Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Industrialization of Brazil: An Economical Historical Analysis until Modern Times

Richard Murdoch Montgomery *

Posted Date: 30 September 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

Keywords: Brazil; Industrialization; Economic development; Inequality; Structural racism; Social inclusion; Lula da Silva; Dilma Rousseff; Jair Bolsonaro; Operation Lava Jato; Environmental sustainability; Regional development; Import Substitution Industrialization; Neoliberal reforms; Sustainable development; Social justice

Article

The Industrialization of Brazil: An Economical Historical Analysis until Modern Times

Richard Murdoch Mongomery *

Universidade of São Paulo; Contact:mariaantoniavmg@gmail.com

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive historical analysis of Brazil's industrialization, tracing its evolution from the 19th century to the present day. It examines key periods and policies that have shaped the nation's economic landscape, beginning with early industrial efforts during the Imperial era and the Old Republic. The analysis delves into the Vargas regime's Import Substitution Industrialization policies, post-war industrial expansion under developmentalism, the military regime's economic strategies during the "Economic Miracle," and the challenges posed by the 1980s debt crisis. The discussion highlights contemporary issues faced in the 21st century, including premature deindustrialization and the complexities during the administrations of Presidents Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff. It explores the impact of Operation Lava Jato on industrial development and assesses the ramifications of President Jair Bolsonaro's policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Central to this exploration is the critical examination of regional disparities, social inclusion efforts, and environmental sustainability initiatives. The article emphasizes that Brazil's most significant challenges lie in persistent inequality and structural racism, which serve as fundamental barriers to economic progress and industrial advancement. It argues that addressing these issues through comprehensive policies focused on education reform, economic inclusion, healthcare access, legal and institutional changes, community development, and cultural recognition is essential. By integrating social justice into economic strategies, Brazil can achieve sustainable and inclusive industrial development, fostering a more equitable and prosperous society.

Keywords: Brazil; Industrialization; Economic development; Inequality; Structural racism; Social inclusion; Lula da Silva; Dilma Rousseff; Jair Bolsonaro; Operation Lava Jato; Environmental sustainability; Regional development; Import Substitution Industrialization; Neoliberal reforms; Sustainable development; Social justice

---

Section 1.1 Introduction

The industrialization of Brazil represents a pivotal aspect of the nation's economic and social development (Baer, 2008). From its early stages in the 19th century to its current challenges and advancements, Brazil's industrial journey reflects a continuous effort to transform its economy, reduce dependency on primary commodities, and enhance its position in the global market (Furtado, 1970). This article aims to provide a comprehensive historical analysis of Brazil's industrialization, emphasizing the key periods, policies, and factors that have influenced its trajectory.

Brazil's industrialization is not merely an economic phenomenon but a complex interrelation of political decisions, social changes, and international dynamics (Skidmore, 1999). The transition from an agrarian economy dominated by coffee and sugar exports to a diversified industrial economy involved significant shifts in labor markets, technological adoption, and state intervention (Dean, 1969). Understanding this process requires examining the historical context, the strategies employed by different governments, and the responses to both internal and external challenges (Levine, 1999).

The article is structured to first explore the early industrial efforts during the Imperial era and the Old Republic, followed by an analysis of the Vargas regime's Import Substitution Industrialization policies (Fishlow, 1972). It then examines the post-war industrial expansion, the military regime's economic strategies, and the challenges of the 1980s debt crisis (Skidmore, 1988).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

The discussion further delves into the neoliberal reforms of the 1990s, the contemporary issues of deindustrialization, and the initiatives undertaken to address these challenges (Baer, 2008). Finally, the article considers regional development, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability as integral components of Brazil's industrial future (Reis & Moore, 2005).

Section 2. Discussion

Section 2.1 Early Industrialization and the Imperial Era

In the 19th century, under the reign of Emperor Dom Pedro II, Brazil began to lay the groundwork for industrial development. The economy was heavily reliant on agricultural exports, particularly coffee, sugar, and rubber, which were the mainstay of Brazil's economic strength (Dean, 1971). However, this export-oriented model exposed Brazil to the volatility of international commodity markets, inhibiting stable economic growth.

