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ABSTRACT

Objective: The aim of the essay is to discuss the agrarian issue in Brazil, articulating it in the mainstream of sustainable development, as an opportunity to democratize access and use of land, and especially to inhibit chronic problems that generate opulence and deprivation of freedoms, such as those emphasized by the COVID-19 crisis.

Theoretical framework: It is based on the perspectives of two renowned researchers, Navarro and Medeiros. While Navarro questions the options for agrarian reform in democratic contexts, emphasizing the business perspective, Medeiros highlights the evolution of the agrarian issue, addressing struggles for land and cultural identity.

Method: This essay is characterized by its qualitative nature, according to the methodology of content analysis in the style of a theoretical essay, and is focused on the debate on agrarian reform, based on two renowned researchers: Navarro (2014) and Medeiros (2015).

Result and conclusion: It is concluded that abuses of power to invade the lands of citizens who have rightfully earned that space are crimes, given that the discussion suggests that they should be resolved by Brazilian land reform, so the judgment is positive related to the total relevance of land reform.

Originality/value: The originality of this essay lies in the critical analysis of the perspectives of Navarro and Medeiros, contextualized in the post-COVID-19 crisis. The innovative approach underscores agrarian reform as a relevant solution to urgent social issues, adding value to the academic debate on sustainable development in Brazil.
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ENTRE A FORÇA DO “MOINHO SATÂNICO DA PRODUÇÃO” E OS “CONTRAMOVIMENTOS” PELA REFORMA AGRÁRIA

RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo do ensaio é discutir a questão agrária no Brasil, articulando-a à corrente principal do desenvolvimento sustentável, como uma oportunidade de democratizar o acesso e o uso da terra e, principalmente, inibir problemas crônicos que geram opulência e privação de liberdades, como os enfatizados pela crise da COVID-19.
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Referencial teórico: Baseia-se nas perspectivas de dois renomados pesquisadores, Navarro e Medeiros. Enquanto Navarro questiona as opções de reforma agrária em contextos democráticos, enfatizando a perspectiva empresarial, Medeiros destaca a evolução da questão agrária, abordando as lutas pela terra e pela identidade cultural.


Resultados e conclusão: Conclui-se que abusos de poder para invadir terras de cidadãos que legitimamente conquistaram esse espaço são crimes, considerando que a discussão sugere que tais questões devem ser resolvidas pela reforma agrária brasileira. Portanto, o julgamento é positivo em relação à relevância total da reforma agrária.

Originalidade/valor: A originalidade deste ensaio reside na análise crítica das perspectivas de Navarro e Medeiros, contextualizadas na crise pós-COVID-19. A abordagem inovadora destaca a reforma agrária como uma solução relevante para questões sociais urgentes, agregando valor ao debate acadêmico sobre o desenvolvimento sustentável no Brasil.
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"The farming class and the working class
Eagerly await the agrarian reform
Knowing that it will provide a solution
To the precarious situation.
Leaving the Brazilian soil project
I know that in misery, no one would live
I know that in misery, no one would live
And production would increase
Five hundred percent even in livestock!"
(Zilo & Zalo)⁵.

1 INTRODUCTION

Since the emergence of the COVID-19 health crisis, which began in December 2019 in the city of Wuhan, Hubei Province, China, it has spread rapidly around the world and particularly in Brazil (Simon Melchor et al., 2022; Exime, 2023). It was a phenomenon that potentialized the various existing crises, mainly in terms of health, education, unemployment, poverty, food, and conflicts over land, among others (Lima et al., 2020).

⁵ Great Hope (Zilo & Zalo). The farming class and the working class are anxiously awaiting land reform. Knowing that it will provide a solution to the precarious situation. Leaving the project of the Brazilian floor, of each roceiro to gain his area. I know that in misery no one would live, production would already increase, five hundred percent even in livestock! This great crisis that has arisen in time, mistreats the caboclo hurting his brio. In a rich and high country, Brazilians die of hunger and cold. In our cities rich in real estate, millions of cars have already been produced, while the poor worker lives tight earning wages, which goes up after everything has gone up! Our farmer who lives off the land only gets half of his production, because the seed he sows has to be half with his boss! Our farmer lives in a dilemma, and his problem has no solution. Because the rich man who lives in a state of luxury thinks that if the bill is signed, it will be in violation of the Constitution! But the people's great hope is to ask Jesus through prayer to guide the poor where they go, and for the family not to lack bread. That they do not let capitalism take our nation to the abyss. The inequality here is so great, while the rich do not know what they earn, the poor of the poor live in illusion!” Composition: Francisco Lázaro / Goia. Available at: https://www.letras.mus.br/zilo-e-zalo/975200/ Accessed on: July 29, 2023.
Thus, it is understood that these are elements that contribute to creating a "world of extraordinary deprivation, destitution, and oppression", where "the persistence of poverty", the extent of collective and chronic hunger, and the invisibility of women mutually coexist with the "violation of freedoms", in addition to the successive threats to the "environment and sustainability" in economic and social reproduction (Sen, 2000, p. 9). Therefore, they have a stronger correlation with the slice of society that is less economically well-off, generating degrees of unsustainability.

