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Summary
Currently, many Indigenous and Tribal communities face a double burden of climate change: while changing weather patterns threaten their ways of life, green-labelled extractive industries are encroaching on their territories. Psychological studies of individual and community experiences of climate change have yet to adequately address this “double burden” of climate change, a phenomenon referred to by Saami indigenous political thinkers as “green colonialism”. The main argument contained in this conceptualisation is that green-labelled extractive industries and renewable energy development occupy Indigenous peoples’ ancestral territories, and while discourses of “saving humanity” drive these growth-based climate change mitigation initiatives, Indigenous and Tribal communities experience and resist the gradual dismemberment of their lifeworlds. This study contributes to psychological research on climate change by expanding the scope to the lived experiences and meaning-making of people in Indigenous and Tribal communities where climate change mitigation threatens their future life prospects and can violate their rights.

To conduct the study, I combined an overarching theoretical framework drawing on cultural psychology, community psychology, and decolonial theories. I was particularly interested in exploring recent developments in cultural and community psychology, in which researchers have sought to renew these fields of inquiry by facilitating greater dialogue with decolonial theories and tried to incorporate these perspectives into the study of the subject matter. This enabled me to use a broad set of tools for examining lived experience and meaning-making, placing people’s narratives and critical knowledge construction at the centre of the analysis. Meaning-making was theorised as a socioculturally situated, intersubjective, dialogical, creative and political process through which potentially critical knowledge can be created.

I selected three case studies for the research. The first case study is the struggle of the Guarani and Kaiowá people, who in the Brazilian state of Mato Grosso do Sul, resist the green-labelled agribusiness that produces agrofuels for the national and international market. The violent conditions in which the Guarani and Kaiowá families live are well known in the literature. Their situation can be seen as a ‘worst case scenario’ that reveals the severity of some of the structural problems of green growth models in which human and non-human lives are ‘sacrificed’ in order to develop low-carbon economies elsewhere. The next two case studies are interconnected through a green-labelled supply chain and illuminate how the appropriation of resources and territories for climate action can connect places and structure people’s lived experiences across territories in Global North and South. First, I examined the lived experiences
and meaning-making of indigenous Southern Saami people in Norway who resist the construction of large-scale wind turbines in the mountains where they have ancestral ties and carry out reindeer herding. Second, I studied the experiences of Amazon communities in Brazil confronting the bauxite-aluminium value chain of transnational companies in the eastern Amazon. Wind power projects in the Saami pastoral mountains provide renewable energy to these aluminium companies’ plants in Norway in order to position aluminium as ‘green’ and sustainable. The latter two case studies, in conjunction with each other, illustrate the interconnectedness of the struggles of Indigenous and Tribal communities against extractive industries in Global North and in South.

A total of 49 individual interviews and 21 group interviews were conducted, in combination with extensive participant observation of seminars, protests, trials and herding activities, and ethnographic methods exploring meaning-making in everyday life in Case Study 1. The combination of interviews and observation allowed me to see how meaning-making processes take place in real-life environments and opened up the possibility for more careful reflection and dialogues with research participants. I took a dialogical-epistemological stance, both as a mode of critical reflexivity and as situating dialogues – including those in which we participate as research communities – as central to the production of new knowledge.

The thesis consists of three papers. Paper I, “Green colonialism in a Nordic context: Exploring Southern Saami representations of wind energy development”, was based on an investigation of the social representations of Southern Saami reindeer herders on wind energy development in Norway. Three main themes were organised through Thematic Analysis to reflect Southern Saami representations of wind energy developments: Wind power as “one more” in the Lounge Durée of dispossession; Norwegian society’s Ignorance, as individual knowledge gaps or as structurally produced; and Individual and collective responsibility to guarantee herding in the future. I combined Social Representations Theory (SRT) with analytical frameworks from critical community psychology to focus on meaning-making as a process through which knowledge is produced – knowledge that Norwegian institutions have been unable to learn from.

In Paper II, “’Time is our worst enemy’: lived experiences and intercultural relations in the making of green aluminium”, I explore the lived experiences of the Southern Saami and Amazon communities whose ways of life, although located in distant continents, have come under pressure from the value and supply chains of the production of “green aluminium”. The paper analysed participants’ lived experiences of exclusion from the climate agenda and their frustrating encounters with the state institutions and corporations involved as forms of ‘bad
I generated three themes through Thematic Analysis: Narratives of loss; Dealing with bad faith practices; and Experiencing violence and dehumanisation. These themes illustrate how the green supply and value chains have changed participants’ lives in ways that they find incompatible with maintaining their desired ways of life and their self-determination rights. The paper was written as a critical contribution to proponents of different versions of the Green New Deal (GND), which is understood as an umbrella term for various proposals aimed at more socially just and inclusive green transitions. I proposed that the GNDs must become international and decolonial in their scope in order to achieve their goals of inclusion and social justice.

In paper III, “Re-living a common future when being confronted with ecological disaster: Exploring (elements of) Guarani and Kaiowá collective memories, political imagination and critique”, I expanded the scope of the thesis by suggesting concrete ways in which cultural psychological perspectives on political imagination and collective memory can contribute to the development of decolonial approaches in psychology. The paper also expands the scope of the thesis in the sense that I problematize to a greater extent the theoretical and conceptual shortcomings of psychological science as it enters a cultural contact zone with Guarani and Kaiowá cosmology and philosophy.

Global climate and biodiversity reports acknowledge the importance of Indigenous Knowledges (IK) to climate action. Nevertheless, the thesis sheds light on the detachment between these global goals of including Indigenous Knowledges in climate agendas and how green-labelled extractive industries can structure people’s lived experiences in negative ways. This thesis highlights loss, exclusion and dehumanisation as the study’s key findings of what characterized people’s lived experiences across research sites as they confronted the green-labelled industries. I propose that psychological research on climate change can be expanded, not by including more communities in already established research schemes, but by interrogating the assumptions and consequences of those research schemes, including in non-indigenous settings. This could be a way to open up to learning in practice from the diverse value and knowledge systems existing across the planet, which is arguably needed to design alternatives as we face severe and life shattering climate change.
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It's time for us as a people to start makin' some changes
Let's change the way we eat
Let's change the way we live
And let's change the way we treat each other
You see, the old way wasn't working so it's on us to do
What we gotta do, to survive

1. Introduction

Remembering Berta Cáceres

¡Despertemos humanidad, ya no hay tiempo!, – wake up humanity, there is no more time – were among the words Berta Cáceres spoke at the award ceremony when she received the Goldman Environmental Prize in 2015 for her struggle to protect the Gualcarque River in western Honduras. Gualcarque is sacred in the cosmology of her Indigenous people, the Lenca, but the river risked being dammed up by a joint project of Honduran company Desarrollos Energéticos SA (DESA) and Chinese state-owned firm Sinohydro, the world’s largest dam developer. Berta co-founded, and was leading, the Lenca organization, COPINH, acknowledged for its persistent human rights work in a country where promoting human rights is too often a dangerous mission. A few months after she received the Goldman Prize, DESA hired gunmen to execute Berta in her home in the little Honduran town of Esperanza on March 3, 2016. She was not the only persecuted Goldman prize recipient. A year later, the 2005 Goldman Prize winner Isidro Baldenegro López, an indigenous Rarámuri person from Mexico, was killed. Keeping Berta’s words in the title was a way of remembering her during this research project.

Extractive violence while saving the planet?

Berta and Isidrio’s assassinations belong to a broader global pattern of violent persecution of environmental defenders and Indigenous peoples (Butt, et al., 2019). Interwoven with the emergence of modernity,1 throughout history, indigenous communities worldwide have suffered violence and devastating dispossession of the lands upon which their cultural survival depends (Bacon, 2019). The violence contrasts with the promise lingering in the legal achievements of Indigenous peoples since the 1980s when international Indigenous advocacy articulated demands for human rights frameworks that could guarantee their self-determination

While ‘modernity’ is a widely contested concept, in this thesis I build on the works of decoloniality theorists, who suggest that ‘modernity’ is the result of and prolongation of European colonialism. Uncritical modernity discourses, in this view, conceal how progress and modern life-ways are based on the colonial expansion over lands and extraction of resources (Maldonado-Torres, 2004; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018).
as collectives and peoples. Many countries with Indigenous populations ratified international legal frameworks, such as the ILO Convention 169 on the Rights of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples or the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (Aguilar-Støen, 2016, 2017; Engle, 2011). The private sector, and particularly the extractive industries, have also begun to directly reference Indigenous rights in their social policies (Hanna & Vanclay, 2013). However, socio-environmental conflicts involving natural resource extraction in Indigenous territories often continue to be intertwined with different forms of violence and injustice (Dunlap & Jakobsen, 2020). Large-scale extractive industries occupying or polluting Indigenous peoples’ territories can pose direct threats to their cultural survival. Moreover, Indigenous cosmovisions that consider natural elements as humans’ relatives (Porsanger, 2010; Ruiz-Serna, 2017), and animist cosmovisions in which animals have entitled humanity (De Castro, 2019), can make the large-scale extraction of these resources be experienced in particularly brutal ways with traumatizing effects that Western thinking often dismisses (Gómez-Barris, 2017). In our Anthropocene epoch, hegemonic plans of global climate action push for de-carbonizing the economy by promoting the growth of a range of new and old extractive industries and renewable energy infrastructures, many of which involve dispossession and violence against rural communities (Lynch & Veland, 2018; Sovacool, 2021). These renewable energy projects (or the implementation of such) seem to largely follow the negative trends of extraction industries in Indigenous territories, and have subjected Indigenous peoples to enclosures, exclusion, encroachments, or entrenchment, often in combination and repeatedly entangled with direct violence (Sovacool, 2021). The Saami Council (2017), an organization that advocates the rights of indigenous Saami people in Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia, refers to this phenomenon as “green colonialism” 2, making explicit the link between how they experience green transitions now and the colonialism and assimilation the Saami have experienced historically. The bottom line in many places is the

2 I first found ‘Grønn kolonisering’ (Norwegian for ‘green colonization’) used in a 2013 newspaper article, where Aili Keskitalo, President of the Saami parliament in Norway, says (my translation): “It is politically correct to favor renewable energy, but the sum of the area interventions done in the name of climate policies, is experienced as green colonization. For many it may appear irrelevant compared with the global energy demand. But it is beyond reason that many Saami adolescents must forget their future because of political climate goals.” (Næss Olsen & Dolmen, 2013). In 2017 the Saami council’s declaration wrote: “The foregoing considerations apply correspondingly in relation to the ‘Green Nordic industry,’ including wind power, hydro power, wave power, etc., which competes with the Saami traditional land use. Saami livelihoods – including reindeer herding are among the ‘greenest’ there are. The Saami have always used and are still using their traditional areas in an ecologically responsible sustainable manner. The result of the lasting Saami use of Sápmi has left behind very few traces that are visible today. That these Saami areas to a large extent are to be exploited by what the Nordic peoples define as ‘green energy’ is a paradox.” (Saami-Council, 2017)
discrepancy between the urgency to “save humanity” contained in climate change discourses (Lynch & Veland, 2018) and the experiences of Indigenous and Tribal communities that their ways of life may remain too easily “sacrificable” (Wainwright & Mann, 2018). In the next section, I argue that psychological research, and particularly an emerging climate psychology, has largely neglected these trends.