The abolition of the slave trade in 1850 through the Eusébio de Queirós Law and the eventual abolition of slavery in 1888 with the Lei Áurea transformed Brazil's labor market (Conrad, 1972). The end of slavery led to an influx of European immigrants, primarily Italians, Germans, and Portuguese, who filled the labor void and became instrumental in the nascent industrial sector (Levine, 1999). Small-scale industries began to emerge, focusing on textiles, food processing, and other consumer goods to meet domestic demand (Luz, 1982).

Despite these developments, significant obstacles hindered industrial progress. The agrarian elite, known as the "coffee barons," wielded substantial political and economic power, favoring agricultural interests over industrial investment (Fausto, 2014). Infrastructure was underdeveloped, capital was scarce, and technological expertise was limited (Furtado, 2007). These factors collectively constrained the expansion of industrial activities during the Imperial era.

Section 2.2 The Old Republic and the Seeds of Industrialization (1889-1930)

The proclamation of the Republic in 1889 marked a political shift but did not immediately catalyze industrial growth. The Old Republic continued to prioritize agricultural exports, with coffee constituting a significant portion of national revenue (Prado Júnior, 1945). World War I, however, disrupted global trade, reducing imports and creating opportunities for domestic industries to fill the gap (Bielschowsky, 1988).

Entrepreneurial figures such as Francisco Matarazzo and Jorge Street played pivotal roles in establishing early industrial enterprises, particularly in textiles and food products (Suzigan, 2000). While the government began to recognize the importance of industrialization, policies remained inconsistent, lacking comprehensive support for the sector (Versiani & Barbosa, 1993). Protectionist measures were sporadic, and there was no cohesive industrial strategy during this period.

Section 2.3 The Vargas Era and Import Substitution Industrialization (1930-1945)

The 1930 Revolution brought Getúlio Vargas to power, ushering in a new era of state intervention and economic nationalism. Recognizing industrialization as essential for economic independence, Vargas implemented Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI) policies aimed at reducing dependence on imported goods by promoting domestic production through protective tariffs, quotas, and state investment (Fonseca, 2004).

Under Vargas, significant strides were made in establishing key industries. The creation of the Companhia Siderúrgica Nacional (CSN) in 1941, with assistance from the United States in exchange for Brazil's support during World War II, marked a major advancement in the steel industry (Hilton, 1975). The establishment of Vale do Rio Doce in 1942 expanded mining capabilities, and the founding of Petrobras in 1953 solidified state control over oil resources (Vianna, 1997).

Vargas also enacted social and labor reforms, most notably the Consolidation of Labor Laws (CLT) in 1943, which provided workers with rights such as a minimum wage, regulated working hours, and social security benefits (D'Araújo & Castro, 1997). These measures aimed to improve living conditions, stimulate domestic consumption, and mitigate social unrest.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

Despite these achievements, the Vargas era faced criticism for its heavy-handed state intervention, which some argued led to inefficiencies and corruption (Baer, 2008). Additionally, the focus on heavy industries sometimes came at the expense of other vital sectors, and the economy remained vulnerable to external shocks.

Section 2.4 Post-War Industrial Expansion and Developmentalism (1950s-1960s)

The post-war period saw continued emphasis on industrialization, influenced by developmentalist thought that advocated for state-led economic development to overcome underdevelopment (Bielschowsky, 1988). President Juscelino Kubitschek's administration (1956-1961) epitomized this approach with the Plano de Metas, setting ambitious targets across sectors like energy, transportation, food, and basic industries (Abreu, 1990).

Kubitschek's vision included the construction of Brasília, the new federal capital inaugurated in 1960. Designed by architects Oscar Niemeyer and Lúcio Costa, Brasília symbolized modernization and aimed to promote the integration of Brazil's vast territory (Holston, 1989). The relocation of the capital was part of a broader strategy to stimulate economic activity in the interior regions.

Foreign investment was significant during this period, particularly in the automotive industry. Multinational corporations such as Volkswagen, Ford, and General Motors established manufacturing plants in Brazil, contributing to technological transfer and industrial diversification (Shapiro, 1991). The government provided incentives to attract foreign capital while attempting to balance national developmental goals.