The pandemic, inflation, unemployment, and economic recession have tragically affected the vulnerable, leading them into degrading situations in order to survive. The Brazilian media is full of photos and news of people looking for food in the dumps, fighting with vultures, surrounding the trucks that collect the garbage to try to find something, even if deteriorated that mitigates hunger, and sleeping in lines in the hope of being graced with bones discarded by supermarkets. In this condition of extreme poverty, the person seems to dehumanize and has to renounce his dignity to meet the survival instinct (Ahlert et al., 2022, p. 686).

In this sense, food as an interdisciplinary link soon indicates the protagonism of family farming, as a producer of the highest percentage of food consumed by Brazilian society, about 70%, employing the majority of people involved in rural areas for food security, occupying about a quarter of arable land (Figueredo & Da Silva, 2020; Ribeiro-Silva et al., 2020).

This last element highlights the agrarian issue, the ostentation of the country that has a high concentration of land, and at the same time, which is the other side of the issue, the democratization or decentralization of land, that would give the opportunity to add more people to agrarian production, produce more food, and in fact begin to face bundles of crises, as reflected by the health crisis (Silva & De Lorenzo, 2020).

Thus, agrarian reform is considered a set of measures aimed at redistributing land in a fairer and more equitable way, especially for existing inequality, that is, given the right to land (Martins, 2000). This policy was introduced in Brazil in the 1960s with the enactment of Law No. 4,504 of November 30, 1964 (Land Statute), unfortunately a date that coincides with the military dictatorship (López, 2023). The implementation of agrarian reform is overseen by the National Institute for Colonization and Agrarian Reform (INCRA), which is responsible for acquiring land, settling families, and providing technical and financial assistance to settled families in order to improve the quality of life in rural Brazil, generating employment, and increasing agricultural production (Araújo & Araújo Sobrinho, 2023).

The Earth Charter offers a comprehensive perspective on existence on Earth, highlighting the intrinsic connection between all human beings and the planet we inhabit. We are part of one human family and one Earth community with a shared destiny (BRASIL, 2020; De Bessa Antunes, 2020). Consequently, we emphasize the need to join forces to promote a sustainable global society based on respect for nature, universal human rights, economic justice, and a culture of peace (Boff, 2012).

These fundamental principles challenge us to take collective responsibility for protecting and preserving the environment, ensuring social equity, and promoting peaceful relations between individuals and nations. The Earth Charter calls us to act consciously and collaboratively, recognizing that our present actions will shape the future of our planet and all life forms that inhabit it (Mamede et al., 2021).

In the United Nations (UN) Agenda 2030, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and targets are treated as strategies to transform society into something more sustainable and resilient (Nista et al., 2020; UN, 2015). Thus, sustainable life is achieved when the individual enjoys autonomy in his life, both in material, professional, and spiritual infrastructure (Boff, 2012).
The objective of this work is to discuss the agrarian issue in Brazil, articulating it in the mainstream of sustainable development, as an opportunity to democratize access and use of land, and especially to inhibit chronic problems that generate opulence and deprivation of freedoms, such as those emphasized by the COVID-19 crisis. Therefore, as researchers, we take the liberty of asking the following question:

Does land reform in the country make sense or have relevance, especially in the current context?

To improve readers' understanding of the text, this theoretical essay is divided into four topics: 1) Introduction of the theme; 2) Methodology; 3) Discussions in two points, the first being theoretical discussions on agrarian reform from the Brazilian perspective and the second, COVID-19 as a new opportunity to rethink agrarian reform in Brazil; and 4) Conclusion.

2 METHODOLOGY

In this essay-type article, we will make use of the qualitative approach in order to obtain freedom to interpret the data and diverse information due to its flexibility. This type of approach gives the researcher the chance to focus on the process and not just the results. Thus, it is taken into account that a major feature of this approach is the permission to use various sources of information in order to create new knowledge, which explains the constant use of this approach by scientists (Lessa De Oliveira, 2008).

