identify the rhetorical devices utilized by the textual producer in the shaping of social identities, beliefs and how knowledge is constructed. The sections below are divided into subsections addressing topics that is used by the Bolsonaro administration to legitimize the consequences of extractivism.

Agriculture

When looking at the linguistic choices for the legitimization of extractivism by the Bolsonaro administration. It becomes apparent that the knowledge constructed is that for agribusiness to thrive, Indigenous Territories must decrease. The argument here is that a thriving agribusiness is crucial, not only for Brazil but for the world altogether. In a speech for the Federation of Industries of the State of São Paulo Bolsonaro explains: "Agribusiness is largely the locomotive of our economy. We cannot have an environmental policy like we had until recently, the industry of demarcating indigenous lands, the quilombola industry, the industry of ecological stations" (Boehm 2019*) by stating that 'we cannot have'

* Own translation

creates a sense of urgency that makes the termination of demarcation of indigenous lands crucial for the agricultural industry to continue to operate. Internationally, Bolsonaro creates a causal relationship between Brazilian agriculture and global food security through the following statements “The world increasingly relies on Brazil to feed itself” (UN 2020), “we cannot forget that the world must be fed” (UN 2019) and “We provide food security to one sixth of the world’s population” (UN 2020). Such statements are often anteceded by comparisons of productive lands utilized by Brazil compared to Europe. This is visible through: “France and Germany, for instance, use more than 50% of their territories for agriculture while Brazil uses merely 8% of its land for the production of food – 61% of our territory is preserved” (Itamaraty 2019) and “[...] even while preserving 66% of our native vegetation and using only 27% of our territory for animal husbandry and agriculture. These are figures that no other country has” (UN 2020). The interrelatedness between the necessity for maintaining global food security and the modest area used for agriculture in Brazil creates a representation of reality that seeks to justify the expansion of the agroindustry in the Brazilian territory.

Socially desolate areas

By framing the area utilized for agriculture as modest the area not used for production is identified as another key linguistic strategy when looking at the Bolsonaro administrations attempt to legitimize extractivism despite socio-environmental consequences. This is done mainly through shaping the Amazon biome and especially Indigenous Territories as socially desolate areas. A repetition that demonstrates that strategy is that of repeating the vast size of the indigenous territories “14% of the national territory, that is, more than 110 million hectares, an area equivalent to Germany and France together, is destined for indigenous reserves.” (UN 2021*) the comparison between indigenous territories and Europe is done frequently with utterances such as “I remind you that the Amazon region is equivalent to the area of all of Western Europe” (ibid.*). The comparison between indigenous territories and graspable areas are repeated not only with regards to western Europe, but nationally as well, in order to influence the discursive practice. Addressing a national audience, the comparison caters a national recognizable area where Bolsonaro states that “You keep thinking how 10 thousand Indians can have an area equivalent to twice the state of Rio de Janeiro, like the Yanomami. Enough, it’s no longer possible because the intention of this is to cripple the agriculture, cripple the agribusiness in Brazil and turn it into a conflict.” (Barros 2021*). By comparing the indigenous territories to other enormous areas helps to depict a reality of the territories as

*Own translation

being “Socially desolate” (Svampa 2019: 28). Implicitly stating that as no one is there, the area should be incorporated into the national economy.

This is further illustrated when Bolsonaro is asked about the future of indigenous reserves “The reservations will remain as they are, but with a small reduction. In places where they’re not even used anymore by the indigenous peoples – I call this ethnological fraud –, as is the case with two reservations, they must be suppressed.” (Morgenstern 2020). The representation of indigenous territories is once again depicted as vast and unproductive which functions as a change of the dominant notion of territory which helps to legitimize extractive ventures in the area while justifying legal interventions that seek to disable the protection of the areas such as the PL 191/2020

The enormous size of the Amazon region is further used as a legitimization for the lack of combating of illegal logging in the area. This is explicitly seen at the 75th session of the UN General Assembly “May I call to mind that the Amazon Region is larger than the whole of Western Europe. Hence, the difficulty of fighting not only fire outbreaks, but also illegal logging and biopiracy” (UN 2020)

Indigenous peoples:

When addressing indigenous peoples Bolsonaro contrasts with the understanding of development of various indigenous peoples in the Brazilian Amazon.

When addressing the indigenous population in Brazil, Bolsonaro speaks on behalf of the people affected by the consequences of increased mining activity and deforestation this creates a social identity for the indigenous peoples that is based on a wish for increased economic activity in the region.

This is illustrated as when he frames the indigenous peoples as incapable of creating their own decisions and development aspirations in an interview with Rádio 96 FM de Natal. Here, Bolsonaro addresses a FUNAI project that allegedly seeks to allocate cryptocurrency into indigenous communities. Here, Bolsonaro states that “[...] most people (indigenous people) don’t even know what money is” (Barros 2021*). In a Facebook video published by Bolsonaro in 2020 he further states that “The indigenous people are evolving. More and more they are becoming human beings like us” (Poder 360 2020*). This condescending depiction of indigenous peoples functions as a reverse personification. A rhetorical device which is further utilized when addressing international interest in the Amazonian region by saying “The interest in the Amazon isn’t because of the Indian (Indigenous person) or the fucking trees, it’s the mining”

* Own translation

(Rocha 2019*). Not only does the statement display a racist ideology by using a derogative term about indigenous peoples, but it also displays the disregard for indigenous peoples using a reverse personification, sidelining indigenous peoples with trees.

With respect to industrialization of the indigenous territories with reference to the attempt to open for extractivism ventures in protected areas Bolsonaro further claims that “We are freeing the Indians” (Barros 2021*). He continues and uses the desires of one indigenous community to shape the social identity of all indigenous peoples as sharing the development aspirations with the Bolsonaro administration “[...] the indians (indigenous peoples) are increasingly producing, like the Parecis, a source of pride to us.”(ibid.) stating that the Parecis is a source of pride is arguably mentioned as the Parecis have previously been fined for conducting commercial agribusiness with genetically modified crops in protected areas (Boadle 2019) thus, sharing the economic agenda with the Bolsonaro administration. The statements achieve to address the stance towards the indigenous communities, being the attempt to integrate the indigenous peoples and their culture into the ‘rest’ of the Brazilian population.