Challenges persisted, however. *Inflation became a chronic issue due to expansive fiscal policies and external debt accumulation* (Skidmore, 1999). Income inequality remained high, Afro-Brazilians remained excluded from the major economy, living in poverty and working in peripheral manual jobs. Regional disparities were exacerbated as industrial growth concentrated in the Southeast, particularly São Paulo (Singer, 1977).

Section 2.5 The Military Regime and the "Economic Miracle" (1964-1985)

The military coup of 1964 led to an authoritarian regime prioritizing economic growth and national security. The government adopted a technocratic approach, implementing policies to modernize the economy and suppress political dissent (Dreifuss, 1981). Between 1968 and 1973, Brazil experienced the "Economic Miracle," with GDP growth rates averaging over 10% annually (Baer, 2008).

The regime focused on promoting capital-intensive industries such as steel, petrochemicals, and heavy machinery. State-owned enterprises expanded, and significant investments were made in infrastructure projects like the Trans-Amazonian Highway and the Itaipu Dam, one of the world's largest hydroelectric power plants (Martins, 1985). These projects aimed to assert control over national resources and promote regional integration.

Export promotion policies were implemented to diversify the economy and reduce dependence on traditional commodities. Incentives were provided to industries capable of generating foreign exchange, leading to an increase in manufactured goods' share of exports (Fishlow, 1972).

The benefits of rapid economic growth were unevenly distributed. The regime's repression of labor movements and curtailment of civil liberties led to social tensions (Skidmore, 1988). Rural-urban migration increased as people sought employment in industrial centers, resulting in urban overcrowding and inadequate public services (Hewlett & Weinert, 1982). Environmental degradation became a concern due to deforestation and pollution associated with industrial activities (Hecht & Cockburn, 1990).

Section 2.6 The Debt Crisis and Economic Challenges of the 1980s

The global economic environment of the late 1970s and early 1980s presented significant challenges. The second oil shock of 1979, rising international interest rates, and a global recession

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

strained Brazil's economy (Cardoso & Helwege, 1992). The country's external debt had grown substantially as the government borrowed heavily to finance development projects.

In 1982, Brazil faced a severe debt crisis, struggling to meet its obligations to international creditors. Negotiations with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) led to austerity measures aimed at stabilizing the economy (Bresser-Pereira, 1993). These included cuts in public spending, currency devaluation, and efforts to control inflation.

The 1980s, often referred to as the "lost decade," were marked by economic stagnation, hyperinflation, and social unrest (Baer, 2008). Industrial production declined due to reduced investment and consumption, while unemployment rates soared. Multiple economic stabilization plans were attempted but failed to achieve lasting success (Modiano, 1991).

The return to civilian rule in 1985 did not immediately resolve economic issues. Political instability, including corruption scandals and the impeachment of President Fernando Collor de Mello in 1992, further complicated recovery efforts (Mainwaring, 1999).

Section 2.7 Neoliberal Reforms and Global Integration (1990s)

In the 1990s, Brazil adopted neoliberal economic policies under President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. The Real Plan, introduced in 1994, successfully curbed hyperinflation by introducing a new currency pegged to the U.S. dollar and implementing strict monetary policies (Franco, 1999).

Trade liberalization became central to the new strategy. Tariffs were reduced, and import restrictions were lifted, exposing domestic industries to global competition (Bonelli & Pinheiro, 2008). The government pursued aggressive privatization, selling state-owned enterprises in sectors like telecommunications, mining, and energy (Pinheiro & Fukasaku, 1999).

These reforms modernized parts of the economy and attracted foreign investment but also led to deindustrialization, as many domestic manufacturers struggled against imported goods (Carneiro, 2002). The focus on financial stability and market liberalization often came at the expense of industrial policy and technological innovation.

Section 2.8 Contemporary Industrialization: Challenges in the 21st Century

Entering the new millennium, Brazil faced the formidable task of revitalizing its industrial sector amidst the pressures of globalization and rapid technological advancement. The country grappled with the phenomenon of premature deindustrialization, where industrial decline occurs at lower levels of income compared to developed nations, raising concerns about sustainable economic growth (Oreiro & Feijó, 2010).