Climate psychology in the making?
Does climate psychology exist? When I discuss ‘climate psychology’ in this thesis, I am aware that there is no such ‘institutionalised’ subfield in psychology. The rationale for using the term is to make explicit that there are ambitions of such a creation among researchers from different subfields (see Hoggett, 2019; Panu, 2020) as psychological research is beginning to influence climate change policymaking. In some places, psychologists use ‘climate psychology’ in daily speech, as a concept with fuzzy boundaries. The thesis does not provide a complete review of the various research engaging under the ‘climate umbrella’, so when I discuss the emerging climate psychology, I am referring to leading researchers who aim to increase their influence in policymaking bodies, in particular to contribute to research that can generate more public adherence to mitigation politics (see Nielsen et al., 2020).

Psychologically oriented studies with climate change or global warming among the keywords increased (Clayton & Manning, 2018) particularly after the APA Task Force report on the Interface between Psychology and Global Climate Change (Swim et al., 2009) called for more research on the issue. Researchers from different subfields in psychology engage under a fairly all-embracing climate umbrella covering research that draws on very different psychological concepts or theories, applies different methodologies, and is published in different journals with relatively little internal cross-fertilization. This is also the case within the wider mainstream psychological perspectives. In other words, the emerging climate psychology continues a characteristic of psychological science today, namely different groups studying different things (Teo, 2018; Zittoun, et al., 2009), governed by different scientific norms, and with specialist languages with “very limited mutual intelligibility” (Danziger, 2013, p. 838).

Clayton et al. (2015) placed the research contributions on climate change into three broad categories; public perceptions of climate change, behavioural drivers of climate change and mitigation responses, and the association between climate change and psychosocial wellbeing. Psychological research has focused on mental health impairments and existential climate anxiety faced with the present or future threat of climate change (Clayton, 2020a), and
the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Sixth assessment report, to be released in 2021, is expected to focus more on mental health impacts than previous assessments (Clayton, 2020b). Experiences of loss among Indigenous communities exposed to changing weather threatening livelihoods have recently received researchers’ attention (Middleton, et al., 2020). However, the cumulative effects of a changing climate and green-labelled extractive industries are largely left unattended in psychological research.

Most psychological studies on climate behaviour are carried out in so-called WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) societies (Henrich, et al., 2010) and have an individualistic focus, or define ‘the public’ as the researched population, with little attention to class, gender or ethnicity (Nielsen et al., 2020). Such research may derive from mainstream psychology assumptions that human minds are psychologically similar ‘everywhere’ (Toomela, 2010). This framing may further be linked to the trajectory of mainstream psychological science in promoting “independent self-ways”, which means a tendency to focus on people’s or objects’ properties rather than their surrounding context (Adams & Estrada-Villalta, 2017). In research in WEIRD settings, this plays out in psychologists’ efforts to address individual failure or success in choosing green consumption options (e.g. Stoknes, 2014). There follow deliberations on various soft power techniques to influence consumer behaviour (e.g. green nudging) (Bonini, et al. 2018; et al., 2017); or studies of which cognitive or emotional barriers may hinder behavioural change (Stoll-Kleemann, et al., 2001). The emphasis on individual behaviour in the mainstream climate psychology as either the problem or the solution to climate change is seen by psychologists who identify as critical as downplaying the influence of social context, discourse, power, and affects (Adams, 2021). Blind spots are also identified by leading researchers in the field themselves. Of relevance in this study is their call for interdisciplinary study designs to increase comprehension of the sociocultural contexts where green transitions are embedded (Nielsen et al., 2020). But their call is mainly for psychologists to collaborate to increase efficiency in climate change policies and less to explore the experiences among people that climate change mitigation and renewable energy development negatively affect or to reflect more critically on the effects of the policies. This thesis aims to fill this gap through empirical research on Indigenous and Tribal communities’ experiences with this double burden of climate change and green-labelled industries in their territories.

My research will expand on how social psychologists contributed with critical knowledge about people’s experiences with large-scale renewable energy industrial development where they live (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015; Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017).
These studies were guided by theoretical and conceptual frameworks from social psychology, such as Social Representations Theory (SRT), on people’s meaning-making processes during the implementation of wind power (Batel, et al., 2016; Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017; Upham & Johansen, 2020) and advanced reflections on what these large-scale projects represent to rural communities. But while this research has contributed to increasing knowledge about why these projects generate protest in specific Global North settings, there is an absence of published research from the Global South and Indigenous communities, often – though not always – located in the southern hemisphere. In the next section, where I outline my research aims, I will narrate how my thesis intends to fill this gap.

The traditions within psychological science’s critical subdisciplines of accompaniment and theorisation in contexts of power asymmetry, marginalisation, and oppression, are only starting to engage explicitly with the climate crisis (Adams, 2021; Teo, 2018). As of writing this thesis, certain critical contributions from community psychologists have been published (e.g. Barnwell, et al., 2020; Fernandes-Jesus, et al., 2020). However, the broader picture is still one of blind spots in empirical studies that can provide us with more knowledge about how the “double burden” of climate change translates into lived experience and how people make meaning out of it. Because leading researchers developing ‘climate psychology’ produce research as inputs to policymakers of green transitions, I argue that failure to pay attention to marginalized communities’ experiences with green-labelled extractive industries contributes to their exclusion rather than inclusion in the climate agendas. Critical and decolonial scholars have shared insights into climate change’s structural and colonial roots (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018; Adams, 2020, 2021), but as yet there has not been much empirical research published on communities’ lived experiences with “green colonialism” (Fernandes-Jesus et al., 2020). These gaps prompted my concern for the need to push the research agenda, and with this thesis, my intention is to fill a gap in psychological literature by centring on some of the voices from people in Indigenous and Tribal communities who are confronting the ‘double burden’ of climate change. While ‘critical psychologies’ are manifold, and delimitations between subdisciplines in psychology are not definite, I will in the following chapters propose how cultural psychology and critical community psychology, in dialogue with decolonial theory, may offer alternative methodologies and theoretical frameworks for psychology on how climate change and climate change mitigation affect people.
Main aim and the contribution of the thesis

The overarching aim of this thesis is to analyse the lived experiences and meaning-making of people from Indigenous and Tribal communities where green-labelled extractive industries and climate change mitigation add to the “insidious loops” (Whyte, 2018) of longstanding discrimination and dispossession of land rights, and to analyse the effects of climate change itself on Indigenous and Tribal life-worlds. In the thesis, I draw on the indigenous Saami conceptualization of “green colonialism” and ask what this means in terms of social and psychological experience. Through a theoretical framework that melds cultural and community psychology with decolonial theories, I theorise meaning-making as a socioculturally situated, intersubjective, dialogical, creative, and ultimately political process, through which (potentially critical) knowledge can be created. In chapter 3, I further outline how I conceptualise meaning-making and lived experience in the study.

I thus aim to contribute to the emerging ‘climate psychology’ (e.g. Hoggett, 2019) with an empirical study constructed through a critical and decolonial methodology. In line with other researchers (Adams, 2021; Teo, 2018), I argue that the evolving ‘mainstream’ climate psychology outlined above has paid too little attention to how hegemonic climate change mitigation models impact Indigenous peoples. This omission has consequences as psychological science produces discourses that increasingly influence climate change policymaking (Clayton, 2020b) and also mould humans’ self-understanding (Brinkmann, 2005; Teo, 2012). Aware that ‘mainstream psychology’ may be a vague term for many psychologists, I use it in the thesis for the reason that many cultural, community and decolonial psychologists use the phrase to refer to dominant perspectives in psychology that lack analysis of the ontological, epistemological and ethico-political principles underlying the discipline (Teo, 2009; Toomela, 2014). The term, in my view, is helpful in analysing the main tendencies in psychology, even when particular researchers’ work may align with both mainstream and critical perspectives in psychology. A decolonial lens may further problematize the ‘critical’ category. For instance, from a European viewpoint, Marxist psychology is critical of the mainstream (Bhavnani, et al., 2014), but an Indigenous community may experience Marxist psychology as yet another mainstream Eurocentric science unable to grasp their realities (Grosfoguel, 2018; Kuokkanen, 2011).

The epistemological considerations that follow the decolonial turn that currently influences social sciences and the humanities (Maldonado-Torres, 2017) have motivated cultural and community psychologists to rethink research and practice (Fernández, et al. 2021; Pickren, 2018). These perspectives allow perceiving that people’s epistemological location may
provide unique places for generating critical knowledge about different phenomena (de Sousa Santos, 2014; Fine, et al., 2016). Thus, my argument – drawing on the analytical concept of ‘critical bifocality’ (Weis & Fine, 2018) developed in critical community psychology to consider how researchers may account empirically for lives and structures in shifting contexts – is that people’s narratives of their lived experiences and meaning-making are much more than intrapsychic phenomena. Meaning-making is, as stated above, a profoundly social and political process and counts as a valuable source of knowledge generated from particular vantage points about the central features of the structures and policies we study.

My ambition is that the empirical findings as presented in this thesis can contribute to policy fields of climate action by identifying and analysing the harm that green-labelled extractive industries and climate change mitigation may impose on Indigenous and Tribal communities. Despite advances in Indigenous peoples’ legal protection in contemporary societies, colonial legacies (Bobowik, et al., 2018), affect intercultural relations, public institutions, knowledge production and economic politics, and still shape Indigenous peoples’ prospects for the future. In the thesis, I argue that excluding Indigenous and Tribal communities’ knowledges and perspectives from the climate agenda may have even broader consequences than these communities’ immediate and long-term experiences because their knowledges, philosophies and practices are important to the development of more sustainable ways of life for the larger community (e.g. Bradbury, 2019). While the need to guarantee Indigenous and Tribal rights is often articulated as a need to locally compensate the historical debt from colonialism and assimilation policies, Indigenous authors highlight that Indigenous sustainable ways of life provide good learning examples for the broader humanity (Davis & Todd, 2017; Krenak, 2020; Whyte, 2017; see also Adams, 2020). The global value of Indigenous Knowledge (IK) is recognised including by the UN Climate and Biodiversity panels (IBPS, 2019; IPCC, 2019). I thus offer the thesis as a contribution to rethinking key trends in climate change mitigation and renewable energy.

While my research aims were motivated by a general concern with how Indigenous and Tribal communities have denounced their exclusion from the climate agenda, I do not intend to make the homogenizing claim that Indigenous peoples’ experiences are the same across the planet. This study contributes with two unique case studies from Brazil and one from Norway, where Indigenous and Tribal communities have contested the implementation of green-labelled extractive industries – specifically wind power, agrofuels and bauxite mining – in their territories. The rationale for selecting these three cases is presented below, while a more detailed introduction to the sociocultural context of each of the case studies is provided in the
methodology chapter. To pursue my research aims I formulated the following overarching research questions:

**Research questions**

This study was guided by the overarching research questions:

1. How do people in the Southern Saami, Amazon and Guaraní and Kaiowá contexts narrate their lived experiences related to climate change mitigation and climate change?
2. How did their lived experiences of confrontations with the industries lead to meaning-making and knowledge construction across the three research contexts?
3. How can the methodological approaches chosen for this study, and the main findings of the thesis, be contributions to develop a more socially engaged and inclusive psychological research on human experiences with climate change?