At the 74th General Assembly of the United Nations Jair Bolsonaro further shapes the aspirations of the indigenous communities on behalf of them. Stating that “The indigenous peoples do not want to be poor landowners on top of rich lands.” (Itamaraty 2019) and “Today, 14% of the Brazilian territory is marked as indigenous land, but it is necessary to understand that our native peoples are human beings, exactly like any one of us. They want to deserve to enjoy the same rights as all of us” (ibid.). Socially constructing the identity of indigenous peoples as ‘poor landowners’ that longs for the same development as the Bolsonaro administration. The term poor has negative connotations and refers to capital, as the ‘rich lands’ is explained to be “Especially the richest lands in the world. It is the case of the Yanomami and Raposa serra do Sol reservations. In these reservations, there is an abundance of gold, diamond, uranium, niobium, and rare earth elements, among others” (ibid.). Not only does the listing of minerals express the Bolsonaro administrations interest in the Amazon but also neglects to recognize the dissimilarities in the understanding of the word poor. When addressing the size of the indigenous territories at the 76th General Assembly of the United Nations Bolsonaro states that “In these regions, 600,000 Indians (indigenous peoples) live in freedom and increasingly want to use their land for agriculture and other activities.” (UN 2021*). Thus, legitimizing PL 191/2020 as beneficial for the indigenous people residing in the affected areas. The opening up for mining activity in the Indigenous Territories is framed as the solution to the representation of development that the affected individuals allegedly deem as the problem.

* Own translation

Demarcation of indigenous lands

Another element that recurs regarding rhetoric towards the legitimization of extractivism is the issue of demarcation of indigenous lands. When addressing indigenous peoples an element that is often linked to the word indigenous is demarcation. Not demarcating indigenous lands has been a top priority for Bolsonaro since the beginning of his term. Bolsonaro has explicitly been an opponent of demarcation of indigenous lands with utterances such as “as long as I am president there will be no demarcation of indigenous lands” (Verdélío 2019*) and “We already have 14% indigenous territory demarcated. Enough. (Barros 2021*). As previously mentioned, through PL 191/2020 the Bolsonaro administration has sought to open up protected lands for mining and other extractivism activities. The primary obstacle to the plan for exploitation of protected lands is the demarcation process that ensures legal rights for the indigenous communities (HRW 2021).

Demarcation of indigenous lands are often described as an economic hindrance for Brazil. Bolsonaro creates a causal relationship between the demarcation process and the unwillingness to work and invest in industry “Farmers often wake up terrified by the news that their property, via an ordinance from the Ministry of justice, was included in a new indigenous reserve” (Band Jornalismo 2021*) creating a emotive coercion by using the word ‘terrified’ creates a belief that the ministry of justice is a villain who often creates indigenous reserves while farmers lives in uncertainty about their livelihoods. According to Bolsonaro the demarcation process altogether must be stopped as “We have to encourage people to work, to invest” (ibid.) Thus, linking demarcation of indigenous territories to the inability to work and invest in the industries operating in the outskirts of Brazil. The rhetorical use of farmers as terrified by the demarcation process functions as a representation of reality wherein passing PL 191/2020 and PL 490/2007 seeking to end the demarcation process is necessary in order to bring virtuousness to the countryside. This virtuousness is also explained by Bolsonaro through stating “Why is the countryside so happy with us? Because we no longer demarcate indigenous land.” (Barros 2021*)

The demarcation process is often framed as an evil that disables Brazil not only economically but altogether. “We will be obligated to demarcate more and more, more indigenous areas equivalent to a new southern region. It will end Brazil” (Band Jornalismo 2021*) and further when speaking of a donation made at the G7 as an aid package towards assisting in the extinguishing of the 2019 Amazon Fires Bolsonaro stated “In large part, the money comes from outside Brazil, this has a price: demarcation of indigenous

* Own translation

lands, [...] This leads to a destination we already know, Brazil's insolvency. We're going to have to face this question anyway." (G1 2019³). Implying that a 20 million dollar donation done at the G7 following the 'forest fire' crisis is made in order to purchase demarcation of indigenous lands. Here Bolsonaro links the demarcation of indigenous territories with the insolvency of Brazil. Explicitly stating that protecting indigenous territory will pull Brazil towards bankruptcy. While at the same time stressing that foreign interference holds a negative agenda which seeks to hinder national sovereignty.

Nationalism – Legitimization through threats to the national sovereignty:

Nationalism as a category covers a variety of linguistic elements. From Foreign interference to framing opposition as a threat to Brazil that justifies exploitation of the amazon through the immediate necessity for economic development. The latter comes to show when looking at a speech given at the 74th General Assembly of the UN. Here, through a nationalist discourse a dislike of socialism becomes apparent. Here, Bolsonaro addresses socialism five times, in each instance preceded or followed by a hyperbolic negative statement "I present to you a new Brazil, resurgent after being on the brink of socialism", "My country has been extremely close to socialism, which has put us in a situation of generalized corruption, grave economic recession, high criminality rates, and uninterrupted attacks to the family and religious values which make up our traditions.", "Venezuela, once a strong and democratic country, today experiences the cruelty of socialism.", "Socialism is working in Venezuela! Everyone is poor and there is no freedom!" (Itamaraty 2019).

By stating that Brazil has been on the brink of socialism that should be blamed for economic recession, enhanced criminality rates and corruption functions as a rhetorical legitimization for the need for immediate action. Sheltering Bolsonaro from criticism of drastic change in Brazil's environmental governance. Socialism contrasts with the aim of the administration who are arguably positioning themselves within the modernization development paradigm by stating that "We are adopting policies that bring us closer to other countries which have developed themselves [...]" (Itamaraty 2019). Furthermore, the goals are expressed through "[...] Opening, competent management, and productivity gains are the immediate goals of our government." (ibid.). The immediate goals through productivity gains and the opening of indigenous territories are thus legitimized through being shaped as essential actions necessary to overcome criminality, corruption, and economic recession.

When speaking of past governance in Brazil, Bolsonaro tends to utilize a three-word repetition which functions as an underlining of the severity of the claims made. The government anteceding the Bolsonaro

administration is described as “fiscal irresponsibility, political rigging and generalized corruption” (ibid.) and enabling “generalized corruption, grave economic recession, high criminality rates” (ibid.). These repetitions function as representations of a reality where the discrediting of opposition has created a time of crisis that deems it necessary to drastically change the course of development for Brazil. This is further illustrated by framing the previous economic strategy of Brazil’s past governance as crippling where the solution is trade liberalization “Under my administration, Brazil finally puts behind a protectionist tradition and has now adopted trade liberalization as a key tool for growth and transformation” (UN 2020).

Foreign Interference:

One of the strategies for the justification of extractivist activities and the violation of indigenous rights is through the threat of foreign interference.