Complexities During the Lula and Dilma Administrations

Under Presidents Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003–2010) and Dilma Rousseff (2011–2016), Brazil underwent significant economic and political transformations that deeply impacted its industrial landscape. Lula's administration capitalized on a global commodity boom, which significantly boosted exports of raw materials such as iron ore and soybeans. This surge led to robust economic growth, increased government revenues, and the implementation of extensive social programs like Bolsa Família, which played a pivotal role in poverty and misery reduction and expanded the domestic consumer market (Bastos, 2012; Soares et al., 2010).

However, the heavy reliance on commodity exports introduced vulnerabilities. The so-called "Dutch disease" emerged, where a strong currency driven by commodity exports made Brazilian manufacturing exports less competitive on the global stage (Bresser-Pereira, 2016). Efforts to stimulate industrialization through policies like the Productive Development Policy faced significant hurdles due to entrenched structural competitiveness issues. The notorious "Custo Brasil," encompassing high taxes, complex regulatory environments, and inadequate infrastructure, continued to impede industrial competitiveness and deter investment (Lopes & Vian, 2016).

Dilma Rousseff's government sought to continue and expand upon these industrial policies through the Greater Brazil Plan. However, her administration faced additional complexities. The global economic slowdown led to a reduced demand for commodities, directly impacting government revenues and exposing the risks of overdependence on commodity exports (Garcia, 2013). Domestically, rising inflation and pressures from increased public spending strained the economy. Political instability began to surface, exacerbated by widespread protests in 2013 over government spending priorities, corruption, and public services.

Section 2.9 Impact of Operation Lava Jato

The situation was further complicated by the onset of Operation Lava Jato (Car Wash) in 2014, a massive corruption investigation that unveiled extensive bribery and money-laundering schemes involving state-owned enterprises like Petrobras and major construction firms (Moro, 2018). While the operation was instrumental in exposing corruption, it had profound unintended economic consequences. The arrest of key business figures and suspension of large infrastructure projects led to a significant downturn in the construction and engineering sectors, which are critical components of industrial development (Saad-Filho & Boffo, 2020). The resultant loss of investor confidence and economic uncertainty further hindered industrial growth and contributed to rising unemployment rates.

Section 2.10 Bolsonaro's Administration and the COVID-19 Pandemic

The election of President Jair Bolsonaro in 2018 introduced a new set of dynamics to Brazil's industrial and economic policies. Bolsonaro's administration pursued a liberal economic agenda focused on deregulation, privatization of state-owned enterprises, and reducing the role of government in the economy (Gobetti & Orair, 2020). However, these plans were soon overshadowed by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, which severely impacted the Brazilian economy and huma global civilization.

Bolsonaro's handling of the pandemic drew widespread criticism both domestically and internationally. His administration was accused of underestimating the severity of the virus, opposing lockdown measures implemented by state governors, promoting unproven treatments, and delaying the procurement of vaccines (Hallal et al., 2021). These actions contributed to Brazil becoming one of the countries hardest hit by the pandemic, with significant loss of life and prolonged economic disruption (Montgomery, 2024).

The pandemic exacerbated existing industrial challenges by disrupting supply chains, reducing both domestic and international demand, and leading to increased unemployment. The industrial sector contracted sharply, and the lack of effective public health measures prolonged the economic recovery process (IBGE, 2020). Furthermore, insufficient fiscal support to businesses and households intensified economic inequalities, disproportionately affecting the most vulnerable populations (Prates & Barbosa, 2020).

Section 2.11 Government Initiatives and Industrial Policies

Recognizing the multifaceted challenges facing the industrial sector, successive Brazilian governments have implemented various policies aimed at fostering industrial development, enhancing competitiveness, and promoting innovation.

During Lula's presidency, the Productive Development Policy (Política de Desenvolvimento Produtivo) was launched in 2008 with the objective of enhancing competitiveness, stimulating innovation, and expanding exports (MDIC, 2008). The policy emphasized increasing investment in strategic sectors, improving infrastructure, and providing support to small and medium-sized enterprises. It also aimed to reduce regional disparities by encouraging investment in less developed areas.

Dilma Rousseff continued these efforts with the introduction of the Greater Brazil Plan (Plano Brasil Maior) in 2011. This plan sought to modernize Brazilian industry by offering tax incentives, reducing payroll taxes for specific industries, and promoting local content requirements to encourage domestic production (MDIC, 2011). The plan also aimed to protect domestic markets from international competition through various trade policies.

