

Title: Hydropower plants, environment e local development

MORETTO, Evandro Mateus; GOMES, Carina Sernaglia; ROQUETTI, Daniel Rondinelli

Abstract: Nowadays, Brazilian hydropower plants are the fundamental strategy for development based on national economic growth, receiving a budget around US\$ 400 billion (48% of current government plan), whose generated electricity will be mainly employed in ore processing to export. On the other hand, the implementation and the operation of hydropower plants cause a wide range of negative impacts in local scale, like the alteration of hydrological regime, the loss of water quality and biodiversity, the occupation of reservoir's surroundings and the emission of greenhouse gases. In this context, the hydropower plants are clearly related to the increase of National Gross Product and to with generation of local significant environmental degradation. However, the relationship between the hydropower plants and the local development has not been adequately understood, especially considering that the Brazilian current policies are still justified by government how a mechanism to improve local development. Thus, this paper aims to theoretically discuss the possible relationships between hydropower plants and the local development phenomenon. The hypothesis for this paper is based on the idea that hydropower plants are a reproduction circuit of the "development myth" to the local scale. Analyzing local alterations caused by hydropower plants, this paper proposes the built of an analysis model that may cope with the relationship between hydropower plants and local development.

Keywords: local development; hydropower plants.

1 **1.Introduction**

2
3 Hydropower plants play an important role to concretize policies that aim to promote a model of development based
4 primarily in the enlargement of economic scale, which is a model adopted in Brazil since 1940ties. Currently, Brazil counts
5 on a Growth Acceleration Plan, called PAC, that foresees an investment of R\$ 763 billion, from an amount of R\$ 1,59
6 trillion, in the construction of hydropower plants, aiming to increase electric energy offer, specially to ore processing to
7 exportation.

8 Besides the high environmental costs associated to hydropower plants, Federal Government justify these projects in
9 the name of social interest for the country development, promoting beyond raise of Gross Domestic Product (GDP),
10 regional and local development. In this second aspect, related to the development of others scales that is not national, is

11 possible to verify the fractal reproduction of policies based in the “myth of development” from Furtado (1974), which
12 assure that the mechanisms that enrich a country could generate wealth to the locals affected by the hydropower projects.

13 Hypothesis discussed by this paper is that hydropower plants are fractal reproductive circuits of development myth to
14 the local scale. For this discussion are used elements from development theories, like the the sinapses from Boisier (2004),
15 the enclaves from Cardoso e Faletto (1984), dependency theory from Teófilo dos Santos (2000) and the myth of
16 development, from Furtado (1974).

18 **2.Development as Economic Growth**

20 The new economic world order established after 2nd World War resulted in a model of development inducted in poor
21 countries, at the time classified as underdeveloped, by international cooperation mechanisms created by this time, which
22 allowed a direct financial support to these countries coming from developed world. By the action of international
23 organizations, like World Bank, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Organization for
24 Cooperation and Economic Development (OCED), underdeveloped countries started to receive financial support which was
25 invested especially in the implementation of large infrastructure projects, like large roads and dams, it happened in most of
26 Latin-American countries. Since this period, Brazil has tried implementation of large dams to electricity generation as base
27 to configure an economy strongly sustained by electro-intensive ways of production.

28 In the past 40 years, GDP of many countries called underdeveloped has raised significantly, especially due to the
29 international cooperation mechanisms, which have influenced a strong reproduction of an internal socioeconomic
30 asymmetry, with most of society remaining in economic system’s periphery. This reproduction of global scale to national
31 scale can be understood as the fractal reproduction of the “myth of economic development” from Furtado (1974).

32 As Furtado (1974) states in the “Myth of development”, that this model of development adopted nationally and
33 fomented by international cooperation organisms, reproduces in Brazil the same strategy that the rich countries have
34 implemented to the composition of its economic systems, socially building a myth that the path to development of any
35 country is to reproduce the economic history of rich countries. The premise associated to this idea of international
36 cooperation is related to the presumption that economic growth by itself would be enough to deal with socioeconomic
37 problems of poor countries (KLIKSBERG, 2002). However, as Vergara (2004) states, historic results reveal that the
38 socioeconomic gap existed among rich countries (core of global economy) and poor countries (periphery) have been
39 internally reproduced in the poor countries.