As mentioned above, according to Bolsonaro, Brazilian sovereignty is not compatible with the preservation of the Amazon. Amid the 2019 Amazon Forest fire, the Bolsonaro administration became the target of both national and international condemnation, when links between the fire and increased deforestation rate were revealed. This arguably ignited hostility towards foreign governments, NGOs and environmentalists supporting efforts to conserve the Amazon. Looking at environmental conserving NGOs the linguistic traits often attributed to them by the Bolsonaro administration is that of obstructing economic development. This can be seen as Bolsonaro accuse the NGOs in question to “Exploit and manipulate” (HRW 2019) indigenous peoples to hinder Brazil’s economic development while holding the hidden agenda of exploiting the forest themselves in the future (ibid.). The social identity created by Bolsonaro to the environmentalists who position themselves in favor of the NGOs are created through addressing them as ‘Ongueiros’ (NGOists) and through describing ‘Ongueiros’ as criminals (Mazui 2019*). By describing the ‘Ongueiros’ as criminals works as a way of shaping their environmental conservation efforts as unreliable and as a threat to both national security and national sovereignty. This was explicitly illustrated during the 2019 Amazon fires. “Crime exists and we have to do everything possible so that this crime does not increase, but we take money from the NGOs [...] so these people are feeling lack of money” (ibid.*). Here, Bolsonaro seeks to depict the NGOs as villains who were behind the forest fires because of the Bolsonaro administration withdrawing money from the institutions. By villainizing opposition Bolsonaro thus manages to avoid being held accountable for the socio-environmental consequences of extractivism through deforestation.

* Own translation

5.2 Discursive Practice

National and International Audience

At the UN summits Bolsonaro is addressing an international audience. In doing so, the speech acts are influenced, the unrefined addressing of climate change denial is substituted by reasoning and factual arguments that help legitimize arguments made more crudely to a national audience. Whereas, typically in a national setting the opinions and rhetoric differ. “The interest in the Amazon isn’t because of the Indian (Indigenous person) or the fucking trees, it’s the mining” (Rocha 2019), whereas “We also condemn the attempts at instrumentalizing the environmental matter or indigenous policies toward external political and economic interests, especially those disguised as good intentions.” (Itamaraty 2019) holds the same argument but presented informal as it is directly addressed to an international audience. At the international level, the emphasis of the foreign involvement of conservation efforts in Brazil, is understood to be destabilizing Brazilian sovereignty while holding hidden intentions, this is illustrated repeatedly when addressing an international audience

“The Brazilian Amazon is known to be immensely rich. That explains the support given by international institutions to this disinformation campaign anchored on shady interests coupled with exploitative and unpatriotic Brazilian associations with the purpose of undermining the Government and Brazil itself.” (UN 2020).

Not only does the argument of a hidden agenda help to persuade potential voters in siding with the Bolsonaro administration regarding international skepticism, but it also functions as a legitimization of exploitation of indigenous territories as it creates an argument of ‘if we won’t do it, they will’.

Environmental Protection Discourse

When speaking of the environment and environmental protection, the Bolsonaro administration aims to safeguard against international skepticism. This is done through an environmental protection discourse that seeks to reassure that the Brazilian environmental protection efforts are of high importance, by creating a reassurance to the international audience is a means to an end. By persuading the international community about the high levels of environmental protection in Brazil, Bolsonaro seeks to get rid of the skepticism towards the development goal of the government that aims to accumulate wealth based on exploitation of the amazon. Bolsonaro explains the environmental governance as: “Our agribusiness remains vibrant and thriving and, above all, it has and respects the best environmental legislation on the planet.” (UN 2020) and later links it to the high standards of the human rights agenda “Brazil stands out not only on the environmental preservation front, but also on the humanitarian and human rights agenda (ibid.)”. Through an environmental protection discourse aimed at the international community with a focus on Brazil high

standards of rights demonstrates a hidden meaning within the discourse. The extracts above are spoken at the 75th General Assembly of the United Nations in 2020. Approximately one year after the amazon forest fires that made Brazil face international condemnation critiquing the Brazilian environmental governance while threatening to oppose trade deals with Brazil. The discourse thus serves as a tool to advise against possible economic punishment rather than reflect the environmental legislation of Brazil. Bolsonaro rejects possible criticisms as lies while reminding the consumer of the text that they can't apply economic sanctions based on what is explained as "the world increasingly relies on Brazil to feed itself" (ibid.).

Indigenous Development Aspirations

As mentioned above, the rhetorical traits given by Bolsonaro when addressing indigenous peoples are often that of shaping a social identity of a group of people unable to direct their own development aspirations.

However, neither the producer nor the consumer of the indigenous development aspiration discourse is of indigenous origin. When addressing the development goals of the indigenous people it is either addressed to an international audience at the UN General Assembly or in interviews. This amplifies the top-down development approach that the Bolsonaro administration places upon the Indigenous Communities. By speaking on behalf of the indigenous community, Bolsonaro exhibits an expert knowledge of the wishes of the communities but without including them. This creates a representation of reality for the consumer of the discourse that the indigenous communities do in fact support an economic development agenda despite socio-environmental consequences. Concurrently the pronouns utilized to describe indigenous peoples are often "they/them" and stands in contrast with the rest of Brazil as "we/us".

5.3 Social Practice:

In the following section, this paper will seek to analyze how the Bolsonaro administration strategically justifies post-extractivism and the socio-environmental consequences thus counteracting the rights for land for the indigenous peoples in Brazil. Furthermore, it will sideline the development goals for the people affected and explain how the dominant discourse of the Bolsonaro administration can thrive under the national and international resistance towards the socio-environmental actions of the Brazilian government.

A villainizing discourse

By means of villainizing opposition to the Bolsonaro administrations economic agenda, functions as a veil that springs questions about who should be understood as the responsible entity for the socio-environmental damages in the indigenous territories. Both by directly blaming environmentalists for starting fires within the Amazon, but also through the persuasion of the receiver of the discourse that the opposition in the form of foreign governments holds a hidden agenda of exploiting the area themselves.

The villainizing discourse of the Bolsonaro administration brings forth linguistic similarities to the military regimes 1970's Amazonian development plan. Ridiculing environmentalists as expressed through "If one day I could, I would confine them in the Amazon, since they like the environment so much. So they can stop disturbing the amazon from within the Urban areas" (Bolsonaro 2020) functions as a means to stage the environmentalists as unacquainted with the issues facing the Amazon. Furthermore, it seeks to express that the environmentalists are hindering the political exploitation agenda. Playing the nationalism card to cast doubt on the credibility and patriotism of "environmentalists" is a repeated discourse that dates back to the 1960's construction of the Trans-Amazonian Highway (Rohter 2010: 208).