Despite the ambitious nature of these policies, their implementation faced significant obstacles. The persistent structural issues of the "Custo Brasil" remained largely unaddressed. The complex tax system, bureaucratic red tape, and inadequate infrastructure continued to hinder the competitiveness of Brazilian industries (Bresser-Pereira, 2016*). Additionally, investment in research and development remained below the global average, limiting technological advancement and the ability to compete in high-value-added industries* (De Negri & Coelho, 2013). Political instability, particularly during Rousseff's second term, culminated in her impeachment in 2016, further disrupting policy continuity and undermining investor confidence (Anderson, 2016).

Section 2.12 Regional Development, Social Inclusion, and Racial Issues

Addressing regional inequalities and promoting social inclusion are critical components of Brazil's industrialization efforts. The stark disparities between different regions and social groups pose a significant *sine qua non* condition to sustainable economic development

Regional Disparities

The Northeast and North regions of Brazil have historically lagged behind the more industrialized Southeast and South. These disparities are the result of historical patterns of investment, migration, and economic development that have concentrated wealth and infrastructure in certain areas (Diniz & Lemos, 2005). Efforts such as the Northeast Development Fund (Fundo de Desenvolvimento do Nordeste) have been implemented to provide financial incentives for businesses to invest in less developed areas, aiming to stimulate local economies and reduce regional inequalities (Banco do Nordeste, 2017).

However, these initiatives have had limited success due to persistent challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, lower levels of education and healthcare, and limited access to capital. Bridging the regional development gap requires comprehensive strategies that address the underlying structural issues and promote sustainable economic activities tailored to the strengths and needs of each region.

Racial Inequalities and Criminality

Racial issues significantly contribute to the rampant inequalities and criminality observed in Brazilian society. Afro-Brazilians and indigenous populations are disproportionately affected by poverty, have limited access to nutrition and quality education and healthcare, and face higher unemployment rates compared to their white counterparts (Telles, 2004). *Structural racism* and discrimination have long impeded social mobility for these groups, perpetuating cycles of poverty and exclusion (Hasenbalg & Silva, 1990).

These social inequalities are closely linked to higher levels of crime and violence, particularly in urban areas where marginalized communities are often concentrated in favelas and underserved neighborhoods (Peres & Nivette, 2017). High levels of income inequality and social exclusion contribute to the proliferation of organized crime, drug trafficking, and gang violence, which in turn hinder economic development and deter investment.

Social Inclusion Policies

Social inclusion policies have been implemented to address some of these disparities. Programs like Bolsa Família have had a positive impact on reducing poverty and improving access to education and healthcare for millions of low-income families (Soares et al., 2010). These conditional cash transfer programs have been praised for their efficiency and effectiveness in promoting human capital development.

However, to achieve sustainable progress, it is essential to integrate social policies with economic development strategies. This includes implementing affirmative action policies in education and employment to reduce racial disparities and promote diversity within industries (Paixão & Carvano, 2008). Enhancing access to quality education and vocational training for marginalized groups is critical for building a more inclusive industrial workforce and fostering innovation and insertion of these population wasted inside an economy with serious workforce problems in all ranks.

Section 2.12 Environmental Sustainability and the Green Economy

Environmental sustainability has become an increasingly important consideration in Brazil's industrial policy, presenting both challenges and opportunities for the country's development.

Advancements and Opportunities

Brazil's vast natural resources and biodiversity position it uniquely to capitalize on the growing global emphasis on environmental sustainability. The country's commitment to the Paris Agreement includes ambitious targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the share of renewable energy in its energy matrix (Government of Brazil, 2015). Brazil has made significant strides in developing its biofuels industry, particularly ethanol derived from sugarcane, which is considered one of the most efficient biofuels in terms of energy balance and carbon emissions (Goldemberg, 2008).

Investments in wind and solar energy have also been growing, supported by favorable regulatory frameworks and incentives aimed at diversifying the energy portfolio and promoting sustainable development (ANEEL, 2017). The potential for expanding these industries is substantial, given Brazil's favorable climate conditions and technological capabilities.