40 In this historic course criticisms have been made to this model of development induction, evincing the many
41 consequences of this process like the raise of economic dependency from underdeveloped countries, the asymmetry
42 intensification in the relations core-periphery, wealth concentration, cultural mimicry, etc. (CARDOSO E FALETO, 1969;
43 FURTADO, 1974). According to an econometric study realized by CEPAL, PNUD and IPEA (2003), development
44 strategies based exclusively in economic growth tend to concentrate the wealth and strength inequality. As social disparity
45 creates assets discrepancy, like credit to education, for example, the reduction of these inequalities may be a much more
46 effective mechanism to poverty reduction rather than economic growth. Still in Latin America, social disparity is a
47 characteristic that persists historically.

48 It's very clear how this myth still persists as a guide to the formulation of public policies in Brazil, considering that
49 the model of development remains oriented mainly to the increment of economic scale (GDP increase)with main strategy
50 based on the construction of large infrastructure projects. The projects of energy sector have an important role in this
51 process, prove of this is the amount of financial resource that is predicted to be invested mainly in the construction of
52 hydropower plants. From a total of R\$ 1,59trillion estimated to be spent with the Growth Acceleration Plan (PAC), R\$ 1,09
53 trillion is directed to the energy sector, with emphasis to dams construction to electricity generation, which represents 68%
54 of whole investments. It is important to highlight that hydroelectricity is responsible for more than 70% electricity
55 generation in Brazil (ANEEL, 2009).

56 Hydropower plants are in the middle of this development model based on the increase of GDP aimed by Brazilian
57 public policies since 1970. During this historical course, these projects have been deeply analyzed and criticized due to the
58 negative impacts associated, like the alterations in the hydrological regime, quality water loss, land use occupation,
59 emission of greenhouses gases, biodiversity loss, increase of endemic diseases, among others (BERMANN, 2007).

60 However, these projects have been called as development promoters from local and regional scale. This discourse
61 has justified the implementation of new hydropower plants despite all of the impacts well already known. In this context, it
62 will be made a theory analyses of how is the relationship between this kind of project and the territories where it is located.
63 For more than impacts, it is aim to analyze if alterations resulted from the whole process associated to a hydropower plant
64 (planning, implementing and operating) are planned and oriented to the development of the localities affected.

65

66 **3. Hydropower and development**

67

68 The socioeconomic disparity in Brazil and also the loss of environmental quality are strongly associated to the
69 economic growth model that the country has adopted especially since 1960 and 70. During the 1970ties Brazil has tried a

70 growth in GDP that was nearly 10% per year, still it was not felt in society better life conditions, as it was expected to be,
71 for example, improvement in the guarantees of individual rights and in promotion of an income distribution that was less
72 asymmetric. The opposite can be observed in the past 30 years, when the growth of economic scale was weakened, though
73 social indicators have improved.

74 From this historical contradicted scenarios, Veiga (2010) deconstructs the idea that development is directly
75 proportional to the raise of GDP per capita and states that development and economic growth are not synonyms. According
76 to the author, “development of a society depends on how it takes advantages from the benefits of its economic performance
77 to expand and distribute opportunities of access to goods, like civil liberties, health, education, decent jobs, etc.”.

78 Sachs (2004) states that development is different from economic growth especially when the benefits generated go
79 beyond reproduction of wealth, being the growth a necessary condition for development, but not an end on itself. For the
80 author, the term also implies in the appropriation of three groups of rights: the first one is compound by the human, political,
81 civil rights; second one is associated to the economic, social and cultural rights, with emphasis to the right to decent jobs;
82 and third are the collectives rights, like right to environment and development.

83 In this sense, the author proposes five dimension to analyze the process of development: social dimension, where he
84 points out the necessity to transform a *having* civilization in a *being* civilization; environmental dimension, which
85 represents to the author the support of life, being the dimension that supply all the necessary resources and also the ways to
86 absorption wastes from human activities; territorial dimension that is associated to a better physical distribution of human
87 settlements and economic activities; economic dimension to which the author discuss the allocation and efficiency
88 management of resources, aiming to get over the local dependency of external conditions; and political dimension, Sachs
89 considers that a democratic governance is a fundamental element in the development process, being essential to the
90 promotion of others dimensions, and it is assure by the guarantee of freedom to public participation and the establishment of
91 spaces that allow the materialization of this participation.

92 Boisier (2004) defines development as an intangible phenomenon which happens as an emergent property of a
93 system, and defines economic growth as a quantitative element of material nature and only perceived by a reduced vision
94 from reality, meaning, it represents simply the sum of internal GDPs, which the author defines as “sum syndrome”.

95 Though these themes are under intense academic debate for the past 40 years, the model of public policies planning
96 for development still focuses in the amount of economic quantity instead its quality.