As a method to achieve the objective proposed above, we unite the qualitative approach with the methodology of content analysis in the style of a theoretical essay, which will help us consistently treat information found in documents available from two renowned researchers: Navarro (2014) and Medeiros (2015). In addition, this methodology has the exceptional breadth of making the researcher conquer views of unusual facts, as will be done in this essay. According to Severino (2013, p. 121), it is "a set of techniques for analyzing communications, it is about critically understanding" any document, regardless of its nature.

In this perspective, the discussions in this essay focus on two moments, one being the agrarian reform in the context of the two main texts cited and the agrarian reform in the context of COVID-19 in Brazil. Thus, the first topic of discussion is presented.

3 THEORETICAL DISCUSSIONS ON AGRARIAN REFORM FROM THE BRAZILIAN PERSPECTIVE

The issue of land in Brazil is an old problem, a fishbone stuck in the throat, which takes us back to the period of the colony condition, where the normative instrument of the "Sesmarias Base Data Letters" determined the distribution of land, generally to those who had the funds to develop agriculture, as one of the main criteria (Cabral & Costa, 2021). This fact did not change with the enactment of the Land Law of 1850, which maintains the unequal and concentrated structure of land until today (Costa, 2022; Silva, 2015).

But what about access to land for those who do not have large assets in which many were deterritorialized and others had their freedoms violated? That is, these marginalized actors regarding access to land circumscribe the theme of the agrarian question (Medeiros, 2015; Navarro, 2014) from the political perspective of agrarian reform, as a democratic form, and thicken the debate together with their social representations (Contag, MST, Pastoral da Terra, etc.), due to the importance and need for agrarian reform (Comparato, 2001; De Almeida, 2012; Brelaz et al., 2023).

The topic yields fruitful discussions and divides opinions in the most diverse environments, whether political, policymaking, agrarian, agricultural, or academic. Among those who summarize the subject as lacking arguments for the realization of an agrarian reform...
policy, the agronomist-sociologist Zander Navarro (2014) emphasizes that there never was and never will be agrarian reform in Brazil. In his impressive ability to problematize the subject, Navarro (2014) puts us at a crossroads.

First, he questions the theoretical orientation of the defenders of agrarian reform, rooted in Marxism (Marx, Lenin, and Kautsky), cited by Cruz (2012), under a vision that postulated the disintegration of small agricultural production units among proletarians and large owners from the social division of labor due to the increase in rural poverty from the rural environment from the production of agriculture.

Second, it questions the fact that large tracts of land are unproductive, an aspect that changes completely with the modernization of the Brazilian countryside, and here is in evidence the presence of implementation of agricultural technologies in increasing production and productivity of agricultural commodities, and the contribution mainly to the strong rural exodus (Camarano & Abramovay, 1999; Del Grossi et al., 2001). Another aspect is that small productive units in rural areas harbor rural poverty and competitive inability to produce. This is a very powerful argument of Navarro (2014) from a capitalist perspective, that is, that of agricultural development.

In another perspective, the social scientist Leonilde de Medeiros (2015), inserts other elements in the game to discuss the agrarian question in Brazil, evidencing that agrarian reform, as a banner of struggle of social movements, undergoes metamorphoses from the 1980s, whose debate was for the "expropriation of lands that did not fulfill the social function for the creation of settlements" and later expands, by the emergence of new identities (quilombolas, faxinalenses, etc.), which claim the right to land, substantiated by the immateriality of belonging to the place. Debate that is legitimized by the struggle for the right to territory, for the reproduction of the means of life in a non-capitalist matrix. Another element refers to the removal of the productivist aspects of production, such as immersion in sociotechnical risk paths, and especially to elements related to environmental issues.

The visions presented by Medeiros (2015) and Navarro (2014) start from different fields of development. The first, non-capitalist realization and second, agricultural development.

The first author brings a deep discussion on the subject, transiting in the historical context of land reform in Brazil, from its starting point with colonization in 1530, and expands, especially in the three first centuries in the history of Brazil. The notes of the need to conquer the land, should not only be to work and take income for the family, is also the right to live and birth in a territorial context. The movements, such as landless or small farmers' movement, struggle to acquire a space that, in recent years, is presently occupied by large capital companies for agribusiness, mainly in the Amazon (De Medeiros, 2015).