The concept of a green economy offers Brazil opportunities to develop industries that are both environmentally sustainable and globally competitive. Sectors such as sustainable agriculture, eco-tourism, and clean technologies not only contribute to economic diversification but also align with global market trends and consumer preferences (Viola & Franchini, 2018). By investing in these areas, Brazil can create new jobs, stimulate innovation, and enhance its international standing.

2.13. Setbacks During the Bolsonaro Administration

Despite these opportunities, environmental policies faced significant setbacks during Bolsonaro's administration. The government prioritized economic development through agricultural expansion and resource extraction, often at the expense of environmental conservation. Deforestation rates in the Amazon rainforest increased sharply due to relaxed environmental regulations, reduced enforcement, and encouragement of mining and logging activities (Fearnside, 2019). The dismantling of environmental agencies and weakening of protections for indigenous lands drew international condemnation and threatened trade agreements with countries emphasizing environmental standards.

These actions not only have severe implications for global climate change but also undermine the long-term sustainability of Brazil's natural resources (maybe already to a point of no return), which are integral to its economy and cultural heritage. The environmental degradation poses risks to biodiversity, water resources, and the livelihoods of indigenous and local communities.

Section 3. Conclusion

Brazil's industrialization journey is a complex tapestry woven with threads of economic ambition, political upheaval, social transformation, and environmental considerations. From the early efforts during the Imperial era to the contemporary challenges of the 21st century, Brazil has continually strived to transform its economy and enhance its global standing. However, the persistent shadows of inequality and structural racism have remained significant impediments to realizing the nation's full potential.

Inequality in Brazil is multifaceted, manifesting in economic disparities, regional imbalances, and social stratification. The concentration of wealth and opportunities in certain regions, particularly

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

the Southeast, has left vast areas of the country marginalized. Despite various government initiatives aimed at regional development, the Northeast and North continue to lag in infrastructure, education, and healthcare. These disparities hinder the creation of a cohesive national economy where all regions contribute to and benefit from industrial growth.

Structural racism compounds these challenges, as Afro-Brazilians and indigenous populations disproportionately experience poverty, limited access to quality education, healthcare deficiencies, and higher unemployment rates. Historical patterns of discrimination and exclusion have entrenched social hierarchies that limit social mobility and perpetuate cycles of poverty. This not only undermines social justice but also deprives the economy of the full participation and contributions of a significant portion of its population.

The interplay between inequality and structural racism has profound implications for Brazil's industrialization efforts. A workforce hampered by inadequate education and health services cannot meet the demands of a modern, innovation-driven industrial sector. Social exclusion fuels crime and violence, particularly in urban centers, creating an unstable environment that deters investment and disrupts economic activities. Moreover, the lack of diversity in industry stifles creativity and innovation, which are essential for competitiveness in the global market.

Government policies over the decades have attempted to address these issues with varying degrees of success. Social programs like Bolsa Família have made strides in poverty reduction and improving access to essential services. However, without comprehensive strategies that directly tackle structural racism and systemic inequality, such programs can only offer temporary relief rather than sustainable solutions.

The administrations of Lula and Dilma recognized the importance of social inclusion in economic development, but their efforts were often hampered by structural challenges, corruption and political instability, and external economic pressures. The setbacks during Bolsonaro's tenure, particularly concerning environmental policies and handling of the COVID-19 pandemic, further exacerbated social inequalities and highlighted the vulnerabilities created by neglecting these critical issues.

For Brazil to achieve sustainable and inclusive industrial development, it must place the fight against inequality and structural racism at the forefront of its national agenda. This requires:

Educational Reform: Investing in quality education accessible to all, with curricula that address the historical and cultural contributions of all racial and ethnic groups. Education is a powerful tool for empowerment and essential for developing a skilled workforce capable of driving innovation.

Economic Inclusion: Implementing affirmative action policies and providing support for minority-owned businesses can help redistribute economic opportunities. Access to credit, technical assistance, and markets are crucial for enabling marginalized communities to participate fully in the economy.

Healthcare Access: Ensuring equitable access to healthcare services improves overall productivity and quality of life. Health disparities contribute to economic inefficiencies and perpetuate cycles of poverty.