The two first research questions are dealt with in the three papers summarised in chapter 5 (results), which lay the groundwork for this thesis. I moreover continue the discussion of main findings in the thesis’s discussion in chapter 6. I reflect on the third research question throughout all the three papers and chapters of the thesis.

**Case selection**

To explore the research questions, I undertake a multi-site approach (Jenkins, et al., 2018) and conduct research in three socio-culturally different contexts in Brazil and Norway. In all three of them, people from communities with Indigenous and Tribal identities are engaging in various forms of social and legal struggle to prevent the further advancement of extractive industries with green labelling and renewable energy development in their territories. The use of the terms ‘Tribal’ and ‘Indigenous’ in this thesis draws on the definitions of ILO convention 169.³ In what follows, I define these research sites as distinct cases (Morgan, 2012), grounded in their particular regional, temporal, sociocultural, inter-subjective and politico-economic dynamics. Each of the three cases sheds light on how global climate change mitigation and green economy models interact with the “insidious loops” (Whyte, 2018) of dispossession and marginalization that these Indigenous and Tribal communities were already contesting. I reflect on these cases

---

³ Indigenous peoples are defined as descending from populations inhabiting a geographical region prior to the colonisation or the establishment of present state boundaries, and, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions. Tribal people too are defined as people with social, cultural and economic conditions distinguishing them from other sections of a national community, and at least partially regulated by their own customs. For both groups, self-identification is a fundamental criterion (for details, see Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989). In Brazil, the Amazon communities are often entitled rights by being considered “Tribal peoples”, and therefore in the thesis I am using the term “Tribal” to connect to legal discourses.
as dialogical cases because rather than providing evidence for generalizations, they offer knowledge to engage in dialogues with potential audiences (Cornish, 2020), which in this study are academics, policymakers and other affected communities. I draw on a cultural psychology perspective which prefers idiographic research that prioritises the richness of individual differences between cases over homogenizing or strictly comparative cases (Lehmann, et al., 2019). In the methodology chapter, I will introduce these cases in more detail, while here I focus on the rationale for their inclusion.

The indigenous Guarani and Kaiowá peoples’ struggle against green-labelled agribusiness comprises the first case (paper III). In the Brazilian state of Mato Grosso do Sul, many Guarani and Kaiowá families are involved in historical battles to reclaim their lands occupied by agribusiness flex-crop economy actors producing agrofuels for national and international markets. In the thesis, I refer to this product as ‘agrofuels’, in line with the literature that recognises the environmental and social consequences of its production (Altieri, 2009). The violent conditions in which the Guarani and Kaiowá families live are widely acknowledged (e.g. Ioris, 2019; Naccache, 2019). Their situation can be seen as a ‘worst-case scenario’ revealing the gravity of some of the structural problems of green growth models, and particularly how these models create “Green Sacrifice Zones” (Lynch & Veland, 2018; Zografos & Robbins, 2020), in which human and non-human lives are ‘sacrificed’ to develop low-carbon economies elsewhere.

The next two case studies (paper II and paper I) are interconnected through a green-labelled supply chain, illuminating how “green grabbing” (Fairhead, et al., 2012) or the appropriation of resources and territories for climate action may connect places and structure peoples’ lived experiences crisscrossing territories in the Global North and South. First, I study the lived experiences and meaning-making of the indigenous Southern Saami in Norway who are resisting the construction of large-scale wind turbines in the mountains where they have ancestral ties and carry out reindeer herding (paper I and paper II). Second, I study the experiences of Amazon communities in Brazil confronted with the bauxite-aluminium value chain of transnational companies Alcoa and Norsk Hydro in the eastern Amazon (paper II). In the vertical integration of the aluminium sector (Gendron, et al., 2013), bauxite is refined into alumina, which is then shipped from Brazil to the same companies’ plants in other countries, where it is smelted into aluminium. In green transitions, this metal has become extremely lucrative (Mäkitie et al., 2020) as it is used to produce renewable energy infrastructure and substitute for heavier metals, such as steel, in the automobile industry. However, aluminium smelting impacts the environment and increases emissions (Haraldsson & Johansson, 2019),
adding to the globally growing demand for renewable energy sources to fuel the sector. Two of the wind power projects in the Saami herding mountains studied here, namely Fosen Vind DA and Øyfjellet Vind (see paper I and paper II), will provide Alcoa’s and Norsk Hydro’s plants in Norway with the renewable energy needed to position the aluminium as ‘green’ and sustainable. In conjunction, these two latter case studies exemplify the interconnection between Indigenous and Tribal communities’ struggles against extractive industries in Global North and South locations. Public debates concerning the socio-environmental impact of wind energy in Norway have underestimated the broader picture of how wind energy development is linked to extractive industries with global impacts through supply chains (paper II). Creating awareness of the global implications of these linkages is essential in establishing more socially just and inclusive green transitions (Paul, 2020; Zografos & Robbins, 2020).

The criterion for selecting the three cases was that in all of them people with Indigenous and Tribal identities are outspoken about the harm that climate change mitigation and renewable energy is causing them, although both Brazil and Norway are signatories to ILO 169 and UNDRIP. In all three case studies, I study the meaning-making among participants who maintained a critical stance towards the industries (however ambivalent or tensioned it might be), and the thesis should be read with this in mind. No community is homogeneous, and further study will be needed. Here I seek to learn from people who developed a critique against the implications of green economies for their communities.

A strength of the multi-site study design is that I situate the research in both the Global South and Global North. The thesis thus contributes with empirical evidence to the decolonial literature that discusses central dynamics in contemporary capitalism, where the distinctions between the geographical Global South as a raw material supplier and the Global North as a commodity extractor are becoming diluted (Quijano, 2007). In the present, “the abyssal line” (de Sousa Santos, 2017), a conceptualization that pinpoints the border between inclusions and exclusions of humans and groups in the present colonial world, may crisscross geographies and no longer be restricted to a geographical North/South divide. Empirical research in countries as different as Norway and Brazil contributes to understanding the dynamics of exclusions through the meaning-making and lived experiences of study participants. In paper II, for instance, I present research on how the Saami participants narrate the dynamics of their exclusion in Norway, a country that is considered internationally to be a promoter of Indigenous rights (Jentoft, et al., 2003). Thus, this study design allows a widening of the analysis of how globalisation, in tandem with colonial legacies, transforms lived experiences in particular national and local contexts. In addition, studying the impact of green transitions on different
Indigenous and Tribal communities can shed light on how climate action must be reconsidered to stop violating Indigenous rights.

Outline of the thesis

The thesis is structured in the following way: In the background chapter, I provide an overview of key aspects of global climate policies and some of the impasses of climate policies as voiced by Indigenous delegations attending global forums. In the theoretical framework chapter, I outline how combining perspectives from decolonial theories, cultural psychology and community psychology allowed me to centre on meaning-making and lived experience as central concepts to engage with empirically. My argument is that the decolonial perspectives currently inspiring psychological science’s critical subfields are good alternatives if psychologists want to contribute to socially just green transitions with their research and practice. In the methodology chapter, I outline how the methodology cycle (Valsiner, 2017), which asserts that research designs are strengthened by assuming a dynamic relationship between theory, research phenomena and methods, oriented my research strategies. I also narrate the sociocultural contexts of each case study, provide an overview of the methods, and reflect critically on some of the ethical dilemmas and shortcomings I identify in my research. I then summarise the findings and embark on a discussion, where I reflect on the findings and suggest pathways for future psychological research and policymaking.
2. **Background: Climate policies, and Indigenous critiques.**

**Climate change and policies**

“Is this planet turning into an uninhabitable hothouse?” the postcolonial philosopher Achille Mbembe (2019) asks. Since the beginning of this doctoral project in 2017, reports of extreme weather events that alter and threaten human and animal lives have been mounting. The United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that threats to health, livelihoods, food security, water supply, human security, and economic growth will continue to increase in the coming years, with disproportionately higher risks to vulnerable populations, including Indigenous peoples and other communities dependent on agricultural and coastal livelihoods (IPCC, 2019). Climate change is also a “driver” contributing to significant biodiversity loss, high rates of species extinction, and changes in ecosystem functions (IPBES, 2019). From 2002, “the Anthropocene” was relaunched by atmospheric chemist Paul Crutzen (2002) to describe our epoch in which human activity is transforming the earth’s surface environments. At the centre of our epoch’s focal challenges is climate change as an urgent existential crisis on a planetary scale (Zalasiewicz, et al., 2011). The effects of the climate crisis exacerbate other crises, such as famine, forced migration, and violent conflict (Clayton, 2020a).

Global efforts to deal with climate change and global warming led to the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988. But the uneven distribution of extreme weather events and the political denial of global warming and anthropogenic causes (Dunlap & McCright, 2010) delayed global commitments to develop mitigation strategies. Today, IPCC's reports demonstrate the matter’s urgency and a sense of gravity characterises global policy discourses (Lynch & Veland, 2018; Wilson & Orlove, 2019). The Paris Agreement adopted by 195 countries in 2015 built on the earlier United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and rescued the global consensus that the climate crisis is a shared concern (Robbins, 2016). Through National Determined Contributions (NDCs), countries commit to social and economic transformation to reduce emissions and halt global warming. The Conference of the Parties (COP), which meets regularly, intends to make the agreements operational (Seo, 2017). The Paris Agreement, although centring on mitigation, has not led to a break with ‘green growth’ or the growth-based green economy paradigms developed after the Rio + 20 conference in 2012, promoted by OECD, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), and the World Bank (Hickel & Kallis, 2020). While the green economy and green growth are defined in manifold ways (Merino-Saum, et al., 2020), these models share the belief that technological development and a free-market-based economy can enable continued economic growth decoupled from environmental impacts. The prevailing
green growth models make reducing energy demand become less pronounced in countries’ national policies, while strategies of boosting energy efficiency through developing renewable energy sources have taken precedence (Giacomelli et al. 2020; Nieto, et al., 2018). This has prompted investments in renewable energy projects, chiefly hydropower, wind power, solar power, and agrofuels, through combinations of public funds, state investment banks, private banks, and multilateral development banks (Sovacool, 2021). In 2019, two UN reports addressed how land-use change and environmental damage – often following these kinds of projects – are responsible for climate change and ecosystem loss (IBPS, 2019; IPCC, 2019). Renewable energy developments, mainly taking place in rural areas, may also affect communities already vulnerable to climate change (Marino & Ribot, 2012), as this thesis aims to illustrate.

