



Development of the Brazilian Amazon

In their discussion of "the future of the Brazilian Amazon" (*Science's* Compass, Policy Forum, 19 Jan., p. [438](#)), W. F. Laurance and his co-authors offer a serious contribution to a very serious subject. Nevertheless, we reject their projections of extensive deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon.

The first difficulty is that they look 20 years ahead but extrapolate practices and events of 15 to 25 years ago. Today, Brazil is a fully functioning democracy. Gone are the days when public debate was shackled and development planning was a centralized, technocratic, closed-door process that produced nonnegotiable directives and was dominated by geopolitical concerns. In fact, just the existence of the current debate about development projects, several of them scheduled for many years ahead, shows how much Brazil has changed.

Second, the authors of the Policy Forum seem to deny that the Brazilian government can learn from the past, and they do not recognize the enormous changes of the last quarter-century. Brazil today has world-class environmental licensing procedures. Every major project must be evaluated by independent experts and discussed in public hearings, and recent legislation makes environmental destruction a criminal offense. Brazil uses satellite monitoring and other advanced technologies to observe and control rain forest development. Yes, enforcement is a problem, as in any country, but it is unreasonable to assume that past errors must necessarily be repeated.

Third, the full scope of the Avana Brasil development program goes far beyond the infrastructure projects Laurance and his co-authors mention. They wrongly suggest that Amazon development is a "top-down" process where projects are "approved long before the environmental costs and risks can be evaluated." In fact, Avana Brasil was preceded by a 3-year study led by international consultants and involving 100 experts from 18 Brazilian consulting companies and universities, including many nongovernment Amazon specialists. Preliminary results were debated in every state capital, as were numerous additional written submissions. A selection of the projects so identified was then incorporated into the Avana Brasil legislation sent to Congress and debated for 11 months. Even so, the government is commissioning supplementary environmental studies.

Finally, it is essential to understand that inclusion in Avana Brasil in no way diminishes the legal

- ▶ dEbate: [Submit a response](#) to this article
- ▶ [Related articles in Science](#)
- ▶ Similar articles found in: [SCIENCE Online](#)
- ▶ Search Medline for articles by: [Silveira, J. P.](#) || [Delamônica, P.](#)
- ▶ Alert me when: [new articles cite this article](#)
- ▶ [Download to Citation Manager](#)

requirement for each project to undergo full, individual environmental licensing, as described above. If any project is found to present unacceptable environmental costs, it must be modified or shelved.

Nothing threatens the rain forest as much as poverty and ignorance. Some 20 million people live in the Brazilian Amazon region, most of them very poor. We must offer these people a lifestyle better than hacking and burning. That is what *Avana Brasil* seeks to do, by steering development toward the appropriate and sustainable use of each individual area through correct zoning.

Vast regions will be left untouched, as nature and Indian reserves. Others are appropriate for sustainable harvesting of forest products. And some areas, but certainly a minority, are appropriate for agriculture. Laurance *et al.* rightly advocate intensive rather than extensive agriculture, favoring "high-value agroforestry and perennial crops," but they do not mention that various programs within *Avana Brasil* promote exactly that. Others foster biotechnology, ecotourism, and integrated local development, and dozens of programs in education, health, and sanitation seek to break the poverty circle.

Yes, the plan includes paving some existing highways, but no new ones will be added. And wherever possible, we will develop waterways rather than highways, because the environmental impact is much lower. Natural gas will replace oil-fired energy, thus reducing pollution and the demand for new hydropower, and projected dams are designed to minimize reservoir size and impact.

We are satisfied that the general directions proposed in *Avana Brasil* offer the best way forward. Nevertheless, we will continue to welcome and encourage the critical, informed participation of the Brazilian and international scientific communities in the awesome challenge and responsibility implicit in planning the development of the Amazon.

Jose Paulo Silveira

Secretary of Planning,

Avana Brasil Plan Coordinator,

Braslia, Brazil.

E-mail: <mailto:jose.silveira@planejamento.gov.br>

or thais.mendes@planejamento.gov.br

Response

Silveira is certainly correct in emphasizing that Brazilian society is more open and democratic than in the past, and that the *Avana Brasil* program includes many provisions (such as construction of new schools, hospitals, and low-income housing) that would improve the lives of Amazonian residents. According to our estimates, however, about half of the total investments of *Avana Brasil* (over \$20 billion) would be used for construction of major highways and infrastructure projects that are likely to have serious, negative impacts on Amazonian forests (1). Many of these megaprojects are mainly designed to support corporate soybean, logging, and cattle-ranching industries that tend to benefit major landowners and the wealthy, but have limited benefits for the poor (2). It was these projects on which our article focused.

Silveira suggests that there have been fundamental changes in Brazil that would substantially reduce the impacts of new highways, roads, and infrastructure projects on Amazon deforestation. In our view, little evidence supports this claim. Although there have been laudable improvements in Brazilian environmental legislation and public awareness, deforestation rates are still alarmingly high (3), and

illegal logging and forest burning are rampant (4). In the past, highways and roads have dramatically increased deforestation, logging, hunting, and other degrading activities (5, 6), and this situation has not changed fundamentally. It strikes us as naïve to suggest that the Amazon basin could be crisscrossed by dozens of new highways and infrastructure projects and yet there would be little effect on forest destruction.