Legal and Institutional Reforms: Strengthening laws against discrimination and improving their enforcement (which recently has happened) can help dismantle systemic barriers. Institutions must reflect the diversity of society and be held accountable for promoting equity.

Investing in infrastructure and services in underserved areas can stimulate local economies and reduce regional disparities. Community engagement in decision-making processes ensures that development meets the actual needs of the population.

Valuing the cultural heritage of Afro-Brazilian and indigenous populations fosters national unity and enriches society. Cultural inclusion helps combat prejudice and promotes mutual respect.

Addressing environmental sustainability is also intertwined with combating inequality. Environmental degradation disproportionately affects marginalized communities, and sustainable practices can create new economic opportunities in green industries. Protecting natural resources ensures long-term economic viability and aligns with global trends toward sustainability.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

In conclusion, Brazil's greatest modern challenges—inequality and structural racism—are not just social issues but fundamental barriers to economic progress and industrial advancement. Overcoming these challenges requires a holistic approach that integrates social justice into economic policies. By embracing diversity, promoting equity, and ensuring that all citizens have the opportunity to contribute to and benefit from industrial growth, Brazil can unlock its full potential. Such a path promises not only economic prosperity but also the creation of a more just, cohesive, and resilient society capable of navigating the complexities of the modern world.

Conflict of Interest: The Author Claims no Conflict of Interest.

References

1. Abreu, M. P. (1990). A ordem do progresso: Cem anos de política econômica republicana, 1889-1989. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
2. Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica (ANEEL). (2017). Boletim de Informações Gerenciais. Brasília: ANEEL.
3. Baer, W. (2008). A economia brasileira (6th ed.). São Paulo: Nobel.
4. Baer, W. (2008). The Brazilian Economy: Growth and Development (7th ed.). Lynne Rienner Publishers.
5. Banco do Nordeste. (2017). Relatório de Gestão. Fortaleza: Banco do Nordeste.
6. Bielschowsky, R. (1988). Pensamento econômico brasileiro: O ciclo ideológico do desenvolvimentismo. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA/INPES.
7. Bonelli, R., & Pinheiro, A. C. (2008). New export activities in Brazil: Comparative advantage, policy or self-discovery? In G. J. D. Hewings et al. (Eds.), Trade, networks and hierarchies. New York: Springer.
8. Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (1993). Economic reforms and cycles in Latin America and Brazil. Latin American Perspectives, 20(3), 5–24.
9. Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2016). Reflecting on new developmentalism and classical developmentalism. Brazilian Journal of Political Economy, 36(2), 237–265.
10. Cardoso, E., & Helwege, A. (1992). Latin America's economy: Diversity, trends, and conflicts. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
11. Carneiro, R. (2002). Desenvolvimento em crise: A economia brasileira no último quarto do século XX. São Paulo: Unesp.
12. Conrad, R. E. (1972). The destruction of Brazilian slavery, 1850–1888. Berkeley: University of California Press.
13. D'Araújo, M. C., & Castro, C. (1997). Vargas e a nova República: Lutas sociais e populismo no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getulio Vargas.
14. Dean, W. (1971). The industrialization of São Paulo, 1880–1945. Austin: University of Texas Press.
15. Dean, W. (1969). The Industrialization of São Paulo, 1880–1945. University of Texas Press.
16. De Negri, J. A., & Kubota, L. C. (2008). Políticas de incentivo à inovação tecnológica no Brasil. Brasília: IPEA.
17. Diniz, C. C., & Lemos, M. B. (2005). Economia e território: Desenvolvimento regional no Brasil. Revista Econômica, 7(1), 10–29.
18. Dreifuss, R. A. (1981). 1964: A conquista do Estado. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
19. Embrapii. (2018). Relatório de atividades. Brasília: Embrapii.
20. Fausto, B. (2014). História do Brasil. São Paulo: Edusp.
21. Fishlow, A. (1972). Origins and consequences of import substitution in Brazil. In L. E. DiMarco (Ed.), International economics and development. New York: Academic Press.
22. Fishlow, A. (1972). Origins and Consequences of Import Substitution in Brazil. In L. E. DiMarco (Ed.), International Economics and Development: Essays in Honor of Raul Prebisch (pp. 311–366). Academic Press.
23. Fonseca, P. C. D. (2004). Vargas: O capitalismo em construção. São Paulo: Hucitec.
24. Franco, G. H. B. (1999). O plano Real e outros ensaios. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves.
25. Furtado, C. (2007). Formação econômica do Brasil. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
26. Furtado, C. (1970). Economic Development of Latin America: A Survey from Colonial Times to the Cuban Revolution. Cambridge University Press.
27. Goldemberg, J. (2008). The Brazilian biofuels industry. Biotechnology for Biofuels, 1(1), 6.
28. Government of Brazil. (2015). Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (iNDC). Brasília: Government of Brazil.
29. Hecht, S., & Cockburn, A. (1990). The fate of the forest. London: Verso.
30. Hewlett, S., & Weinert, R. (1982). Brazil and Mexico: Patterns in late development. Philadelphia: ISHI.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202409.2364.v1