Legitimization of the socio-environmental consequences of extractivism is bound up on a conservative nationalist discourse. By anchoring political opposition with the enemy Bolsonaro seeks to establish a security threat through socialism. Socialism is framed as the main threat to the dominant ideology which justifies immediate action. By blaming socialism for the insolvency of Brazil enables a development discourse that shapes the social reality for the consumers of the discourse. The discourse that Brazil needs to regulate indigenous territories and allow exploration of oil, hydroelectric plants and commercial mining as sought to do through PL 191/2020. Socialism thus becomes a hindering factor for economic potential through the preservation of indigenous territories.

Socialism is used interchangeably with communism and 'left-wing'. All of which are used in a war discourse "A few decades ago, they tried to change the Brazilian regime and those of other countries in Latin America. They were defeated!" (UN 2019) and further "Brazilian civilians and military personnel were killed and many others had their reputations destroyed, but we won that war and safeguarded our freedom." (UN 2019) here speaking of communists the discourse functions as a way of validating the dominant conservative ideology as left-wing governance is expressed as an enemy that seeks to remove freedom from Brazilian society.

Contradicting development goals.

As explained above, the Bolsonaro administrations understanding of development is closely related to the modernization paradigm.

Within the actors involved in the Amazon different understandings and importance given to development from various social actors arise. The international community's pressure on the Bolsonaro administration stems from a climate concern and the possible inability to reach CO2 emission targets set by the Paris Agreement. The Bolsonaro administration on the other hand understands development as the accumulation of wealth and creates a representation of reality where this understanding of development is

necessary to establish domestic economic stability. The consequence of the Bolsonaro administrations understanding of development is that both deforestation and fires hereof contributes to carbon dioxide emission (Raftopolous & Morley 2020) thus hindering the international communities development.

As explained in subsection 'indigenous peoples', through an empowerment discourse Bolsonaro forces development goals upon the indigenous peoples, Bolsonaro aims to create a reality where the industrial development of the amazon region is the agenda of the indigenous peoples themselves. By utilizing an empowerment discourse expresses the racist ideology. It disregards the social and cultural aspects of the communities affected, but rather seeks to make "'traditional' societies acquire the attributes of 'modernity'" (Tipps 1973: 203). The development discourse contains traits of what Tipps (1973: 210) describes as "cultural imperialism" i.e. a superimposing of western cultural values upon other societies which tends to "Subordinate all other considerations". In this case the superior consideration consists of economic development while the subordinate consists of preservation of protected areas.

A top-down approach of defining development problems, goals and solutions is arguably in sharp contrast to the dominant development understanding of the Indigenous communities. When looking at indigenous communities' open letters to both national and international agencies, it becomes visible that contrary to exploitation of the amazon for economic development, the dominant development paradigm sought for, is that of a self-determined one.

"They say they are for the preservation of the forest, to put an end to illegal activities, but we know that these "solutions" coming from outside do not respect our ways of life and our autonomy to think about and care for the territory. We don't need any company to control the use of our territory and tell us how to preserve the forest. (Amazon watch 2020)

Here, through an open letter by the Munduruku, the goal presented by the Munduruku people are autonomy. The 'outsiders' who hold an interest in the territory is portrayed as intruders seeking to assert expertise knowledge upon the inhabitants of the territory. This illustrates the development agenda sought for, for the Munduruku, resembles critical alternative development which is "Deeply critical of the top-down, hegemonic character of most mainstream development discourse and practice" (Parpart & Veltmeyer 2004: 52). Rather than the economic modernist development paradigm which is attributed to them.

Bolsonaro reproduced a discourse of empowerment through defining the goals and solutions of the indigenous population. He does so to justify his own agenda of opening up indigenous lands to exploitation. However, the empowerment discourse produced by Bolsonaro seeks to justify his agenda by trying to assert his governments attitude towards the indigenous community within the critical alternative

development paradigm. This becomes visible when looking at the way the empowerment discourse is constructed. By claiming the administration is “freeing” the indigenous peoples, from a position of marginalization to a position where they will be able to have autonomy of their own lives. This presupposes that the autonomy of their own life is the life as citizens of Brazil rather than citizens of their own culture and social understanding of reality. Furthermore, he shapes the empowerment discourse through the social construction of an identity where all of the indigenous communities’ points towards economic development as a solution to their self-determination. By understanding the discourse in this regard Bolsonaro arguably seeks to construct a representation of reality where he makes way for a participatory approach where he enables the indigenous peoples to develop under their own terms while attempting to retain “sensitivity, to and respect for, cultural and social differences” (ibid.).

The empowerment discourse of Bolsonaro, however, does not reflect the same development objectives as those of the Munduruku. The letter further explains “Our ancestral territories need to be respected” (Amazonwatch 2020) and regarding environmental protection “We are constantly discussing and developing our ideas for protecting the lands that we have always cared for, and yet the pariwat comes in to destroy the forest and to deceive our own kin.” (ibid.).

Elevating the indigenous people from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ by expressing their unwillingness to be poor landowners on top of rich mineral rich lands is thus not the objective, at least for some, indigenous peoples. Rather it is a Eurocentric discourse constructed by the Bolsonaro administration to create a representation of reality where western understanding of normality is the means to emancipate marginalized peoples of the Amazon.

Addressing the top-down approach of attributing development goals for the communities, the Munduruku continues:

“We already have our plano de vida – our strategies that support life and growth for all our relatives. Our resistance organizations and the alternatives that we envision for generating income with traditional products must be strengthened. And all this in the support of increasing our autonomy and our management over our lands, and not the other way around.” (ibid.)

Autonomy and empowerment from within are expressed to be the attributes that drives the development of the community. Generating income with traditional products to obtain autonomy demonstrates the call for a participatory approach seeking to allocate power from large structures and letting the communities themselves define the development sought for. Economic accumulation is thus explained to be possible while “retaining sensitivity, to and respect for, cultural and social difference” (Parpart and Veltmeyer 2004: 52).