97 Among many theories that discuss the development phenomenon, it is emphases in this work the theory of
98 endogenous development, that was organized in the beginning of 1980, and which starts from the premise that territory is
99 far from receive and process passively strategies from external corporations and organizations. According to Vázquez

100 Barquero (1999), territory has its own strategy of development and of incidence in the local economic dynamics – strategy
101 that is directly related to the complexity of territory internal elements, which are called endogenous factors.

102 Vázquez Barquero (2007), states that the social, cultural and environmental aspects of a territory are central to its
103 development. To the author, development is a complex process that alters the space in different plans – economic,
104 technologic, social, cultural, political and environmental – and the notion of endogenous development allows the
105 interpretation of these alterations. The endogenous aspects can be associated to the territory autonomy in the process of
106 appropriation and use of resources by local agents (VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, 2007).

107 Haesbaert (2006) defines territory as a result of relations among different forces with variable intensities that
108 establish political and economic control over the space elements, which represent a symbolical appropriation of the internal
109 aspects of a social system. In this case, hydropower plants are exogenous forces to a territorial system, which establish a
110 new order of endogenous factors appropriation, including the control over natural resources. Depending on the intervention
111 magnitude resulted from a hydropower plant and the territorial vulnerability where the project was implemented the result
112 could be a completely reconstruction and reconfiguration of the territory.

113 In this sense, according to Vainer and Araújo (1992), great infrastructure projects can be understand as mechanism
114 that “generate new regions”, because they reconfigure the territorial relations preexistent, generating new factors. Vainer
115 (2008) states the appearance of new socioeconomic dynamics and new social groups that lead to the configuration of new
116 interests and issues.

117 According to the ideas exposed and with the analyzes model of development presented by Sachs (2004), it was
118 sought to verify in literature how the alterations provoked in the territory, induced by hydropower plants are related to the
119 dimensions define by the author.

120 The World Commission on Dams report (WCD, 2000) lists the main local alterations caused by hydropower plants
121 in biophysical and socioeconomic dimensions. Regarding biophysical, it highlights the negative impact in terrestrial
122 ecosystems and in biodiversity, the emission of greenhouse gases, the impact on water flow of downstream ecosystems, the
123 alteration of upstream flood plains and the impact in fisheries in upstream, in downstream and in the reservoir. Regarding
124 socioeconomics, the report lists the increasing of job offering during the construction of the dam, the new productive
125 possibilities generated by the local provision of water and electricity, the displacement of people (both physical and
126 livelihood’s), the non-consideration of downstream population as affected people, the effects of the project over gender
127 inequality, the adverse effects on local cultural heritage and adverse effects on public health.

128 Considering the endogenous development theory already presented to analyze the local alterations in biophysical
129 dimension, it can be addressed that none of them contributes positively to the process of development. All of them concern

130 the depletion of biophysical conditions, which compromises the stocks of natural capital that both maintain the local support
131 life system and provide natural resources potentially useful in local productive process, a central factor to guarantee an
132 endogenous process of development. The alteration in fisheries is a clear example of the loss of natural capital influencing
133 the process of development beyond the biophysical dimension. Alterations in fisheries concern the local economic activity,
134 consisting in a rupture in the space of social/cultural reproduction of those who used to practice it (BERMANN, 2007). This
135 rupture generates conflicts that evidence the rights privation suffered by the affected people, which is negative to the
136 process of endogenous development.

137 Socioeconomic alteration will be analyzed separately. The increase in job offering during the construction of the dam
138 is a factor that, despite be always considered positive, has its contribution to the process of development attached to the
139 existence of local infrastructure and to the institutional capacity in managing labor force's demands. Besides, local workers
140 leave their former occupation to dedicate themselves to the dam edification in jobs that generally belong to the lower
141 positions of the labour market (RIBEIRO, 1987). Additionally, when the demand for workers is not supplied by local
142 people, foreign workers do the job. The migratory flux of workers generates pressure on the local community. As Ribeiro (1987),
143 Vainer and Araújo (1992), Bortoleto (2001) e Zhouri and Oliveira (2006) mention, hydropower plants are traditionally
144 undertaken in small communities and it intensifies the pressure, once those communities have lower chance to respond up to
145 local population pressures.

146 Otherwise, population growth is followed by the creation of local markets. Local residents glimpse there an
147 opportunity to generate and accumulate financial capital (BORTOLETO, 2001). Once again, the potential market depends
148 on the provision of due local infrastructure to diversify and generate benefits in socioeconomic dimension (WCD, 2000).
149 However, the diversification benefits will be real only if its influence reaches long-term scale and, besides, if urban
150 infrastructure be provided to local community (BORTOLETO, 2001). If well managed, the project potential to diversify the
151 local economy may be a factor that contributes substantially to the process of endogenous development. Unfortunately, the
152 Brazilian practice has not demonstrated this ability in hydropower plants management (VAINER and ARAÚJO, 1992;
153 BORTOLETO, 2001; BERMANN, 2007).