31. Holston, J. (1989). The modernist city: An anthropological critique of Brasília. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
32. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (IPEA). (2010). Programa de Aceleração do Crescimento: Balanço 2007–2010. Brasília: IPEA.
33. Jenkins, R. (2012). China and Brazil: Economic impacts of a growing relationship. Journal of Current Chinese Affairs, 41(1), 21–47.
34. Levine, R. M. (1999). The history of Brazil. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
35. Lopes, R. L., & Vian, C. E. F. (2016). Competitividade industrial no Brasil: Análise dos fatores sistêmicos. Revista de Economia Contemporânea, 20(1), 94–121.
36. Luz, N. (1982). A luta pela industrialização do Brasil. São Paulo: Alfa-Omega.
37. Mainwaring, S. (1999). Rethinking party systems in the third wave of democratization: The case of Brazil. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
38. Martins, J. S. (1985). Caminhada no chão da noite: Migrações e preconceito de cor no Brasil. São Paulo: Hucitec.
39. Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações (MCTIC). (2016). Estratégia Nacional de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação 2016–2022. Brasília: MCTIC.
40. Ministério do Desenvolvimento, Indústria e Comércio Exterior (MDIC). (2008). Política de Desenvolvimento Produtivo. Brasília: MDIC.
41. Ministério do Desenvolvimento, Indústria e Comércio Exterior (MDIC). (2011). Plano Brasil Maior. Brasília: MDIC.
42. Modiano, E. M. (1991). A crônica de uma crise anunciada: A economia brasileira nos anos 80. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
43. Montgomery, R. M.; Nakaguma, M. (2024). A Study on the Institutional Context and Dynamics Surrounding the Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 (2024). FGV-SP. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.23791.6160.
44. Oreiro, J. L., & Feijó, C. A. (2010). Desindustrialização: Conceituação, causas, efeitos e o caso brasileiro. Revista de Economia Política, 30(2), 219–232.
45. Pinheiro, A. C., & Fukasaku, K. (1999). Privatization in Brazil: The case of public utilities. Rio de Janeiro: BNDES.
46. Prado Júnior, C. (1945). História econômica do Brasil. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
47. Reis, E. P., & Moore, M. (Eds.). (2005). Elite Perceptions of Poverty and Inequality. Zed Books.
48. Shapiro, H. (1991). Engines of growth: The state and transnational auto companies in Brazil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49. Singer, P. (1977). Desenvolvimento econômico e evolução urbana. São Paulo: Editora Nacional.
50. Skidmore, T. E. (1988). The politics of military rule in Brazil, 1964–85. New York: Oxford University Press.
51. Skidmore, T. E. (1999). Brazil: Five centuries of change. New York: Oxford University Press.
52. Soares, S. S. D., et al. (2010). Programas de transferência de renda no Brasil: Impactos sobre a desigualdade. Texto para Discussão IPEA, 1228.
53. Suzigan, W. (2000). Indústria brasileira: Origem e desenvolvimento. São Paulo: Hucitec.
54. Versiani, F. R., & Barbosa, J. F. (1993). Formação econômica do Brasil: Ensaios sobre a história econômica do século XIX. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília.
55. Vianna, S. B. (1997). O petróleo é nosso: A luta contra o entreguismo. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
56. Viola, E., & Franchini, M. (2018). Brazil and climate change: Beyond the Amazon. New York: Routledge.