The settlement policy brought up in the text makes it clear that the problem of distribution, both of wealth and the increase in poverty which is directly related to agrarian policy, shows the need to reform. This need for agrarian reform has a debate those transits not only the common struggles for land, but that involves large agribusiness properties, as well as family farming, among other demands for land. We can also say, regarding the issues of the struggles, that it is a battle of lack of perspective that must be discussed from the right of the people. The negligence of not having taken advantage when a reform was previously favorable, in fact, leads to thinking about the qualities and consequences generated without the reform, such as the disappearance of indigenous culture, a constant struggle for the quality of family settlements in the country, not to mention the misery in the general context (De Medeiros, 2015).

From the point of view of the second author, Navarro (2014), he brings in turn a discussion about whether agrarian reform in Brazil would be worthwhile, stating that the reform was in the past because today we live in other conjunctures, both economic and political. In this perspective, the author proposes to answer the following question.
Would land reform as a topic of national debate, especially its implementation as a public policy, be part of that list of permanent and irremovable themes of government action? He goes on to explain that, in the democratic context in which we live today, the issue of reform in the international sphere, which takes place in a different context, is simply authoritarian. Thus, the problem of agrarian reform goes beyond politics, land destruction, remembering that we have in Brazil today a highly privileged process that is the agricultural sector, with the political wear and tear to do so (Navarro, 2014).

In addition to the economic and social impacts that encompass the subject in question, the struggles for land and the killings from confrontations show that it is really impossible to attempt agrarian reform, as the author mentions.

As mentioned by Navarro (2014), land redistribution processes usually occur in periods of authoritarian governments, in which centralized power and the ability to impose decisions allow property transfer mechanisms to be applied to change the structure of land tenure in the country. In authoritarian governments, leaders find it easier to take drastic measures to redistribute land in order to pursue land equity or respond to social pressures.

Arguably, in democratic regimes, the situation is different. With politics tilted towards cities and urban social interests, it becomes more challenging to conduct a successful land reform process. This is because urban interests often dominate political agendas, while the problems and needs of rural areas, where land distribution issues often occur, are neglected. Moreover, in democratic regimes, political decisions usually go through more complex processes of negotiation and conciliation, which can make it difficult to implement land reforms that involve significant land redistribution (Navarro, 2014).

Therefore, it is understood that land redistribution tends to be more frequent in authoritarian governments, as they face more significant obstacles than democratic regimes. This is due to the prevalence of urban interests and the intricate nature of political processes present in authoritarian regimes. However, it is understood that this is not necessarily an absolute rule, as the plausible argument in this case would be that in authoritarian regimes, measures of land redistribution can indeed be implemented as part of social control policies, to secure political support, or to promote a specific agenda. On the other hand, in democratic regimes, it could be part of strategies for social justice, rural development, or equity promotion.

Thus, to try to bring new perspectives of reflection on the agrarian question, especially agrarian reform in Brazil, some reflections of the economic anthropologist, sociologist, and political economist, Karl Polanyi (2000), are used.

First, thinking about development only in terms of the stimuli of the injection and reproduction of capital in rural areas creates spaces for the assaults of the satanic mill to become increasingly strong in providing inequalities and destroying the environment, such as what is opening up in the Amazon, that is, this market system is devoid of the important substances for social reproduction and human survival. Second, the idea of agrarian reform seems to be based on the concept of counter-movements, which, based on the actors' capacity for agency, (re)elaborate the resource bases and social relations follow other orientations, such as reciprocity and redistribution (Polanyi, 2000).

However, it is in the political field that the main ties or lack of forces persist for the desired agrarian reform project in Brazil (Graziano Da Silva, 1985; Kautsky, 1986; Martins, 2000). On the one hand, we have a political left that drank from the source of Keynesianism in development, and its government actions were allocated more to the welfare or credit aspect, leaving the land issue practically untouched, and its political forces were placed in doubt due to their alleged involvement in corruption. On the other hand, there is the Brazilian right, where this issue has never been on the agenda of its debate or government, doing something only when it felt extremely pressured. In this group there is still the ruralist caucus, which houses the Brazilian agrarian oligarchies in the political arena and which will never support any nature of
agrarian reform since they had a relevant contribution in the destructive approval of the New Forest Code.

In turn, the evangelical caucus has shown itself to be great negotiators on the issues, exchanging positions or parliamentary amendments. And finally, an ultra-right or neo-militarist path, which seeks support mainly in the evangelical, ruralist and right-wing benches, which, when represented by the last government (2019–2022), had a performance that looked more like "Alice in Wonderland" when she falls into the hole and asks the cat how to get out of there, and he replies: It depends on where you want to go.