One of the main strategies for impeding autonomy for Indigenous Peoples in Brazil has been the weakening of the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI). However, the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA) whose responsibility is the monitoring and fining of violations of Brazil's environmental law has been strategically weakened as well (Rodrigues 2022). The weakening of IBAMA has resulted in an 80% decrease in fines on rural properties since the instatement of Bolsonaro. Environmental fines have been addressed as "an industry" by the Bolsonaro administration (ibid.). The weakening of both institutions is justified through a discourse of overly protecting indigenous rights while farmers and miners are displayed as incapable of doing their 'business as usual'. "Our farmers do their part to fight hunger in the world. We must protect them from exaggerated reprimands." (Morgenstern 2020) speaking of environmental fines as exaggerated reprimands help to legitimize the exploitation agenda of the Bolsonaro agenda. Coupled with the necessity for food security it legitimizes the agenda of exploitation on the agribusiness front. On the mining front, exaggerated reprimands are coupled with a call for legalizing exploitation "Instead of fighting illegality, we should allow legal exploitation. Maybe the precious stones – which are currently sold cheaply abroad, in the black market – can be processed by the indigenous peoples themselves." (ibid.). The discourse of downplaying environmental monitoring seeks to establish a legitimization of exploitation through the need for the indigenous peoples to obtain economic development that could lead to empowerment in a global capitalist system.

Contrary to the call for legalizing mining, mining activity can be identified as one of the main drivers for hindering the self-determination of development goals of the indigenous peoples. The communities of Pariri, Wakoborün, Aro, Arikico, Da'uk, Ipereg Ayü Movement, and CIMAT explains "First, we want the mining activity within our territory to stop immediately. We blame the current government for neglecting its duty, leaving us to get sick from mercury contamination" (Amazonwatch 2020).

Illegal logging and gold mining can be attributed to be one of the main threats to an abundance of indigenous communities within the Brazilian Amazon. The largest illegal mining sites in indigenous territories is found to be that of the Kayapó, Munduruku and Yanomami peoples (Mapbiomas n/d). Since 1985 an increase of 300% relating to illegal gold mining has occurred in indigenous territories (ibid). The Yanomami reserve is frequently addressed by Bolsonaro as both being socially desolate and holding riches in the form of minerals.

In the lower Tapajós basin where the Munduruku reside, Meneses et al. (2022) found that 75.6% of the people from eight communities and one urban area exhibited mercury levels higher than what is considered safe. Which has found to be caused by artisanal gold mining.

Through downplaying environmental monitoring through fines by IBAMA along with shaping indigenous territories as socially desolate help to justify illegal artisanal small-scale mining. The illegal mining activity in the indigenous territory of Yanomami increased 46% in 2021 compared to the 2020 numbers (Rodrigues 2022). This demonstrates that the Bolsonaro administrations legitimization of exploitation for economic development helps to justify illegal Artisanal-small scale mining. Which in turn hamper the existence and wish for autonomy for the indigenous peoples.

6.0 Discussion

With a depiction of 'traditional' vs 'modern', the Bolsonaro administration has constructed a cliff between the identity of the indigenous peoples in Brazil. Either their identity presents as citizens of Brazil adhering to the dominant ideology of capitalism or it is that of indigenous peoples with the right for self-determination but depicted as a threat to national sovereignty.

The struggle for a development based on autonomy has been a long lasting struggle for indigenous communities in Brazil. Spanning from colonial times throughout a variety of right- and left leaning governments (Meade 2010). However, in late October 2022, it was announced that the former union leader and two-time Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva also known as just 'Lula' had won the Brazilian election.

With a focus on the international audience, Lula initiated his speech at the 2022 Cop27 with the phrase "Brazil is ready to come back" vowing to put the conservation of the Amazonian rainforest and the marginalized people residing therein as the primary concern of the new administration (Zee, Greenfield & Gayle 2022).

This shift of the dominant development agenda opens for the possibility of an alternative critical development approach when addressing indigenous peoples. However, the discussion arises as the lines between responsibility for socio-environmental damages becomes blurry with the shift of politics in Brazil in contemporary Brazil. During the first two terms of Lula's presidencies, neo-extractivism played a vital role in alleviating people from extreme poverty to the middle class, through spillover effects financing social welfare programmes (Gudyanas 2010: 8). Albeit the development discourse of Lula's first two terms has been arguably subtle towards the 'development' of the Amazon, compared to Jair Bolsonaro's presidency, one key element to emphasize is the role of international and transnational companies speculating in extractivism venues within the Amazon.

In March 2022 Lula criticized an attempt to fast-track PL 191/2020 based on a potential lack of Russian fertilizer import as a result of the Russia-Ukraine war (Boadle 2022). Lula stated that

“If I become president of the republic. There won't be mining on indigenous land. The native people are not intruders. They were here before the Portuguese arrived. They have the right for a life with dignity and taking care of the Amazon is more important than mining a bit of gold.” (Lula da Silva 2022).

‘A bit of gold’ is an understatement. Illegal mining in the Yanomami Indigenous Territory alone grew 3350% from 2016-2020 (Hutukara Associação Yanomami 2022). While the mining area inside indigenous territory increased by 495% between 2010-2020. 86.1% artisanal small-scale mining and 6% of industrial mining is related to gold mining (MapBiomas n/d). From 2015 to 2020, almost half of the 229 tons of illegal gold sold in Brazil were illegally mined where the majority is imported by refineries outside Brazil (Amazonwatch 2022). The gold is used in cellphones, computers and other electronic components making it highly demanded by consumers (ibid.).

Where government policies and commending of mining activity enables both legal and illegal mining, the global mineral demand incentivizes it. Extractivism has been found to have dire consequences of the indigenous peoples of Brazil (Rorato et al. 2021; Menezes & Barbosa 2021). With an increase in extractivism ventures throughout the Bolsonaro administration, an increase in violence against indigenous peoples has happened simultaneously with a direct link to the extractivism ventures (Raftopolous & Morley 2020: 1633; HRW 2019). Thus, the depiction made by the Bolsonaro administration of the indigenous territories as socially desolate is arguably not the reality of the Brazilian territorial configuration.

Additionally, the market demand for electronics makes the gold industry supply chain a question of the social responsibility of the autonomy of indigenous peoples in the Amazon.

It can therefore be said that Bolsonaro’s claim of foreign interest in the exploitation of the Amazon holds some truth to it. Furthermore, Brazil’s new Lula administration, albeit promises of reversing the exploitation agenda, stands before an issue that requires not only a change in environmental governance but a global market pressure in order to hinder the incentive for both legal and illegal mining in indigenous territories.

7.0 Conclusion

In order to understand how the Bolsonaro administration sought to legitimize an increase in extractivism with enhanced socio-environmental consequences for marginalized peoples of Brazilian Society. This paper

has utilized Norman Fairclough's (1992) three-dimensional model for critical Discourse analysis to operationalize the theoretical framework of development and extractivism.