**Indigenous perspectives**

Indigenous and Tribal communities are among the “frontline communities”, meaning that they are the ones that experience climate change and escalating ecological destruction “first and worst” (Monani & Adamson; Sanders, 2020). These communities’ increased vulnerability to climate change is related to their geographic location, their spiritual and cultural connection to the land and territory and because they often share a history of colonial exploitation and dispossession (Adelman, 2018). This is what Whyte (2018) refers to as “insidious loops”. The problem is that renewable energy development often reinforces these patterns rather than bringing about a change. Indigenous groups have consequently struggled for the new carbon market rules that require respect for human rights and indigenous rights, and that states carry out meaningful consultations of Indigenous communities prior to the approval of renewable energy projects in their territories (Newell & Taylor, 2020). *Meaningful* is an important word in this context. The principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), delineated in UNDRIP and ILO 169, require signatory States to ensure that Indigenous peoples affected by a project have sufficient information and adequate time to decide whether and how a project implementation can proceed (Tomlinson, 2019). But violations of rights may be overlooked by governments if interests are sufficiently big, or companies and governments engage in minimal tick-box procedures during consultations (Hanna & Vanclay, 2013; Kuokkanen, 2019). Exclusion from the broader conversation about climate change mitigation (Herman, 2021) the sacrificing of Indigenous rights in green transitions is implied in the notion of “green colonialism” conceptualized by indigenous Saami thinkers and politicians (Saami-Council, 2017). Land disputes are not new, but instead of implying a change of course, green economies have escalated the pressure on Indigenous cultures (Fairhead et al., 2012; Marino & Ribot, 13
Positive framing as ‘green’ and ‘sustainable’ may lead to a resurgence of historical prejudices that categorize subsistence practices as inefficient, and indigenous customs as inferior (Finley-Brook & Thomas, 2011), making it difficult for Indigenous peoples, who are often national minorities, to be heard. Even the spread of different versions of the more progressive ‘Green New Deal’, promoted by political parties and trade unions to secure a socially just green transition based on green jobs, may mean continued colonisation for Indigenous peoples if green industrialisation continues to depend on mineral extraction in their territories (Cohen & Riofrancos, 2020; Zografos & Robbins, 2020). In paper II, I discuss this dilemma through a decolonial conceptualization of intercultural relations.

An international articulation of Indigenous peoples has succeeded in influencing the climate agendas, and Indigenous Knowledge should be, according to IPCC (2019), included in the national climate agendas of the Paris Agreement’s signatory States. An acknowledgement of Indigenous practices as historically sustainable, along with recognition of the insidious loops of disproportionate impacts of climate change, land-loss, violence and marginalization (David-Chavez & Gavin, 2018; Whyte, 2018) is the backdrop of UN’s recommendation to include Indigenous knowledge in climate agendas. Despite affirming the importance of taking account of Indigenous Knowledge, research has pointed to procedural, conceptual and structural challenges (Brugnach, et al., 2017; Ford et al., 2016) in translating this into policies. When writing this thesis, in Norway, I could not find evidence of a governmental discussion, or curiosity, about the inclusion of Saami knowledge in the country’s 2021 climate agenda (Meld. St. 13 (2020–2021); see also Jaakkola, et al., 2018, p. 410), even when research suggests that Saami reindeer pastoralist activities may have several positive effects on rapidly changing social- ecological systems (J. Cohen et al., 2013; Horstkotte et al., 2017). The 2009 Nature Diversity Act in Norway includes Indigenous experienced-based knowledge as important for consideration in projects that may affect biodiversity, but there was no evidence of policy development to ensure that this is followed up. When Norway updated its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Agreements in February 2020, consultation procedures with indigenous Saami were barely mentioned, and with no references to the knowledge aspect (UNFCCC, 2020).

In Brazil, the issue is complex because an element of the country’s commitment to the Paris Agreement involves preventing further deforestation in the Amazon and therefore intersects with Indigenous land rights in the Amazon (Villén-Pérez, et al., 2020). In the updated NDCs, Brazil mentions the national and international frameworks that regulate Indigenous rights. However, the inclusion of Indigenous peoples in policy development in Brazil is limited
(WWF, 2020), adding to a broader picture in which Indigenous and Tribal rights and environmental law have suffered alarming setbacks under the current presidency of Jair Bolsonaro (Abessa et al., 2019; Ferrante & Fearnside, 2019).

The brief mentions in both countries’ NDCs – formulated as some level of inclusion in planning stages, rather than a more solid inclusion of Indigenous knowledges – reflect what Agrawal (1995) problematized as the aspirations to empower marginalized people, without an understanding that more profound shifts in existing power relations are critical to sustainable development. A related question is exactly how Indigenous knowledge might be ‘included’ in meaningful ways into hegemonic climate agendas. This is because, on a general level, many Indigenous cosmovisions and philosophies reject the commodification of natural resources that hegemonic green growth models represent. I adopt a view in this thesis that avoids essentializing Indigenous knowledges as stable or “locked” units (Agrawal, 1995; Goldman et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2016) and instead consider them as multiple and diverse and evolving through dialogues with others and in response to changes in both symbolic and material environments on multiple levels. I also problematize whether they can be isolated as units and incorporated into Western schemes of green growth. Western systems can extract, de-politicise, and decontextualise Indigenous knowledges – assimilating them into Western models (Grosfoguel, 2016; Kuokkanen, 2000; Latulippe & Klenk, 2020), with weak or absent accountability (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Gaudry, 2011; Kuokkanen, 2011). This is a central question in the epistemological debates in decolonial theorisation, and I will return to the matter in the theoretical framework section.

When the Paris Agreement and other treaties fail to address global inequalities in their design and implementation, the possibilities for rethinking ontological pluralism and epistemological critique may be weakened (Klenk et al., 2017; Nightingale et al., 2020; O’Reilly et al., 2020). This is not to say that the UN’s inclusion of the demand for Indigenous Knowledges lacks importance. It results from Indigenous peoples’ enduring struggles to gain space in global forums. But these processes are dialectical, and efforts run the risk of being absorbed into – even legitimizing – global discourses and becoming denuded of critical content.

Indigenous practices, cosmovisions, and philosophies vary widely among different peoples. This is why many insist on the word knowledges in the plural form (Smith et al., 2016; Whyte, 2017), and in this thesis, I have retained the plural version. From the viewpoint of Indigenous ways of knowing, scholars have also questioned the term “climate change” per se, arguing that the ecological crisis instead should be understood more holistically (Bacon, 2019; Goldman et al., 2018), a point taken up in decolonial theories, as I outline below. In the thesis,
because I draw on different kinds of literature, I will use the terms “climate crisis”, “climate change”, “Anthropocene” and “ecological crisis” interchangeably while recognising that they may refer to different but also interconnected aspects of the current crisis.
3. Theoretical framework

I draw mainly on three fields of research to establish a theoretical framework for the study. These are decolonial theories, cultural psychology, and community psychology. In particular, the thesis engages with literature that has sought to reconsider and strengthen cultural psychology and community psychology through engagement with decolonial perspectives. This combined theoretical framework offered me a broad set of tools to approach the fields and undertake research. In the following, I start by outlining each research field that informed the study. Then I present the study’s theoretical framework before ending the chapter with a discussion of the concept of dialogical epistemologies that helped me construe a dialogical and reflexive approach to the research contexts, building on major reflections from decolonial theories.

Three fields of research

The decolonial turn
Decolonial theory, or theories, are diverse, and it is helpful to clarify the origins and definitions of the main decolonial concepts I draw on in this thesis. Anticolonial struggles around the world and through time, reaching interconnected global articulation in the 20th century, were the roots of several theoretical schools that question modern forms of colonisation (Barreto, 2012; Bhambra, 2014). For example, postcolonial studies (Chakrabarty, 2008; Said, 1979), settler-colonial studies (Bacon, 2019; Veracini, 2013; Whyte, 2018) or decoloniality theory (Maldonado-Torres, 2011; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). These perspectives share that they originate from concrete struggles against the effects of European imperialism and colonisation across the planet. They analyse how colonial systems formed racial and ethnic hierarchies that contemporary societies still reproduce on different levels, including in academic knowledge production (Adams, Kurtiș, Ordóñez, Molina, & Oropeza, 2018; Álvarez & Coolsaet, 2020; Maldonado-Torres, 2007; Smith, 2013). Maldonado-Torres (2011) called this ‘shift’ towards decoloniality as an unfinished project the “decolonial turn”, and during this research project, such decolonial perspectives were amplified within the social sciences and the humanities. These decolonial theories vary in how they thematise the colony, its effects on the present, and what a decolonising process may look like (Bhambra, 2014; Kerner, 2014). Rather than providing a review of decolonial contributions, in this thesis I focus mainly on how different decolonial perspectives currently influence cultural and community psychologies, and bring these perspectives with me to explore the study’s subject matter. In particular, I draw on Indigenous scholars’ methodological critiques (e.g. Denzin et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2016), along with authors working with decoloniality theory originating in the Latin American context.
(Escobar, 2007; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Quijano, 2007) and postcolonial scholars who work at the intersection between epistemological and phenomenological perspectives (e.g. Mbembe, 2019; de Sousa Santos, 2016).

**Decoloniality**

Quijano (2007) coined the term “coloniality of power”, to refer to the European colonisation of Latin America and the Atlantic slave trade as a significant historical event that in large part became the origin of the structuring of the current world system (see also Ramón Grosfoguel, 2006; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2014). The emerging literature assumes that these events began to develop enduring power patterns, with multiple effects into the present, influencing economic relations, cultural dynamics, knowledge production, and intercultural relations. Coloniality refers to a matrix of power in the modern world rather than economic or cultural dynamics in specific territories (Quijano, 2007). So, even if the conceptualisation emerged from the Latin American reality, there are ambitions among these theorists of inspiring appropriate analytical frameworks for research also outside of Latin America (Bhatia & Priya, 2018). In these scholars’ perspective, as put by Maldonado-Torres, coloniality is so all-encompassing that “in a way, as modern subjects, we breathe coloniality all the time and every day” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

Quijano’s work gave rise to adjacent conceptualisations, and in this thesis, I draw on the concepts of “coloniality of being” (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018; Maldonado-Torres, 2007), and “coloniality of knowledge” (Lander, 2000), because of how they are informing current decolonial approaches within cultural and community psychology. Coloniality of being addresses the effects of coloniality in our lived experiences, (inter)subjectivities, and languages. The concept developed in dialogue with phenomenology (Maldonado-Torres, 2007), and for decolonial psychologists, it has become a lens to illuminate how coloniality frames our social and psychological existence (Bhatia, 2020a; Bulhan, 2015; Maldonado-Torres, 2007). When some psychologists propose to “decolonise” psychological research, this entails documenting how colonising processes affect people’s being in the world, all the way from our intrapsychic experiences to family relationships, communities, nations, intercultural relations, institutions and knowledge production (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018; Bhatia, 2020b; Nandy, 1982). Next, coloniality of knowledge is a lens that problematizes the global hegemonic position of Western epistemologies in contemporary society and academic knowledge production. This means that Western hegemonic knowledge, although it is claimed to be universal in scope, can be considered a “provincial” or local knowledge (Escobar, 2007; Mignolo, 2007). *But* it still has enough power to mute the
knowledges of people and communities in the Global South locations, produced from different epistemes, different material realities and with different purposes (de Sousa Santos, 2014). Manifold critical scholarly traditions influencing psychological research today analyse how power is displayed and reproduced through academic knowledge production (e.g. Alcoff & Potter, 2013; Foucault, 2002; Rose, 1998). However, among the more unique contributions from the decolonial scholars is the insistence that, without considering this dimension of coloniality, the entanglement of power in knowledge production is not accurately analysed (Adams, Kurtiš, et al., 2018; Bhatia, 2020b).