154 The two types of displacement (physical and livelihood) are distinct, but linked by the loss of land by the reservoir.
155 To Bermann (2007), the physical displacement must be carefully accompanied by the maintenance of the community's
156 conditions of social reproduction. According to the author, however, in practice riverine people were violently separated
157 from their cultural and material basis, which indicates a rupture in the process of endogenous development once local
158 inhabitants have their rights expropriated by the project demands.

159 Livelihood displacement concerns the forced alteration of local population's activities, caused by the loss of the
160 resources that make them feasible, such as the loss of land to low-scale family farming and the loss of ecosystems to the
161 riverine way of life.

162 The non-consideration of downstream population as affected people is more a mistake in project's planning process
163 than a local alteration *per se*. Nevertheless, it generates negative consequences to downstream communities' process of
164 endogenous development. As mentioned by WCD (2000), the consequences of large dams may be extended kilometers
165 downstream. Do not considering those effects in projects' planning process is to not observe the right of those who live
166 downstream.

167 Concerning the effects of dams over gender inequalities, WCD (2000) points out that there is no pattern in
168 worldwide experiences. However, Vainer and Araújo (1992) mention the increase in prostitution cases within hydropower
169 plants sites as a serious social problem whose consequences are felt over years. Along with the prostitution comes, cases of
170 violence also become more frequent, compromising local social cohesion and influencing negatively the process of
171 development.

172 The adverse effects over cultural heritage come from several aspects of the project, but all of them linked to the
173 privation of local communities' rights and freedoms. As Bermann (2007) points, the non-identification, by the investor, of
174 the actors and their interests, their history and cultures, it is an element to conceive the invisibility of riverine populations.

175 Finally, dams generate adverse effects in public health. The construction of the reservoir creates conditions to the
176 propagation of illness vectors. Also, it causes a rise in demography that generates pressure over the public health system
177 (generally incapable of cope with the pressure).

178 These effects occur in the direct affected local in many ways, which turns hard the apprehension of the relationship
179 between hydropower plants and the endogenous development of their implantation site. Therefore, it must be built an
180 analysis model capable of coping both with the dynamics generated by the project and with the multidimensionality of the
181 process of endogenous development.

182 Some authors have dedicated their studies to build analyses models that represent the process of development as the
183 product of the interaction between "capitals". Guimarães (1998) and Boisier (1999) list some types of capital that, in
184 systemic articulation, constitute the development phenomenon. These capitals can be approximate to endogenous
185 development dimensions discussed by Sachs (2002) and Vázquez Barquero (2007). Boisier's Economic, cognitive,
186 symbolic, cultural, institutional, psychosocial, social, civic, human and natural capitals have similarity to Vázquez
187 Barquero's economic, technological, social, cultural, political and environmental dimensions.

188 Thus, it is proposed an analysis model in which each one of the alterations caused by hydropower plants would
189 influence territories' capitals distribution, interaction and, therefore, the conduction development process to a path that
190 could be more or less endogenous.

191 Bortoleto (2001) affirms that the development achieved through these kind of projects is ultimately restrict to the
192 hegemonic centre of the national economy, a statement corroborated by the description of the local consequences of dams
193 given by the WCD report. Alterations in local biophysical and socioeconomic aspects tend to hamper the process of
194 endogenous development. As Ribeiro (1987), Vainer and Araújo (1992) and Bortoleto (2001) affirm, big projects usually
195 embrace their implantation sites within their own logic of resources appropriation, imposing a dynamics which small
196 affected communities are not capable to cope with.

197

198 **4. Final considerations**

199

200 Local alterations caused by hydropower plants may be well known, nevertheless the influence of projects over
201 territories' development is a subject described and analyzed within several methodological approaches. The idea to analyze
202 the development of territories affected by hydropower plants by analyzing the distribution of different kinds of capital over
203 the territory can be a way to deal with both complexity of the development process and the dynamics imposed by the
204 hydropower plant. Gathering the analysis of local capitals' distribution together with a systemic approach may be a step
205 forward in the analysis of the relationship between local development and hydropower plants.