By looking at the Discourse as text, the discursive practices and discourse as social practice it becomes visible that in order to legitimize extractivism, the Bolsonaro administration creates a representation of reality where the agrobusiness in Brazil is in dire need of expansion in order to sustain the global food security. It has been argued that

The agricultural along with the mineral exploitation of indigenous territories are legitimized through a rhetorical strategy of comparing the productive area of Brazil to that of European countries and other large domestic areas, in order to justify the expanding agrarian- and mineral extractivism.

by addressing the territorial configuration of the indigenous territories as socially desolate, Bolsonaro enables extractive activity. It has been argued that by creating a representation of reality where the indigenous lands are seen as socially desolate expressed as vast plains, not utilized by anyone enables the legitimization of exploitation and justifies a lack of environmental control.

The primary strategy to legitimize socio-environmental consequences of the extractive agenda has been found to be through outlining political opposition, foreign interests in the Amazon and hidden agendas of NGOs as a threat to national sovereignty that makes economic acceleration a priority above environmental protection.

Indigenous peoples have been found to be the subject of a racist discourse that constructs the social identity of primitive people who are incapable of making their own decisions and define their own goals and solutions for development. Through such a depiction the racist discourse further produces a discourse of empowerment where the disregard for environmental governance and advancement of extractivism shapes a representation of reality wherein exploitation becomes the driver of change for self-determination of the indigenous peoples. This is done by justifying extractivism through the possibility of economic gain thereby promoting contradicting ideologies of development. Namely, one where the empowerment discourse depicts development as grounded in modernization theory which aims to alleviate people from a 'traditional' society to a 'modern' society through economic advancement. And one where the empowerment discourse depicts development as grounded in critical alternative development, where the representation of reality is depicted as economic development being the goal for self-determination according to the indigenous peoples.

Bibliography:

Abessa, Denis; Famá, Ana & Buruaem, Lucas. 2019. The systematic dismantling of Brazilian environmental laws risks losses on all fronts. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*. 3: 510-511. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0855-9>.

Acosta, Alberto. 2013. Extractivism and neoextractivism: two sides of the same curse. In: M, Lang and D. Makrani (eds.). *Beyond Development: Alternative Visions from Latin America*. Quito, Ecuador: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, 61-86.

Amazonwatch. 2020. Letter on behalf of the Munduruku of Upper and Middle Tapajós and Lower Teles Pires Rivers. [PDF]. Available at: <<https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2022-09-14-munduruku-redd-letter.pdf>> [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022].

Amazonwatch. 2022. Blood Gold - Complicity in destruction V. [PDF]. Available at: <<https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2022-complicity-in-destruction-v-blood-gold.pdf>> [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

Andrade, Daniela. 2022. Neoliberal Extractivism: Brazil in the twenty-first century. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2022.2030314. 30 Dec. 2022.

Artaxo, Paulo. 2019. Working together for Amazonia. *Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science)*. 363(6425): 323–323.

Ayres, Ron & Clark, David. 1998. Capitalism, industrialization and development in Latin America: the dependency paradigm revisited. *Capital & Class* 22(1): 89-118

Band Jornalismo. 2021. *Bolsonaro diz que não haverá mais demarcação de terras indígenas*. [Video Online] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EcM-fyWi92U> [Accessed 30 December 2022]

Barros, Felipe. 2021. NA ÍNTEGRA - Entrevista do Presidente Bolsonaro a Rádio 96 FM de Natal - RN - 03/08/2021. [Facebook] 04 August 2021. Available at <<https://www.facebook.com/filipebarrosocial/videos/na-%C3%ADntegra-entrevista-do-presidente-bolsonaro-a-r%C3%A1dio-96-fm-de-natal-rn-03082021/270083331122384/>> [Accessed 30 December 2022].

Boadle, Anthony. 2019. New Brazil government backs former outlaw indigenous farmers. *Reuters*. 07 Feb 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-brazil-indigenous-idUKKCN1PW21L> 30 Dec. 2022.

Boadle, Anthony. 2020. Bolsonaro suffers setback on bill to mine indigenous lands. *Reuters*. 10 Mar. 2022. <https://www.reuters.com/business/environment/bolsonaro-pushes-mining-brazils-indigenous-lands-citing-fertilizer-pinch-2022-03-09/>.

Boehm, Camila. 2019. Na Fiesp, Bolsonaro defende que governo não atrapalhe empresários. *Agência Brasil*. 11 Jun. 2019. <https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/politica/noticia/2019-06/bolsonaro-defende-que-governo-nao-atrapalhe-empresarios>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Blanco, Luisa & Grier, Robin. 2013. Explaining the Rise of the Left in Latin America. *The Latin American Studies Association*. 48(1): 68-90. [Available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41811588>]

Bolsonaro, Jair. 2020. Discurso do Presidente da República, Jair Bolsonaro, durante Solenidade Alusiva aos 400 dias de Governo. Palácio do Planalto. 05 Feb. 2020. <https://www.gov.br/planalto/pt-br/acompanhe-o-planalto/discursos/2020/discurso-do-presidente-da-republica-jair-bolsonaro-durante-solenidade-alusiva-aos-400-dias-de-governo-palacio-do-planalto>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Brazil Constitution. 2022. Available at: https://www.stf.jus.br/arquivo/cms/legislacaoConstituicao/anexo/brazil_federal_constitution.pdf [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

Bryman, Alan. 2016. *Social research methods*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cabral, Paulo. 2010. <https://www.bbc.com/news/10316852>

Chase, Veronika Miranda. 2019. The changing face of environmental governance in the Brazilian Amazon: indigenous and traditional peoples promoting norm diffusion. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 62(2), 1-20. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329201900208>

Cornwall, Andrea & Brock, Karen. 2005. What Do Buzzwords Do for Development Policy? A Critical Look at 'Participation', 'Empowerment' and 'Poverty Reduction'. *Third World Quarterly*. 26(7): 1043-1060.

Della Porta, Donatella & Keating, Michael. 2008. *Approaches And Methodologies In The Social Sciences : A Pluralist Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Deutsch, Sierra. 2021. Populist authoritarian neoliberalism in Brazil: Making sense of Bolsonaro's anti-environment agenda. *Journal of political ecology*. 28(1): 1-22.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferrante, Lucas & Fearnside, Phillip M. 2020. Brazil Threatens Indigenous Lands. *Science* 368(6490), 481-482.

Ferrante, Lucas & Fearnside, Phillip M. 2019. Brazil's new president and 'ruralists' threaten Amazonia's environment, traditional peoples and the global climate. *Environmental Conservation*. 46: 261–263. doi: 10.1017/S0376892919000213.

Ferreira, Maria Liege Freitas. 1999. Estado Novo e ocupação da Amazônia: uma abordagem geopolítica. *Raízes*. 20: 33-40.