Psychologists who take up these critiques to ‘decolonise’ psychological science draw attention to how research designs and practice have reproduced colonial dynamics (Adams, Kurtiš, et al., 2018), and there is enough dark matter to sort through. Historical brutal examples show how psychological science informed colonial regimes’ torture methods (Fanon, 2007; see also Patel, 2020) or reinforced racism through interpreting racial differences based on skewed IQ tests (Teo, 2008). Also more subtle colonial routes of psychological science, which may require more careful analysis, receive attention. The latter focus centres on the effects of omissions in research designs – in, for example, what kinds of research questions we ask (or fail to ask) – and it interrogates the tendency in psychological science to reformulate problems of structural injustice as individual problems (Bhatia, 2020b). If we look at the extreme case of torture again, we can through this lens critique its ‘psychologisation’ – namely, the singular research focus on how torture is experienced individually, which obscures its political nature (Patel, 2011). These perspectives also underline the importance of making space for Indigenous knowledges, arts, storytelling and community perspectives in psychological research (Bhatia, 2020a; Smith et al., 2016). This sheds light on the research gaps I highlighted in the introduction chapter as embedded in larger dynamics of coloniality of knowledge, and suggest that if psychologists fail to include people from Global South locations or marginalised communities in climate research this adds to the construction of the invisibility of their lived experiences and their knowledge contributions. In this thesis, *knowledges* is moreover a central theme because of the different knowledge systems at play in global climate debates, and because of how in the transformation of landscapes and territorial disputes interrelated with industrial developments, certain knowledges are lost – perhaps forever – because their material basis is destroyed or weakened, a process dubbed “epistemicide” by de Sousa Santos (2014).

*Extractivism*

“Extractivism” has become another key analytical concept in decolonial theorisation. The concept has a longer genealogy, but clarity was gained by Gudynas (2018) definition of
Extractivism as the current capitalist system that is based on intense and large-scaled extraction and exportation of natural resources, often from places in the Global South. Extractivism is seen as deeply engrained in colonial structures (Gudynas, 2018; Grosfogel, 2016). The philosophical idea behind this argument is that through the process of colonialism “senses of mastery” engendered in European ways of being and knowing, not only over the nature that became conceived as an exploitable “basket of resources” (Gudynas, 2018) but over the subjects in the colonies, considered racially inferior (Fanon, 2008; Maldonado-Torres, 2017). For decolonial theorists, therefore, the same extractivist ideas that trap people in relations of colonial difference lead us to the current ecological crisis. Hence, the climate crisis is considered a symptom of the deep crisis of coloniality and modernity (Adelman, 2015), to the extent that modernity failed to enable a sustainable world (Escobar, 2007; Stein, 2019).

The interrelatedness leads decolonial scholars to reject “quick fixes” as possible solutions to the climate crisis because short-run interventions leave untouched its “deep-seated structures and agencies” (de Sousa Santos, 2014, p. 28). A dilemma is that the deep perception of urgency disseminated in scientific reports and pressing political debates about climate change may well endorse action (Lynch & Veland, 2018), but reduce our capability for political imagination and hamper a more substantial, possibly decolonising, social transformation (de Sousa Santos, 2014, p. 28). That renewable energy infrastructures and other ‘green’ industries – substitutions for the fossil industry – require increased mineral extraction and extensive agrofuel production, often carried out in the Global South (Zografos & Robbins, 2020), displays the limitations of global climate plans in this perspective.

The ‘doubleness’ of extractivism, as both an economic system generating ecological degradation, and as a way of being, is illustrated by how people in WEIRD societies can develop a “blind eye” (Bulhan, 2015) towards how the ecological burdens and footprints of their unsustainable consumption patterns are transferred to distant communities, where large-scale renewable energy projects and mining industries proliferate (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018). This is among the critiques that some decolonial scholars direct to even progressive versions of the Green New Deal that aim for social inclusion and generating green jobs (e.g. Dunlap, 2021; Zografos & Robbins, 2020). I draw on these scholars in paper II in which I discuss how GND programmes may end up reproducing colonial intercultural relations. A central point is that the sense of urgency in creating climate-friendly work options in Global North settings, makes the ecological damage produced by green industrialisation in the Global South invisible, or ensures it is downplayed in public discourse.
It may appear that the North-South binary in decolonial discourse disregards how people living in metropolitan centres in the southern hemisphere may also be ‘engaged’ in ways of being that reproduce such exclusions, or generate high amounts of GHG emissions, while communities in the northern hemisphere may subsist in conditions of exclusion and structural violence. In this thesis, I draw on scholars that conceptualise the contemporary North/South division as an epistemological partition rather than a geographical one (de Sousa Santos, 2014, 2016; Grosfoguel, 2018). Because coloniality since its origin enforced a colonial difference between North and South, these researchers underline that building strong metanarratives is necessary for the process of decolonisation (Grosfoguel, 2018), and thus maintain (but renews the content of) the North/South categorisation, recognising that in the contemporary world, lines of exclusion and inclusion to a larger degree criss-cross geographies; as this thesis exemplifies through the selection of case studies. While Latin America and other geographies in the southern hemisphere occupied the space of raw material providers during the era of formal colonies, following the expansion of extractivist models, locations in the hemispherical Global North occupy similar spaces today.

Whereas the Latin American decoloniality ‘school’ proposed coloniality as a concept, these scholars draw on a diverse family of theories that conceive coloniality as a fundamental problem of the modern world and where knowledge production is a core element (Bhambra, 2014; Fernández et al., 2021). Of particular note is how diverse Indigenous cosmologies, philosophies and knowledge systems influence decolonial theory. Indigenous communities have struggled for the recognition of their knowledge systems not only as filtered through academic interlocutors, and have questioned colonial hierarchies of knowledge production (Gaudry, 2011; Smith et al., 2016), even confronting decolonial schools of thought. The lack of recognition of Indigenous authorship is an important ‘internal’ critique of decolonial theorisation (Cusicanqui, 2012; Kuokkanen, 2011; Todd, 2016), and the critique points to how extractivism, analysed epistemologically and philosophically, also characterises much research that “extracts raw data” from Indigenous communities, and accumulates money and power through publications (Gaudry, 2011). Developing non-extractivist methodologies is a concern for decolonial scholars (de Sousa Santos, 2018), but as North/South partitions affect academic knowledge production, much decolonial theory is published from academic institutions in the North, with limited access for the majority. In the methodology chapter, I, in light of these discussions, discuss how and to which degree I consider that the thesis advances a more humanised research process.
Cultural psychology perspectives

Cultural psychology has roots going back to philosophies of the 18th century but has had a revival in the last 30 years (Shweder et al., 2007), partially to restore meaning-making as a central concern in psychology. Bruner (1990) is a central author in cultural psychology’s view on meaning. Bruner opposed both what he considered the behaviourist and the cognitivist directions in psychology, arguing that the cognitive turn in psychology, which initially had meant a refreshing change from behaviourist determinism, had withdrawn to consider humans as information processors rather than intentional and creative beings. While Cultural Psychology is a discipline with diverse foci, it develops a view that culture/environment and the psyche mutually constitute one another (Shweder et al., 2007; Vygotsky, 1980). This also means that psychological phenomena are both historically produced and that they transform. This makes it particularly interesting for cultural psychology to study contexts of change (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2015) because during them one can search for and identify different levels of human development. Jovanović (2021) writes that the individualizing and psychologizing turn that mainstream psychological science made shunned the structural sources of human experience and excluded them as targets of critique, in the process inhibiting those transformative potentials that can arise through different kinds of crisis. Social Representations Theory (SRT), which I draw on in paper I, represents one such lens that connects people’s meaning-making to their knowledge construction during processes of rupture and change (Jovchelovitch, 2008; Moscovici, 1981). SRT thinks of people as active agents of contestation, rather than victims, and considers how knowledge construction can be embedded in wider resistance schemes (Howarth, 2006).

Mainstream psychology’s tendency to look at the human mind in fragmented ways is also a central point of critique. In this perspective, the mind is seen as an organized whole, and studying only its different pieces will not move us closer to understanding the phenomena we seek to study. Treating cultural psychology as a subfield in psychology would be contested because, following this view, ‘subfields’ inhibit a more holistic understanding. According to Toomela (2010, p. 12), a “fragmented psychology leads to a chaotic pile of equally fragmented facts; but mind is not fragmented, therefore fragmented facts do not lead to understanding of mind.”

By looking at humans as meaning-makers, cultural psychologists assert that people restructure their environments through everyday practices oriented towards the future (Valsiner, 2007) and through dialogic engagements with others (Marková, 2016). Instead of being conceived as ‘reactors’ to external stimulus, which is implied in some mainstream
psychological science assumptions (Sammut, et al., 2015), people’s intentions and representations of the world are the core. This critique may be relevant to some climate psychological research in western contexts, which, as we saw in the previous section, have mainly studied how individual people react emotionally or cognitively to information about climate change or public policies. This becomes more of a problem since, all the while, humans are self-interpreting beings, and through “looping effects” psychological discourses influence how people see themselves, and hence how they act on the world (Brinkmann, 2005; Hacking, 1995). Perhaps the most compelling contribution that Cultural Psychology may offer to ‘hybrid’ – and nascent – climate psychology is an invitation to recover a more optimistic view of people as agentic and intentional makers of meaning (Shweder et al., 2007).

Cultural psychology has been interested in researching higher psychological functions, including remembering, reasoning and language (Cole, 1998) and human development as it intertwines between the psyche and culture. This may have made some researchers cautious about making any judgements on the epistemic value of other systems of knowledge (Slunecko & Wieser, 2014). But Brinkmann (2016) claims that all psychology has a way of intervening in the world that it studies. This means that psychology is not a value-neutral science and that even a scientific practice that seeks to maintain itself as a neutral observer cannot avoid shaping the reality it observes through the discourses it promotes. In historical-cultural psychology, there are very explicit efforts at putting science in the service of social transformation (Stetsenko, 2008). Motivations that are common among community psychologies, such as (see below) “forming alliances with excluded groups”, seem to be becoming more frequent among cultural psychologists (Pérez Huenteo, 2019). Moreover, there are some initiatives to engage cultural psychology with decoloniality theory. This is both in terms of considering the colonization process of the psychological science itself (Pickren, 2018) and through establishing a dialogue between decolonial theory and cultural psychological concepts such as creativity (Glâveanu & Sierra, 2015), Indigenous territorial claims (Pérez & Marsico, 2021) and political imagination (Bradbury, 2019). In paper III, I connected narratives and collective memories of the past, as crucial meaning-making tools (Brescó, 2017) in the context of agribusiness hegemony, with decolonial conceptualisations of remembering (Mbembe, 2019) and “re-existence” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), in order to explore how the Guarani and Kaiowá formulate a political imagination of a different future, motivating multiple action strategies.

In the broadest sense, the goal of construing a more holistic understanding in psychology (Toomela, 2010) has resemblance with the “decolonial turn”, in which the idea is that transdisciplinarity – meaning that subfields work through each other (Gordon, 2011) – is needed
if psychology is to rethink humanity in decolonizing terms (Maldonado-Torres, 2017). Cultural psychology’s focus on how members of different cultural communities experience (know, think, want, feel, value) and act upon the world, along with its often explicit critique of mainstream psychology, lay the foundations for a dialogue with decoloniality theory with its emphasis on the coloniality of being and knowing (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018; Maldonado-Torres, 2007). Indeed, decolonial psychologists employ cultural psychology perspectives to analyse western culturally independent selfways (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018), which generate a belief in unlimited – and unsustainable – high-energy lifestyles. Whereas decoloniality theory focuses on how oppression and coloniality affects how we know, think, feel, and value, cultural psychology’s ideal of human flourishing (Brinkman, 2016) is more interested in identifying the points of rupture and change (Cole, 1998). Thus, it is a tensioned dialogue with different starting points that can become a fertile ground for research and practice. Maldonado-Torres (2004) makes an interesting point in this regard. According to him, radical critique must always be dialogical and self-questioning, and if the coloniality concepts (power, knowing, being) do not open for “enunciations from non-western cosmologies and for the expression of different cultural, political and social memories”(Maldonado-Torres, 2004, p. 51) they have only limited use in decolonization processes.