206

207 **References**

208 ANEEL, Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Informações técnicas. Sítio eletrônico da ANEEL. (2011). Acessado
209 em 30 de novembro de 2011. disponível em <<http://www.aneel.gov.br/areaPerfil.cfm?idPerfil=2>>

210 ANEEL, Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. **Atlas de Energia**. 3ed. 2009.

211 BERMANN, C. Impasses e controvérsias da hidreletricidade. **Estudos Avançados**. v.21, n59, p.119-137, 2007.

212 BOISIER, Sergio E. **Sociedad civil, participacion, conocimiento y gestion territorial**. Santiago de Chile: ILPES,
213 1997.

214 BOISIER, S. **Conversaciones sociales y desarrollo regional**. Talca: Editorial da Universidade de Talca, 2000.

215 BOISIER, S. Desarrollo territorial y descentralización, el desarrollo en el lugar y en las manos de la gente. **Revista**
216 **Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbanos Regionales**, v.30, n.90, p. 27-40, 2004.

217 BORTOLETO, E. M. A implantação de grandes hidrelétricas: desenvolvimento, discursos e impactos. **Geografares,**
218 **n2, p53-62**, 2001

219 CARDOSO, F. H e FALETO, E. **Dependência e desenvolvimento na América Latina. Ensaio de Interpretação**
220 **Sociológica**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 7ed, 1969.

221 CEPAL/PNUD/IPEA. **Hacia el objetivo Del milênio de reducir la pobreza en América Latina y El Caribe.**
222 Livros da CEPAL, 2003.

223 COLEMAN, J.S. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*. **v.94,**
224 **suplemento 95-120, p.95-120**, 1988.

225 FURTADO, C. **O Mito do Desenvolvimento**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Paz e Terra, 1974.

226 GUIMARÃES, R. P. **Aterrizando una Cometa: indicadores territoriales de sustentabilidad**. CEPAL/ ILPES,
227 Serie Investigación, Santiago do Chile Documento 18/98, LC/IP/G.120, 1998.

228 HAESBAERT, R. **Territórios alternativos**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2ed., 2006.

229 KLIKSBERG, B. **Desigualdade na América Latina. O debate adiado**. UNESCO: Cortez Editora, 3ed., 2002.

230 Myrdal (1974)

231 MYRDAL, What is development? **Journal of Economic Issues**, **v.8, n 4, p.729-736**, 1974.

232 NORTH, D. **Institutions, Institutional change and economic performance**. Cambridge: Cambridge University
233 Press, 1990.

234 PUTNAM, R. Social Capital Measurement and Consequences. **Canadian Journal of Policy Research**, **v.2, n.1,**
235 **p.41-51**, 2001.

236 ROMEIRO, A. R. Economia ou economia política da sustentabilidade. In: MAY, P.; LUSTOSA, M. C.; VINHA, V.
237 (orgs) **Economia do meio ambiente. Teoria e prática**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2003.

238 SACHS, I. **Caminhos para o desenvolvimento sustentável**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2002.

239 SACHS, I. **Desenvolvimento: incluyente, sustentável, sustentado**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2004.

240 SAQUET, M. A. **Abordagem e concepções de território**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

241 SOLOW, R. An almost practical step toward sustainability. **Resources Policy**, **v.19, n.3, p. 162-172**, 1993.

242 VAINER, C. B. Conceito de “atingido: Uma revisão do debate. In: ROTHMAN, F. D. (Ed). **Vidas Alagadas.**
243 **Conflitos Socioambientais, Licenciamento e Barragens**. Viçosa: UFV, 2008.

244 VAINER, C. B.; ARAUJO, F. G. B. de. **Grandes projetos hidrelétricos e desenvolvimento regional**. Rio de
245 Janeiro: CEDI, 1992.

246 VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. **Desarrollo, Redes e Innovación. Lecciones sobre desarrollo endógeno.** Madrid:
247 Ediciones Pirámide, 1999.

248 VÁZQUEZ BARQUERO, A. Desarrollo endógeno. Teorías y políticas de desarrollo territorial. **Investigaciones**
249 **regionales, n. 11, p. 183-210, 2007.**

250 VEIGA, J. E. Economia política da qualidade. **RAE, v. 50, n. 3, p. 338-344, 2010.**

251 VERGARA, P. Construindo desenvolvimento endógeno em territórios pobres e socialmente desiguais. In:
252 VERGARA, P. (org). **Desenvolvimento Endógeno: um novo paradigma para a gestão local e regional.** Fortaleza: IADH,
253 2004.

254 WILLIAMS, L. R. R., e KAPUTSKA, L. A. Ecosystem vulnerability: a complex interface with technical
255 components. **Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, v. 19, p. 1055–1058. 2000.**