Filomeno, Felipe A. & Vicino, Thomas J. 2020. The Evolution of Authoritarianism and Restrictionism in Brazilian Immigration Policy: Jair Bolsonaro in Historical Perspective. *Bull Lat Am Res*. 40: 598-612. <https://doi.org/10.1111/blar.13166>

G1 Globo. 2019. Em reunião com governadores para tratar de Amazônia, Bolsonaro critica demarcação de terras indígenas. *G1 Globo*. 27 Aug. 2019. <https://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2019/08/27/em-reuniao-com-governadores-para-tratar-de-amazonia-bolsonaro-critica-demarcacao-de-terras-indigenas.ghtml>. 30 Dec. 2022.

G1a Globo. 2019. Brasil é uma virgem que todo tarado de fora quer', diz Bolsonaro ao falar sobre Amazônia. *G1 Globo*. 06 Jul. 2019. <https://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2019/07/06/brasil-e-uma-virgem-que-todo-tarado-de-fora-quer-diz-bolsonaro-ao-falar-sobre-amazonia.ghtml> 30 Dec. 2022.

Gudyanas, Eduardo. 2010. "The New Extractivism of the 21st Century: Ten Urgent Theses about Extractivism in Relation to Current South American Progressivism," Americas Program Report (Washington, DC: Center for International Policy) pp. 1-14.

Gwynne, Robert N. & Kay, Cristobal. 2000. Views from the Periphery: Futures of neoliberalism in Latin America. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(1): 141-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590013279>

Hall, Anthony. 2006. From Fome Zero to Bolsa Família: Social Policies and Poverty Alleviation under Lula. *Journal of Latin American Studies*. 38(4): 689-709. DOI: 10.1017/S0022216X0600157X.

Haveman, Paul. 2016. Indigenous Peoples' Human Rights. In: Michael Goodhart (ed.). *Human Rights Politics and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 333-350.

HRW (Human Rights Watch). 2019. RAINFOREST MAFIAS: How Violence and Impunity Fuel Deforestation in Brazil's Amazon. [PDF]. Human Rights Watch. Available at <https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/brazil0919_web.pdf> [Accessed 27.05.2020].

HRW (Human Rights Watch). 2021. Brazil: Reject Anti-Indigenous Rights Bill - Proposal a Major Setback to Land Rights Recognition. Human Rights Watch. 24 Aug. 2021. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/08/24/brazil-reject-anti-indigenous-rights-bill#:~:text=Brazil%20is%20in%20the%20process,have%20been%20pending%20for%20decades>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Hutukara Associação Yanomami. 2022. Yanomami Under Attack: Illegal Mining on Yanomami Indigenous Land and Proposals to Combat it. [PDF]. Instituto Socioambiental. Available at <https://acervo.socioambiental.org/sites/default/files/documents/yad00613_en.pdf>. [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

ILO 169. International Labour Organization – ILO 1989. Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, C169. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Itamaraty (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Brazil). **2019.** *Speech by Brazil's President Jair Bolsonaro at the opening of the 74th United Nations General Assembly*. New York. 24 Sep. 2019. <https://www.gov.br/mre/en/content-centers/speeches-articles-and-interviews/president-of-the-federative-republic-of-brazil/speeches/speech-by-brazil-s-president-jair-bolsonaro-at-the-opening-of-the-74th-united-nations-general-assembly-new-york-september-24-2019-photo-alan-santos-pr>.

Jobbágy, Grau; Paruelo, José; Grau, Ricardo & Viglizzo, Ernesto F. 2015. Farming the Chaco: Tales from Both Sides of the Fence. *Journal of Arid Environments*. 123(10): 1–2.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2015.07.011>

Lakhani, Nina. 2022. Brazil's weak response to Phillips–Pereira murders threatens Indigenous people, lawyer says. *The Guardian*. 16 Jul. 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/jul/15/dom-philips-bruno-pereira-murders-brazil-indigenous>. 30 Dec. 2022

Lamont, Christopher. 2015. *Research Methods in International Relations*. London: Sage.

Le Tourneau, François-Michel. 2015. The sustainability challenges of indigenous territories in Brazil's Amazonia. *Current opinion in environmental sustainability*. 14(14): 213–220.

Loures, Rosamaria. 2018. The Karodaybi Government and its Invincible Warriors: the Munduruku Ipereğ Ayũ Movement versus large construction projects in the Amazon. *Vibrant, Virtual Braz. Anthr* 15(2): 1-23.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-43412018v15n2a404>.

Lula da Silva, Luiz Inácio. 2022. n/d. [Twitter] 10 Mar. Available at
<https://twitter.com/LulaOficial/status/1501875309834088451>.

MapBiomias. n/d. AREA OCCUPIED BY MINING IN BRAZIL GROWS MORE THAN 6 TIMES BETWEEN 1985 AND 2020. *MapBiomias*. n/d. https://mapbiomas.org/en/area-ocupada-pela-mineracao-no-brasil-cresce-mais-de-6-vezes-entre-1985-e-2020?cama_set_language=en&mc_cid=44c898340f&mc_eid=3ddfe29860. 30 Dec. 2022

Marianne W Jørgensen, & Louise J Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis As Theory and Method*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Mazui, Guilherme. 2019. Bolsonaro diz que ONGs podem estar por trás de queimadas na Amazônia para 'chamar atenção' contra o governo. *G1 Globo*. 21 Aug. 2019.
<https://g1.globo.com/politica/noticia/2019/08/21/bolsonaro-diz-que-ongs-podem-estar-por-tras-de-queimadas-na-amazonia-para-chamar-atencao-contra-o-governo.ghtml> 30 Dec. 2022.

Meade, Teresa A. 2010. *A Brief History of Brazil*. New York: Infobase Publishing.

Meneses, Heloisa do Nascimento de Moura; Oliveira-da-costa, Marcelo; Basta, Paulo Cesar; Morais, Christiano GonçalvesM Pereira, Romulo Jorge Batista; de Souza, Suelen Maria Santos & Hacon, Sandra de Souza. 2022. *int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*.19(5)2816: 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052816>

Menezes, Roberto Goulart & Barbosa, Ricardo. 2021. Environmental governance under Bolsonaro: dismantling institutions, curtailing participation, delegitimising opposition. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft*. 15: 229-247.

Moncau, Gabriela. 2022. Documento final do Acampamento Terra Livre 2022 traz propostas e demandas dos povos indígenas. *Brasil de Fato*. 18 Apr. 2022.