Community psychology perspectives
The origins of Community Psychology are often attributed to its founding congress in the US in 1965. Nevertheless, the practice has long and diverse roots (Montero, 1996; Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010), and community psychology seems to mean so many different things in different geographic regions that Fryer and Duckett (2014) prefer to discuss community psychologies, in the plural. Community psychologies, notwithstanding their diversity, often have an upfront value-driven research ethos, highlighting wellbeing, empowerment, social justice, and social transformation as principal goals for theorization and praxis (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). Some directions have had a more direct engagement with, and developed more substantial critiques against, oppressive systems than others. A strong case in this regard is the Latin American Liberation Psychology, developed by the psychologist and Jesuit priest Ignacio Martin-Baró (1994), who worked and wrote from the war-torn country of El Salvador. A core contribution from Liberation Psychology, which can well be regarded as Latin American Community Psychology, argues that psychologists need to rethink their practice. Rather than providing therapy and helping people and communities adapt to pathologically unjust environments – upholding the status quo, in the view of Martin-Baró – psychologists must find
ways to work alongside communities to contribute to developing a critical consciousness (Martín-Baró, 1994). This is taken as the starting point to transform the social conditions that are causing their suffering (Freire, 2000). Some community psychologists outside the Latin-American context have sought to develop Martín-Baró’s ideas in their work contexts (Burton & Kagan, 2005; Lykes & Moane, 2009).

While community psychologies run the risk of reproducing power differentials in their work with communities (Evans, et al., 2017; Fryer & Duckett, 2014), community psychologists defining their practice as critical have sought to re-think their practice as a kind of insurgent scholarship (Ayala et al., 2020). Some critical community psychologists have sought to integrate the transformational ethos in community psychology with political ecology perspectives to position their practice and build stronger analytical lenses to consider how economic structures form psychological experience (Burton, 2015; Fine & Ruglis, 2009). The concept of “circuits of dispossession and privilege” (Ibid.), building on geographer David Harvey’s now classic work on accumulation by dispossession (D. Harvey, 2004), captures how neoliberal politics may throw people into circuits that dispossess them of the chance to achieve self-determination. These authors suggest that a critical ‘bifocality’ must guide psychologists’ practice. This means letting people’s psychosocial experiences make visible the (often oppressive) structures that produce the experiences (Weis & Fine, 2018). In other words, psychological research that identifies, for instance, psychological trauma, without simultaneously searching for the social structures entangled in its maintenance, has a limited scope and may end up reifying cultural traits that have historically produced epistemological violence (Teo, 2008). Qualitative research with people who suffer injustice should highlight the structures and social politics that shape their experiences.

Concerning climate change, critical community psychologists have furthered the interrelatedness of de-growth and critical community psychology to promote wellbeing that contains both social justice and sustainability (Natale, et al., 2016). Others have proposed more ample social science on sustainability, where psychological science can be among the scientific contributions (Kagan & Burton, 2018). However, little empirical research articulating the intertwined experiences with climate change and green economies in rural and Indigenous communities has been published so far (Fernandes-Jesus et al., 2020). On a general level, critical bifocality’s attention to the structures that produce human experience and the social meaning people give to them (Schraube, 2015) may provide a critical lens to those mainstream perspectives in climate psychology presented above. Although it has been involved in working with marginalized communities, a shared appraisal of culture has not been the most vital part
of Community Psychology (Kral et al., 2011; Sonn, et al., 2019). Some of the efforts to strengthen the subfield’s comprehension of culture today work with decolonial theory to accomplish this. While anticolonial struggles and the writings of anticolonial psychiatrist Frantz Fanon were already inspiring Martin-Baró’s analyses (Martin-Baró, 1984), critical Community Psychologists have recently adopted decolonial discourses with more determination (Fernández et al., 2021; Gone, 2016; Seedat & Suffla, 2017). They do not merely seek to “guide communities towards emancipation”, but instead rework epistemologies to enable learning from the diverse knowledges defended by these communities (Fernández et al., 2021; Sonn et al., 2019; see also Adams, 2020). A strengthened focus on epistemological critique and ontological diversity could let community psychologies seeking to approach climate change in a more articulated manner, move beyond fragmentized “research on communities” or local actions, to ameliorate conditions at the community level. Learning from these kinds of experiences and knowledges and making them more than the sum of their parts could strengthen demands for more just climate policies (Burton, 2015).

Theoretical framework for this study

In the thesis, I explore lived experiences with green economies and climate change mitigation in three different contexts where Indigenous and Tribal communities have condemned renewable energy projects and green-labelled extraction industries as detrimental to the continued existence of their ways of life. First, I have narrated how the decolonial turn influencing psychology (Maldonado-Torres, 2017) inspired the present work. Second, I delineated some ways in which cultural psychology and community psychologies have sought to rethink their practice in light of decolonial theorisation. To advance empirical research in the present thesis, I intend to integrate these three roughly defined directions in psychology. This study is explorative; thus, I did not initially seek to confirm, expand or challenge any particular theoretical framework. I instead chose a pragmatic position in which I seek to approach the meaning-making and lived experiences of the participants in this study through a methodology built from cultural, decolonial and community perspectives in psychology. It is helpful here to picture cultural psychology and community psychologies informed by decolonial perspectives as two partially overlapping circles creating a shared field. Meaning-making and lived experience can be analysed from this shared space, drawing on how cultural and community psychology conceptualise them. Figure 1 illustrates how I model the study’s theoretical framework:
In this dissertation, I am interested in both these ways of considering meaning-making, as they facilitate an open and curious attitude in the encounter with cultural ways different from my own, and at the same time call attention to the colonial and power dynamics entangled in the construction of hegemonic ‘master-narratives’ (Hammack, 2011) and the negation of certain
kinds of meanings. It also allows a conceptual dialogue between cultural psychology’s and
community psychology’s views on meaning-making. It further provides a bridge to decolonial
theory, and particularly through the concept of the “coloniality of being” through which
meaning is explored phenomenologically and connected to the loss of meaning of the human in
racist societies where non-ethics are naturalized, and people are dehumanised (L. R. Gordon,
2018; Maldonado-Torres, 2007). Seeing our actions as meaningful (I mean as acts not devoid
of meaning) appeals to critical reflexivity for researchers. Through the dialogical encounter
with the people who participate in a qualitative study, we contribute to something to the realm
of intercultural relations. This something needs to be subject to critical reflection. A self-critical
movement is necessary for decolonizing academia, according to Maldonado-Torres (2004).
Therefore, exploring meaning-making may be one pathway for decolonial empirical approaches
in psychology because it opens up for this kind of “metacognition”.

Lived experience
While lived experience as a concept has a close relationship to phenomenological philosophy,
along with meaning-making it was an influential element in psychology’s “interpretive turn”
(Tappan, 1997; Toolis & Hammack, 2015). The concept is used to comprehend the subjective,
intersubjective and material aspects of people’s (social and relational) lifeworlds (Denzin,
1985), and in psychological research, it has been an doorway to studying human experience in
both a more historically grounded and social way than can be offered by a strictly intrapsychic
perspective (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). It thus represents an alternative and reflective approach
to the more positivist sciences, seeking to grasp the phenomena as they appear to people (Van
Manen, 2016). Scholars vary in how much they theorise lived experience (Finlay, 2012) and in
some research reports, given the link to the deeper meaning of an experience, the concept blurs
with “meaning-making” (e.g. Toolis & Hammack, 2015). In this study, lived experience was a
way to approach how the green economy is experienced for the people in the research areas and
used to maintain an open and explorative approach. It engages in a dialogue with the decolonial
concept of the coloniality of being, which also has a solid phenomenological orientation
(Maldonado-Torres, 2007), allowing us to explore how it is to live, feel, think, and act in
different life conditions.

A dialogical epistemology
In this research project, the decolonial ‘intention’ prompted careful thinking about how to
implement a non-extractivist methodology (Fernández et al., 2021; de Sousa Santos, 2018) in
a way that could be thinking with instead of researching about people. Centring on meaning-
making, as this study does, opens for a dialogical epistemology (Marková, 2016). This makes
explicit the intersubjectivity created in the research processes (or in the process between ‘the self’ and ‘the other’ observing an object/phenomenon), and invites researchers to be attentive to how their meaning-systems play out. Drawing on Bakhtin, Marková highlights that humans have dialogical minds. Rather than seeking fusion with the other, intersubjectivity involves creating new meanings through the tensions and evaluations between the different participants (Marková, 2016, p. 113). A dialogical epistemology thus conceives research as an open and inconclusive process.

Moreover, from reading Emmanuel Levinas (1996), Marková suggests ethical relations and radical responsibility during research as an integrative part of dialogical epistemologies. The researcher needs to take responsibility for that which is created in the research and to be particularly attentive to the limitations of proper meaning-systems. At first glance, a dialogical epistemology may be one way to answer the call from decolonial Indigenous scholars, who invite non-indigenous researchers to improve their practice regarding accountability, responsibility and reciprocity (Denzin et al., 2008; Gaudry, 2011). Nonetheless, some tensions arise. Decolonial scholars drawing on Fanon have found that Levinas’ focus on ethics lacks sufficient attention to the dehumanisation of ‘the other’ in circumstances of coloniality. The call for ethical relations fails in contexts where a racialised subject is considered inferior or superfluous (Maldonado-Torres, 2007, 2012) and outside the domain of human relations (L. Gordon, 2013). These researchers suggest that decolonial politics need to precede ethics in contexts defined by asymmetry (Maldonado-Torres, 2012). Following them, a dialogical epistemology, to be further developed, would need to engage with authors writing from different realities and engage critically with the difficult conditions of dialogue in the current colonial reality. Marková’s texts (Marková, 2015, 2016) do not seem to engage with authors writing from outside Europe.

A relevant question to ask is to what degree this research project can be decolonising while it is produced by a white person like me within an academic institution in the Global North researching in the Global South. In other words, can our intersubjectivity forgo politics? A comment from a Quilombola leader in Brazil (paper II) by cell phone before we met for an interview may enlighten this discussion: “Yes, please visit us, so you learn we are human too”. In this immediate comment, he seemed to establish a colonial difference between us and open for a face-to-face dialogue in which this can be questioned. The point is not to legitimise this research project through his comment, but to reflect on the fact that while decolonial epistemological debates remain open and unsettled, people search for ways to speak with each other. And that even when colonial dynamics continue to affect academic knowledge
productions, respect, openness, accountability and critical reflection about the purposes and effects of our research may be steps to improve research situations.

Decolonial perspectives and Marková’s dialogical epistemology have in common that neither prescribes any set of tools to construct or analyse data. For decolonial theories, ‘locking’ intersubjectivity into fixed method frameworks obstructs the goal of re-humanisation (Maldonado-Torres, 2017). While for Marková (2016) the uniqueness of each intersubjective relation makes developing standard procedures impossible. Both directions invite psychologists to reflect critically on how we pose research questions and how we practise research.