In other words, while we don't know which means would be more efficient for land division, it is difficult to explain the way forward. But our positions strongly disagree with the servitude of the elites, as seen in the face of the pandemic, which released a large mass of resources to bankers, who, as is contradictory, even in the midst of the crisis, made profits. This last aspect highlights the absence of any dialogue with society and works on development from the top down, for which we will continue to ask, for whom is the development for? Especially when the struggle for agrarian reform is intertwined with that of the most needy.

Perhaps the above discussion did not convince our readers as an attempt to answer the question we dared to ask, and it is more appropriate. Does land reform make sense, or is it relevant to the country? The country which, in the face of our gigantic Gini index, the redemocratization of access to and use of land would have constraints that involve actors and organizations connected to a sector that has attracted a lot of attention, which is that of food and scope economy. But would it be possible to aggregate political forces to get on the agenda and be realized while the population has become increasingly urbanized? Perhaps then some arguments developed by Navarro (2014) are quite relevant, such as the difficulty of making an ontological change in democratic regimes.

It is still possible to mention the weaknesses and ambiguities of our institutions in the sense of Douglas North, as presented by Medeiros (2015), referring to the Land Statute. These are undoubtedly elements that contribute negatively to change and, fundamentally, to development in its broad sense. As North himself says, it is necessary to have strong institutions and organizations to promote the development of societies.

We have seen a discussion from each author's point of view, a debate where each author presents convincing arguments for us to reflect on land reform. In fact, the arguments, as well as the procedures and debates, are relevant to each discussion. Thus, we remain in favor of agrarian reform, both in Brazil and in other countries that have not done so.

Our criticism of Navarro, for example, is the fact that he brings a debate with a more business-oriented point of view, with the optimism that it will not be possible due to the historical and political context and the lack of social interests, to believe that it would be a way to solve or contribute to the solution of the struggle for equality in the countryside. The disappointment of how the issue is being conducted without respect for others and the environment shows that, in fact, the business or market is the priority of many. When we ask, is it relevant to land reform in the country, especially at the current juncture? It is about the pandemic moment experienced around the world and its impacts on people's lives, i.e., economic, social, and political impacts.

4 COVID-19: A NEW OPPORTUNITY TO RETHINK AGRARIAN REFORM IN BRAZIL

On the COVID-19 pandemic, Brazil and all countries in the world have been affected in different ways, because in the last 3 years, the words we heard most in every corner of the world in the news were pandemic, deaths by COVID-19, quarantine, reciprocity, solidarity, emergency aid, legitimize abusive inequality, poor and poverty, miseries, among other words.
It should be noted that Brazil is the country with the most deaths in Latin America and second
in the world, with more than 660,000 deaths from the disease since the beginning of the
pandemic (Ferraz; Clair, 2022; Teixeira, 2022; Exime et al., 2023).

Another important impact after one year of the pandemic was poverty and extreme
poverty in Brazil, which in 2021 had a significant increase, with approximately 62.5 million
people (29.4% of the population) living below the poverty line, according to World Bank
criteria. Among them, 17.9 million individuals (8.4% of the population) were in extreme
poverty, the highest numbers and percentages for both groups since 2012. This is considered a
record increase, with the number of people living below the poverty line growing by 22.7%
(11.6 million more individuals) and the extreme poverty group increasing by 48.2% (5.8 million
more individuals) between 2020 and 2021 (IBGE, 2021).

In addition, the different income ranges of Brazilians, whose 75.3% of the total income
of the population represented only 53.8% for those receiving up to ¼ of the minimum wage per
capita, are facts that directly affect the quality of life of Brazilian society since the richest
portion of the population receives much more than the poorest portion. These vulnerable
families had limited access to the labor market, leading to a greater dependence (34.7%) on
social programs such as bolsa família and emergency aid, which consequently had a more
substantial impact (IBGE, 2021; 2022).

The impacts remain brutal, such as the average per capita household income that reached
the lowest level since the beginning of the historical series in 2012, standing at R$ 1,353, further
increasing inequality (Mattei & Heinen, 2020). The modest recovery of the labor market in
2021 was insufficient to compensate for the losses suffered in 2020, and the reduction in the
value of programs such as "Emergency Aid" may have contributed to this result (IBGE, 2021;
2022).