<https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2022/04/18/documento-final-do-acampamento-terra-livre-2022-traz-propostas-e-demandas-dos-povos-indigenas>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Parpart, Jane & Veltmeyer, Henry. 2004. The Development Project in Theory and Practice: A review of its Shifting Dynamics. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 25: 39-54

Peixote, Fabrícia. 2009. Linha do tempo: Entenda como ocorreu a ocupação da Amazônia. *BBC News Brasil*. 22 Jul. 2009. https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/noticias/2009/07/090722_amazonia_timeline_fbdt. 30 Dec. 2022

PIB (Povos Indígenas no Brasil). 2018. Demarcation. *Povos Indígenas no Brasil*. 20 Sep. 2018. <https://pib.socioambiental.org/en/Demarcation>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2000. After post-development. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(2): 175-191. DOI: 10.1080/01436590050004300

PL 191/2020. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/fichadetramitacao?idProposicao=2236765> [Accessed 30 Dec.2022].

Planalto. 1966. LEI Nº 5.173 - Do Plano de Valorização Econômica da Amazônia. Available at <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l5173.htm> [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

Poder360. 2020. 'Cada vez mais o índio é 1 ser humano igual a nós', diz Bolsonaro. [Video Online] Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WX7Xrs2Y3QY> [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

PRODES. 2022. http://terrabrasilis.dpi.inpe.br/app/dashboard/deforestation/biomes/legal_amazon/rates. 30 Dec. 2022.

Raftopoulos, Malayna & Morley, Joanna. 2020. Ecocide in the Amazon: the contested politics of environmental rights in Brazil. *The International Journal of Human Rights*. 24(10): 1616-1641. DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2020.1746648

Riethof, Marieke. 2017. The International human rights discourse as a strategic focus in socioenvironmental conflicts: The case of hydro-electric dams in Brazil. *The International Journal of Human Rights* (21:4): 482-499. DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2016.1191775.

Rocha, Aline. 2019. "O interesse na Amazônia não é no índio nem na porra da árvore, é no minério", afirma Bolsonaro. *Jornal de Brasília*. 01 Oct. 2019. <https://jornaldebrasil.com.br/noticias/politica-e-poder/o-interesse-na-amazonia-nao-e-no-indio-nem-na-porra-da-arvore-e-no-minerio-afirma-bolsonaro/>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Rodrigues, Meghie. 2022. Bolsonaro's Troubled Science Legacy. *Nature*. 609: 890-891. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-03038-3.pdf>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Rodrigues, Natália. n/d. Programa de Integração Nacional. *Infoescola*. <https://www.infoescola.com/historia/programa-de-integracao-nacional/>

Rohrer, Larry. 2010. Brazil on the Rise: the story of a country transformed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rorato, Ana C; Camara, Gilberto; Escada, Maria Isabel S.; Michelle Picoli C. A.; Moreira, Tiago & Verstegen, Judith A. 2020. Brazilian amazon indigenous peoples threatened by mining bill. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 15(1040a3): 1-12. DOI 10.1088/1748-9326/abb428. 30 Dec. 2022.

Teixeira, Raquel Oliveira Santos; Laschefski, Andréa Luisa Zhouri & Motta, Luana Dias. 2021. Environmental Impact Studies and the Development Visibility Economy. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais; São Paulo*. 36(105): 1-17. DOI:10.1590/3610501/2020

Tipps, Dean C. 1973. Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15(2): 199-226

Trebat, Thomas J. 2013. New Directions For a more Prosperous Brazil. *Journal of International Affairs*. 66(2): 127-142.

Senado.leg. 2020. Chega ao Congresso projeto que permite mineração em terras indígenas. [Online]. 6 February. Available at < <https://www12.senado.leg.br/noticias/materias/2020/02/06/chega-ao-congressoprojeto-que-permite-mineracao-em-terras-indigenas>> [Accessed 27.05.2020].

Shen, Fujun; Hughey, Kenneth F.D. & Simmons, David G. 2008. Connecting the sustainable livelihoods approach and tourism: A review of the literature. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 15: 19–31. DOI 10.1375/jhtm.15.19

Silva, Rafael. 2018. Bolsonaro quer abolir Paulo Freire do MEC com "lança-chamas". *Gazeta Online*. 01 Aug. 2018. https://www.gazetaonline.com.br/noticias/politica/eleicoes_2018/2018/08/bolsonaro-quer-abolir-paulo-freire-do-mec-com-lanca-chamas-1014142306.html 30 Dec. 2022.

Svampa, Maristella. 2019 *Neo-extractivism in Latin America: Socio-environmental Conflicts, the Territorial Turn, and New Political Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

UN (United Nations).1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948. Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> [accessed 01.05.2020]

UN (United Nations). 2020. *Remarks by President Jair Bolsonaro at the General Debate of the 75th Session of the United Nations General Assembly*. Available at https://estatemnts.unmeetings.org/estatemnts/10.0010/20200922/cVOOfMrOrKnhR/lleAuB7WE9ug_en.pdf. [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022]

UN (United Nations). 2021. *Statement of His Excellency Jair Bolsonaro, President of the Federative Republic of Brazil, to the 76th General Assembly of the United Nations*. United Nations. Available at <https://estatemnts.unmeetings.org/estatemnts/10.0010/20210921/AT2JoAvm71nq/1a6r0NkCnoc6_ot2.pdf>. [Accessed 30 Dec. 2022].

UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, 2 October 2007, A/RES/61/295*.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2011. Discourse and Ideology. In: A. Van Dijk, Teun (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications Inc, 379-404.

Verdélío, Andreia. 2019. Bolsonaro diz que não fará demarcação de terras indígenas. *AgenciaBrasil*. 16 Aug. 2019. <https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/politica/noticia/2019-08/bolsonaro-diz-que-nao-fara-demarcacao-de-terras-indigenas>. 30 Dec. 2022

Wodak, Ruth & Meyer, Michael. (2009). *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology 1. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*.

Zee, Patrick; Greenfield, Patrick & Gayle, Damien. 2022. Lula says ‘Brazil is back’ as he vows to reverse Amazon deforestation – as it happened. *The Guardian*. 16 Nov. 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/live/2022/nov/16/cop27-paris-agreement-deal-nature-biodiversity-brazil-lula-live?filterKeyEvents=false&page=with:block-637504868f08d41054ea9299#block-637504868f08d41054ea9299>. 30 Dec. 2022.

Ziai, Aram. 2007. *Exploring Post-Development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Ziai, Aram. 2013. The discourse of “development” and why the concept should be abandoned. *Development in Practice* 23(1): 123-136.

Ziai, Aram. 2016. *Development Discourse and Global History: From colonialism to the sustainable development goals*. London: Routledge.