Another limitation in Marková’s dialogical epistemology is observed by Guimarães (2013), who suggests that dialogical epistemologies still need to contemplate that different cultural systems can make the people participating in a dialogue observe a dissimilar object, even when they are using the same words. The symbolic objects involved in a dialogue may often be multiple. Awareness of these fissures is needed for a psychological praxis that seeks to overcome Eurocentric boundaries. Rogoff (2003) asserts that there will be errors in interpretations when one researches culturally different communities from one’s own because the cultural tools at our disposal shape the meanings we bring into the research situation. Jensen and Guimarães (2018) propose expanding Markova’s dialogical epistemology to account for the extra-verbal communication that each participant in a conversation brings. This builds on Bakhtinian (2010) notions that previous and anticipated utterances by many others shape the dialogues we engage in. When participants belong to different cultural systems (illustrating that different cultural systems are not necessarily ethnic ones, they give the example of a Danish health care professional and an adolescent who seem to be discussing the same thing, but turn out not to), their phenomenologically construed social field, from where an object is observed and meaning is communicated, may be different (Jensen & Guimarães, 2018). Figure 2 redraws Markova’s (2016) model, and Jensen & Guimarães’ (2018) reworked version:
In this study, a dialogically oriented epistemology, despite the mentioned tensions, allowed me to move from the decolonial theoretical discussions to engage in an empirical study with communities in which ‘good intentions’ do not necessarily sufficiently question the weight of the coloniality of knowing (Maldonado-Torres, 2012). Creative meaning-making may depend on different epistemological tools that help us analyse misunderstandings based on worldviews in which researchers make statements using data based on a culturally inappropriate understanding (Rogoff, 2003). In line with Jensen and Guimarães (2018), the model should not be taken as ‘fixing’ people’s identities in time. People move through multiple ontological and epistemological communities, and such ‘migration’ through time, space, and meanings is part of being human (Normann & van Alphen, 2021). In this research, their model was a tool, or an entry point, to engage in dialogues in this empirical study through a ‘pluriversal’ beginning. This means both an awareness that people’s assumptions about what exists are plural/multiple (Blaser et al., 2013), and has the goal of constituting a pluriversal and non-extractivist world (Escobar, 2019). Their position connects with the concept of “intercultural translation”, as suggested by de Sousa Santos (2016) to promote more diverse knowledge ecologies to contest the coloniality of knowledge. He invites researchers to identify isomorphic issues among cultures, which can be the basis of developing “new hybrid forms of cultural understanding” (de Sousa Santos, 2016, p. 22). To sum up, this re-worked version of a dialogical epistemology was a tool for approaching the research sites thinking through research questions and data construction methods, and guiding the data analysis and overall reflection about findings and research limitations.
4. Methodology

As argued in the introduction chapter, the three cases in combination strengthen this thesis’s analysis of how globally formulated climate change politics may interact with long-lasting colonial patterns and affect different sociocultural realities in different ways. To present and discuss methodological choices, I have structured this chapter to first provide a narrative of central aspects of the sociocultural context of each case study. I give particular attention to how climate change manifests in each region and how climate change mitigation and green economy initiatives entered these sociocultural contexts, perhaps simultaneously as both a new and ‘old’ intruder.

Thereafter I present and discuss the overall methodological choices, with attention to how in each case study these were adapted to respond to cultural-specific demands. Instead of conceiving methodology as a set of methods/techniques, I took inspiration from perspectives which view the research as a process, or a cycle (Valsiner, 2017) in which the researcher seeks to think holistically about how to generate new knowledge about complex psychological phenomena that are constantly in movement. In this view, a methodology should not be restricted to a list of behavioural procedures to ‘collect data’ and reach the level of validated scientific knowledge (Huniche & Sørensen, 2019; Toomela, 2010). Advanced scientific thinking requires a level of metacognition, in which researchers seek to understand the reasons and implications of their thinking and acting, often called “research procedures” (Toomela, 2010). The methodology cycle contends that the researcher should emphasise the processual aspects of research and that the phenomena made the subject matter of research, the methods, the researcher’s assumptions, and the theories that guide a study can be rethought in light of each other (Valsiner, 2017).

Within decolonial approaches in psychology, the methodology is also designed to favour a decolonial attitude instead of following a strict ‘methodologism’ (Desai, 2014; Maldonado-Torres, 2017) or even extractivist methods (Gaudry, 2011). In this view, researchers are invited to think self-critically about the implications of scientific choices (Maldonado-Torres, 2004). What would it mean, for instance, to insist on standardized data collection methods as a nonindigenous researcher in the regions where I did my research? How may knowledge be generated, or, what kind of knowledge can be generated in ways that simultaneously strengthen the agency and self-determination among people and generate a healthier inter-subjectivity (Denzin et al., 2008; Maldonado-Torres, 2017) between the different subjects in a study? During the research project, I have tried to make these kinds of questions guide my practice. The dialogical epistemology – focusing on research ethics, responsibility,
and on both the human mind and inter-subjectivity as essentially dialogical (Marková, 2016) and which accounts for how the social contexts of the dialogue are phenomenologically formed by different world views (Jensen & Guimarães, 2018) – was the interface between the theoretical framework and methods.

The methodology cycle (Valsiner, 2017) helped me think holistically about the methodology. This led me, for instance, to narrow down research questions and search for suitable theoretical frameworks in each case study; not breaking off from the study’s overall theoretical framework, but strengthening it to respond better to the realities of the participants. Despite this holistic methodology, to organise the thesis’s structure, I present each of the case studies, followed by an overview of the data construction methods and the overall data material. In the following results chapter, I outline how the theoretical framework was narrowed down in each case study. In this way of structuring the thesis, the tight relation between the different elements of the methodology cycle may appear a little fragmented, but this is done to avoid repetition in the narrative.

Three case studies

Case 1: The Guarani and Kaiowá and agrofuels
The first case study included in the research project approaches the Guarani and Kaiowá peoples’ enduring struggles to recover their land in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul (MS), in Brazil. Their situation exemplifies how schemes of flex-crop agribusiness with older roots in the present time re-brand, or ‘greenwash’, as green and sustainable economies (Buseth, 2017). Colonialisation, resource extraction and the implementation of an agribusiness model, producing agro-fuels for the national and international market, harm the Guarani and Kaiowá people. Their alarming human rights situation (Ioris, 2019; Naccache, 2019; S. Pimentel, 2012), entangled with their land loss to a rural elite that deliver sugarcane and soybean to large transnational agrofuel companies, is another reason for including this case study as a worst-case or dystopic example of some of the unsolved problems in hegemonic models of green transitions. MS is a central-western state in Brazil bordering Paraguay. The Guarani and Kaiowá peoples’ ancestral territories are located in the southernmost parts of MS and also include areas on the Paraguayan side of the border, where their relatives identify as Paĩ-Taviterã. With a population of around 43,400 in the official census from 2010 (IBGE, 2010) they are among Brazil’s most numerous remaining Indigenous peoples.

The Guarani and Kaiowá history is frequently narrated as comprising three main epochs. They are the ymã guare (old-time), the sarambi (time of dispersal and chaos) and the time of law (the current time) (Chamorro, 2015).
refer simultaneously to the eras of their spiritual ancestors, retold today as a part of the Guarani and Kaiowá’s intricate cosmovision, or to the epoch preceding the time when the threat to their ways of life through colonisation intensified (Urt, 2016). This is the epoch when the Guarani and Kaiowá still had the autonomy to define their social organization, and before the deforestation of their territories began.

The Sarambi, starting around the first decades of the 20th century, ended this epoch (Brand, 2001). For the formative scholar Antonio Brand, the Sarambi started when the company Cia Matte Larangeira, enjoying monopoly to cultivate matte herb in a large area since 1892, lost its domination in 1915 (Brand, 2001). A growing number of non-indigenous settlers took advantage of the situation, and began formalizing their occupation of the Guarani and Kaiowá areas. Other scholars suggest that the Sarambi began when Cia Matte Larangeira arrived because many people were absorbed into work exploitation, altering the Guarani and Kaiowá ways of life (Morais, 2020). Around 1915, the Indian Protection Service (Serviço de Proteção aos Índios- SPI), responding to the Ministry of Agriculture in Brazil, begun relocating the indigenous families into reserves outside their ancestral lands (Brand, & de Almeida, 1989). In 1943 the National Agricultural Colony of Dourados (CAND) was declared, and from this time on, with increasing intensity under the military dictatorship from 1964, the “agribusiness model” in the state, signifying the instalment of large-scale capitalist agriculture founded on land-grabbing and highly mechanized production, was established (Clements & Fernandes, 2013; Fernandes, et al., 2010). This agricultural model centred on soybean (Brand, 2004) alongside cattle. The reserves, established close to the new cities, served to render invisible Indigenous populations and simultaneously guaranteed the social reproduction of cheap labour for the plantations. On the national level, the Brazilian state strengthened the model of tutelage and assimilation over Indigenous peoples (Rodrigues, 2002) articulated through SPI years earlier. FUNAI, the National Foundation for Indigenous Peoples replaced SPI in 1967, and prevails until today. The Truth Commission’s report in 2014 documented systematic violations of the Guarani and Kaiowá peoples’ human rights during this period (Brasil, 2014).

The time of law narrates the period following the Brazilian military dictatorship. The new constitution from 1988 guaranteed the return of Indigenous peoples to their ancestral territories through a land demarcation process. These advances were the result of the democratization process in Brazil in which Indigenous populations had active roles (Rodrigues, 2002), supported by the strengthening of Indigenous demands globally in this period. Nevertheless, in MS and numerous other Brazilian geographies, the substantial economic
interests in Indigenous lands, and the political power of many landowners slowed down land demarcation.

The political assembly of the Guarani and Kaiowá, Aty Guassu, has since the 1970s articulated legal struggles, political mobilizations and physical reoccupations of their ancestral territories. Families put up provisional tents and mount resistance in small land areas that anthropological studies have confirmed are parts of their ancestral lands. These land areas are today under the control of landowners producing cattle meat, soybean or sugarcane – thus the Guarani and Kaiowá reoccupations are directly conflicting with these interests. The resulting disputes result in violent attacks against Guarani and Kaiowá families (Ioris, 2019). Why the families decide to assume all the risks that their resistance in these provisional camps implies is often explained by the extreme conditions that ‘confinement’ (Morais, 2020) in the precarious reserves entail, which is considered as constituting a genocidal process (Ioris, Benites, & Goettert, 2019; Naccache, 2019). High suicide numbers (Pimentel, 2017), particularly among the younger inhabitants in the reserves, is a terrible sign of the vulnerability that the Guarani and Kaiowá families desire to abandon. These factors, along with a deep spiritual connection to their ancestral lands (E. Benites & Ramos, 2017; T. Benites, 2012; João, 2011; Urt, 2016), which I narrate in paper III, are among the reasons that must motivate the Guarani and Kaiowá families’ constant efforts to return.