Silveira says that *Avança Brasil* will not create new highways, but this is misleading. About 7500 kilometers of existing roads will be paved (1). Paved highways greatly increase year-round accessibility to forests and urban markets and often cause sharp increases in forest exploitation. They also tend to generate extensive networks of secondary roads (5). Hence, the "footprint" of forest destruction and degradation near highways is typically far greater than that of unpaved roads.

Finally, Silveira is correct in suggesting that Brazil has good environmental licensing procedures--on paper--but the implementation of these procedures has frequently been poor (7). Public hearings, for example, have rarely had much effect on the proposed projects, and many of the Amazonian experts to whom Silveira refers were employed by construction or consulting firms that tend to benefit directly from development (8). Until just recently, key agencies such as the Ministry of Environment have been virtually excluded from the planning process.

Our concern is that--given already enormous investments in resources and effort--the *Avança Brasil* program is becoming an almost unstoppable juggernaut. Environmental impact studies are slated to occur only during the final stages of planning--at which point individual projects have often gained enormous momentum. These studies rarely consider the indirect impacts of large-scale projects on forests (such as increased immigration and forest colonization), and their recommended mitigation measures are seldom adequate. Indeed, except for efforts such as those of the National Institute for Amazonian Research (5) and of the Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (6), there has so far been no systematic attempt to predict the impacts of the massive projects on Amazon forest loss and degradation. Moreover, land-use planning in the Amazon is fraught with problems; it is a hodgepodge of individual zonings by the nine Amazonian states, many strongly influenced by local resource-users and pressure groups (9).

In our view, the megaprojects of *Avança Brasil* present precisely the wrong vision for the Amazon. At present, only a small fraction of the Brazilian Amazon is fully protected (<4%, with a future target of 10%), and many existing reserves would become increasingly vulnerable to predatory logging, wildfires, and overhunting as new roads and highways draw near (10). Opening up vast new frontiers for colonization would encourage further immigration into a region that already is experiencing exponential population growth. It would also help maintain cheap land prices, reducing incentives for landowners to develop more efficient agricultural methods based on perennial crops rather than fire-based ranching and slash-and-burn farming. The megaprojects are also predicted to cause unprecedented forest fragmentation, and the resulting forest remnants will be much more vulnerable than intact forests to degrading activities in the future.

William F. Laurance,*
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute,
Apartado 2072,
Balboa, Panamá

Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project

Philip M. Fearnside,

Ecology Department,

National Institute for Amazonian Research (INPA),

C.P. 478,

Manaus, AM 69011-970, Brazil;

Mark A. Cochrane,

Basic Science and Remote Sensing Initiative,

Michigan State University,

East Lansing, MI 48823, USA;

Sammya D'Angelo,

Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project

Scott Bergen,

Department of Forest Science,

Oregon State University,

Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

Patricia Delamônica

Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: wfl@inpa.gov.br

References and Notes

1. W. F. Laurance, S. D'Angelo, A. Andrade, *Science* dEbate response to the Brazilian Embassy, "Re: The future of the Brazilian Amazon," available at <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/eletters/291/5503/438>
2. P. M. Fearnside, *Environ. Conserv.*, in press; P. M. Fearnside, *Ambio* **22**, 537 (1993).
3. *Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia* (Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais, San Jose dos Campos, Brazil, 2000).
4. W. F. Laurance, *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **13**, 411 (1998).
5. ----- *et al.*, *Science* **291**, 438 (2001).
6. D. C. Nepstad *et al.*, *Avança Brasil: Cenários Futuros para a Amazônia* (Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia, Belém, Brazil, 2000).
7. P. M. Fearnside, R. I. Barbosa, *Environ. Manage.* **20**, 631 (1996a); E. Eve, F. A. Arguelles, P. M. Fearnside, *Environ. Manage.* **26**, 251 (2000).
8. P. M. Fearnside, R. I. Barbosa, *Environ. Manage.* **20**, 615 (1996b).
9. *Um Rumo para a Amazônia* (O Estado de S. Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, 3 February 2001).
10. L. V. Ferreira *et al.*, *Áreas Protegidas ou Espaços Ameaçados* (World Wide Fund for Nature, Brasília, Brazil, 1999).

- ▶ **dEbate:** [Submit a response to this article](#)
- ▶ [Related articles in Science](#)
- ▶ Similar articles found in:
[SCIENCE Online](#)
- ▶ Search Medline for articles by:
[Silveira;, J. P.](#) || [Delamônica, P.](#)
- ▶ Alert me when:
[new articles cite this article](#)
- ▶ [Download to Citation Manager](#)

Related articles in Science:

ENVIRONMENT:

The Future of the Brazilian Amazon.

William F. Laurance, Mark A. Cochrane, Scott Bergen, Philip M. Fearnside, Patricia Delamônica, Christopher Barber, Sammya D'Angelo, and Tito Fernandes
Science 2001 291: 438-439. (in Policy Forum) [\[Summary\]](#) [\[Full Text\]](#)

Volume 292, Number 5522, Issue of 1 Jun 2001, pp. 1651-1654.

Copyright © 2001 by The American Association for the Advancement of Science. All rights reserved.

[Sign up for Job Alerts!](#)

[Subscribe to Science](#)