Other important data on the impacts of the pandemic in Brazil are corroborated, such as
the Gini Index, which increased in 2021, reaching the level observed in 2019 (0.544), being the
second-highest value in the series since 2012. This index decreased until 2015 and increased
until 2018. The return to pre-pandemic levels of income inequality highlights the challenges of
tackling poverty and inequality during the pandemic (IBGE, 2021). It should be noted that the
situation of the pandemic can help us think about Brazilian social problems from different
perspectives, such as family farming, social struggles, land struggles, and agrarian issues.

Thus, it is believed that it is possible to think of the importance of agrarian reform in the
context of the pandemic as a crisis that demonstrated the fragility and problems related to
inequality. It is thought that land reform can help reduce poverty and inequality, improve food
security, and strengthen the health system (David et al., 1997; Penna & Rosa, 2015). It would
be a logical way to think about rural development from this issue, being an opportunity to
visualize the production from family farming. Therefore, land is considered a fundamental
resource for agricultural production, and access to land can help families produce their own
food and generate income (Plein & Schneider, 2003; Schneider & Escher, 2011). Thus, agrarian
reform can also help reduce inequality by distributing land more fairly.

A way to think together about the role of agrarian reform in the world, in rural Brazil
and in the communities of disadvantaged groups that were already experiencing a pandemic,
such as seeing their properties deteriorating because they could not survive with the small
productions of their backyard, because they saw the cities being invaded by agribusiness
companies, as a way of saying "we have money, and we have the world" (De Sousa Santos,
2020).

In this way, the cruelty of why they cannot compete and sell their products to avoid
misery and poverty is clearly perceived. After spending most of their lives in the countryside,
they are forced to move to the city and look for a job after being forced to sell their properties
to the invaders of the business world, as stated by De Sousa Santos (2020). The limitations
caused by COVID-19 will always be difficult to deal with, but there are some groups that suffer the most, such as small farmers and society itself, those who have lost their jobs, women, and single mothers, among others who have had difficulty getting through the crisis without help, in addition to the health risk in the countryside.

If we think about it, there is no way to stay in the countryside in this situation. In addition to the issues mentioned, there is also a great health risk in staying in a place where there is a vast production that uses a large amount of pesticides in every corner. If they stay in the countryside, there is a risk of dying from diseases resulting from these substances, if they go to the city, they lose their quality of life. During COVID-19, this situation worsened as they lost their jobs and were forced to ask the government for emergency aid. To survive, another way was to rely on solidarity groups that did an excellent job, on the reciprocity and on generosity of others so as not to starve.

At this juncture, even without COVID-19, they would be starving after being evicted and banished by the big agribusiness companies, forcing them to sell their land. In addition, there is a strong impact that this process has on the food that reaches the table of each citizen and the difference between quality and quantity. This brief reflection clearly demonstrates the need to maintain small properties with a law that guarantees the rights of these subjects due to the influence that places have on people, family attachment, and cultures that die together during this process. The need for agrarian reform is evident, and it is necessary to rethink the reform in order to help the most vulnerable, such as indigenous and quilombola communities, and to put limits on agribusiness invaders as a way to avoid class struggles and conflicts over land in Brazil.

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is still possible to cite the weaknesses and ambiguities of our institutions in the sense of Douglas North, as presented by Medeiros, referring to the Land Statute. Undoubtedly, these are elements that contribute negatively to change and fundamentally to development in its broad sense, as North himself says that it is necessary to have strong institutions and organizations to promote the development of societies.

A significance of land reform in Brazil is indeed recognized, and we cannot overlook the duty to emphasize that it is a challenging battle to be won, yet not insurmountable if we unite under the same purpose. Within the context of the pandemic, it is regrettable that we were already immersed in a pandemic without fully comprehending the complete scope of its pandemic nature within society, especially considering social demands such as the agrarian issue from the perspective of social inequality.

Still, regarding the debates between the two authors, it is argued that each author presents convincing arguments for us to reflect on land reform. In fact, the arguments, like the procedures and debates, are relevant. Thus, we respond that agrarian reform is necessary, both in Brazil and in other countries that have not yet gone through this process, even if the struggle is arduous and incessant, so that human interests are above economic interests.

Thus, articulating it in the mainstream of sustainable development, as an opportunity to democratize access and use of land, we conclude that the abuse of power to invade the lands of citizens who have won that space by right, is a crime whose discussion suggests that it should be solved by agrarian reform, so the judgment is positive related to the total relevance of it. From the reflection of the essay, it is believed that the work is of paramount importance for the current debates on agrarian reform, and as future studies, we suggest research from qualitative and quantitative data analysis on agrarian issues and their inequalities.
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