**Figure 3**
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*Note.* Newspaper article form 1993, ascribing the high suicide rates to land dispossession.
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Climate change and agrofuels

Through the Paris Agreement, Brazil committed to increasing the share of renewable energy of the energy matrix. This included boosting the country’s already world-leading agrofuel production (Lima et al., 2020). Brazil is one of the world’s leading exporters of soybean-based biodiesel, and since the 1970s, national programmes have been implemented to stimulate the production of ethanol fuel from sugarcane as an alternative to gasoline for the country’s vehicles. The Kyoto Protocol then brought renewed enthusiasm for ethanol production, pushing the implementation of new technology in the automobile industry, in particular the invention in 2003 of ‘flex-fuel’ cars’ that can run on both gasoline and ethanol (Matsuoka, et al., 2009). This promoted the expansion of sugarcane plantations in many of the country’s regions, and Mato Grosso do Sul is described as an “epicentre” of such expansion in Brazil. From 2003, “flex crops” of sugarcane (fuel, food) and corn/soybean (biodiesel, food, feed) expanded in MS, backed by extensive financial support from the national development bank BNDS, and investments from global petroleum companies and food producers such as Shell, Petrobras, Bunge and Cargill (Sauer, et al., 2017; Wilkinson & Herrera, 2010). Even if the state has the highest growth in sugarcane, cattle and soybean/corn flex crops still dominate. In 2015, 52% of agricultural land was dedicated to pasture, 3% to sugarcane plantations, and 19% to other crops, mainly corn and soy (Tomei, et al., 2020). The “RenovaBio programme” established in 2020 to meet Brazil’s commitments to the Paris Agreements, and augmented public incentives, are predicted to double ethanol fuel demand by 2030 (Tomei et al., 2020). As a result, more land is forecast to be absorbed into sugarcane production in MS through the conversion of pasture lands, and incorporation of new land areas.

Sugarcane expansion has nevertheless raised concerns about its socio-environmental impacts. MS is one of the Brazilian states most severely affected by climate change, and a 2016 report predicted increased temperatures of between 5 and 8% in the next 25 years and a 19% reduction in rainy days (Peracio, 2016). The Pantanal area, the world’s most extensive wetland, high in biodiversity, comprising areas in MS and another Brazilian state Mato Grosso, as well as parts of Paraguay and Bolivia, was considered highly vulnerable both to heavier rainfall hindering the reproduction of species and to droughts and fires (Marengo, et al., 2016; Peracio, 2016). The latter proved to arrive first: in 2020, approximately 4, 5 million hectares (30 % of the Pantanal) burned (Inova, 2020). World-leading companies and investors, enjoying climate-friendly labelling and access to ‘green’ financial mechanisms for their operations in MS, thus act in a situation of extreme social and environmental vulnerability. The Guarani and Kaiowá families’ alarming situation with regard to ongoing disputes with landowners who provide the
transnational companies with sugarcane and grains, convert these corporations into silent yet omnipresent actors in the land conflicts and advancing ecocides. These transnational companies are only very seldom held accountable for the human rights violations in the region.

Case 2: The Southern Saami and wind energy development
Second, I engage with the experiences of Southern Saami people living in Norway. They are the southernmost culture among the Indigenous Saami people, whose large territory, Saepmie, stretches over the vast lands under Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish and Russian sovereignty. The Saami communities share a history of colonization and assimilation (Ahrén, 2004; Spangen, et al., 2015). However, the gradual imposition of borders during state formations; the different characteristics of conflicts and wars between Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia, and current political and legal frameworks in each country, are factors that produced contrasting conditions for the Saami communities’ practice of self-determination. Different institutional arrangements and structures shape mobility and social organization (Lantto, 2010). Moreover, Saami communities maintain diverse sociocultural practices – for instance, there are at least 10 different languages (Hermanstrand, et al., 2019). Reindeer herding, fishing and handicrafts have been central in Saami cultural history as crucial means of subsistence. These activities are under increasing pressure. An estimation is that around 10 per cent of the Saami have managed to hold out as reindeer herders until today (Broderstad, 2011), although a larger number of people participate in herding activities during intense seasons, through community and family relationships. Moreover, the reindeer herding generates a sense of community and identity among many Saami generally (Nilssen, 2019, p. 175). The Saami population has been estimated to comprise of between 80000 and 117000 individuals or more (Jaakkola et al., 2018). A further approximation is that around half today live within Norwegian borders (Broderstad, 2011). Some estimate that the Southern Saami comprises around 2,000 individuals living in the Southern Saepmie in Sweden and Norway, although these two countries have no ethnic population registers (Mæhlum, 2019). Because they are fewer in number than the Northern Sámi4, their communities are at times conceived as a minority within the Saami people (Hermanstrand et al., 2019), and most live in towns or settlements side by side with the majority population.

Norwegian assimilation policies have shown changing forms according to historical shifts and national priorities but have had detrimental effects on many aspects of the Saami

---

4 For the Southern Saami, in English language, the double ‘aa’ is often used to resemble the pronunciation. For the Northern Sámi, the ‘á’ is used, hence I write it differently.
people’s self-determination. In 2022, the ‘Commission to investigate the Norwegianisation policy and injustice against the Saami, Kven and Norwegian Finnish peoples’ (called The Truth and Reconciliation Commission – TRC) will deliver a report after four years of work. The TRC aims are threefold; a historical mapping of these policies, a study of the impacts on the Saami people and the Kven and Norwegian Finnish minorities today, and finally proposing reconciliation measures.

For the Southern Saami, the assimilation policies strongly affected their language. Even though substantial efforts to strengthen the language are made part of current resistance and identity reconstruction (Pie tikäinen, 2003), with around only 500 speakers, their language, åarjel saemien gïele, is listed by UNESCO as in danger of extinction (Hermanstrand et al., 2019). This increases the significance of reindeer herding for the Southern Saami (Nilssen, 2019) because it is one of the few remaining spaces where the language is practised (Normann, 2019). Only the Saami language has the necessary level of clarity and detail to accomplish herding tasks, describe landscapes, weather conditions and animal behaviour (e.g.Eira et al., 2013; Sara, 2009).

Climate change and wind power
The early effects of climate change on indigenous peoples’ livelihoods living in the Arctic regions are widely recognized (Stepien, et al., 2014), and a 2018-report from IPCC underlined the risks for Indigenous communities in the Arctic (Eerkes-Medrano & Huntington, 2021). The Saami settlements comprise both arctic and sub-arctic regions. In both regions within Norway, reindeer herding generally occurs in mountain areas covered by snow for approximately eight months of the year (Jaakkola et al., 2018). Herding entails protecting freely moving animals, and moving the animals across large distances, in accordance with annual cycles, so as to safeguard the herd. It is a practice that takes account of eight seasons in each year (Reinert et al., 2008) with differences both in weather conditions and in the necessities of the herd, related to calving for instance. Herding thus requires complex knowledge systems which disappear if not practised. The effects of climate change on reindeer herding are many and vary across sub-regions. During winters, difficulties may be that the reindeers’ pasture and water resources become hidden under layers of ice (Jaakkola et al., 2018) or that ice conditions make herding dangerous (paper I). In summer, there is an increased risk of uncontrollable fires. Therefore, Saami herders now need sufficient space to adapt herding activities to unstable weather conditions (Heikkinen, et al., 2012; Turunen, et al., 2016).

This situation illustrates some of the dissonances of global climate action communicated through the Saami conceptualization of “green colonialism” (Saami-Council, 2017). While
international research reports and policy documents centre on vulnerable populations in the Arctic and their livelihoods as facing an exceptionally high risk from climate change, in Norway the construction of renewable energy projects mingles with climate change adding “insult to injury” (Marino & Ribot, 2012), since it reduces rather than fortifies herding resilience. Historically hydropower was the prioritized energy source in Norway and provoked confrontations between the State and the Saami herders (Brantenberg, 1985). Today, green-branded mining projects and wind power, boosted by how Norway materializes the country’s international commitments to climate change mitigation, are considered by many to be further fragmentizing the Saami’s ancestral landscapes and threatening the sustainability of herding (Lawrence, 2014; Nilssen, 2019). Several wind power projects have been disputed in recent years (Nilssen, 2019). The herders stress that wind turbines have a disastrous socioecological effect on herding. Wind turbines disturb the shy reindeer across long distances, and so they acquire different behavioural patterns related to stress or avoid certain areas. Additionally, wind farms cause increased human activity, energy infrastructure construction, and new road networks that negatively affect reindeers’ pasturelands.

The herders’ experience-based knowledge is supported by research that finds that wind farms fragment pasturelands because the reindeer acquire avoidance behaviour (Skarin, et al., 2015; Skarin & Åhman, 2014). The degree of avoidance behaviour is questioned by other research groups, finding less significant effects from wind farms on reindeer herds over short distances (Colman, et al., 2012; Flydal, et al., 2004). During licencing procedures in Norway, the wind power developing companies are in charge of engaging consultants for the Environmental Impact Assessments (Inderberg, et al., 2019), leading to situations of distrust concerning the seemingly tight relationships between consultants and the companies (Lund, et al. 2020). In ongoing lawsuits, both research groups testify as expert witnesses. The reliability of their methods and the position of scientific knowledge compared to the experience-based knowledge systems among Saami herders is subject to debate in Norway and Sweden. The Saami herding districts’ persistent struggle to halt what they consider a violation of Norway’s international commitments to protect Indigenous rights has led to The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) denying some licences, while in one case the Oil and Energy Department’s annulled a licence after the Saami community’s mobilisation (Ellingsen, 2020). But the ongoing large-scale projects (paper I and paper II) have added to the accumulated pressures on the survival of herding, bringing increased stress and concerns over the future survival of reindeer herding and Southern Saami ways of life (Jaakkola et al., 2018).
Case 3: Amazon communities and the ‘green’ bauxite-aluminium value chain

This third case study was included in the research project because, in conjunction with case study 2, it provides a good example of the global extension of transnational companies, articulated through value and supply chains (Haller, et al., 2019; Murrey & Jackson, 2020). Norwegian public debates rarely discuss the wind power sector’s interconnectedness to global extractivist schemes. However, two contested wind power projects in Southern Saemien, namely Fosen Vind DA and Øyfjellet vind, trade energy directly with Alcoa and Norsk Hydro in Norway. Ensuring that aluminium smelting is made with renewable energy is required to achieve certificates of ‘green’ aluminium production (Brough & Jouhara, 2020). Both Alcoa and Norsk Hydro undertake bauxite extraction in the Brazilian Amazon as part of their vertical integration and global value chains (Sandvik, 2013; Sheller, 2014). This illustrates how the struggles of the Southern Saami to protect their herding rights confronted with wind power, and the struggles among Amazon communities confronted with the bauxite mining model, are examples of the interconnection of processes of resistance to dispossession (Fine & Ruglis, 2009) and green financial mechanisms, value and supply chains. Political ecology asserts that illuminating these kinds of interconnections may be vital to the local communities who contest them (Haller et al., 2019; Murrey & Jackson, 2020), and paper II illustrates how through the research process I have contributed with knowledge to Brazilian and Norwegian grassroots organisations seeking to uncover greenwashing mechanisms (Buseth, 2017) in the aluminium industry.

The culturally diverse Amazon communities have resisted the impacts of bauxite-aluminium mining for many years. Under the military dictatorship (1964–1984), the Brazilian Amazon became a prioritized economic expansion horizon, and most large infrastructure projects, dams and mining projects were implemented rapidly and without environmental assessments or consultations (Bratman, 2014). Indigenous and Quilombola (communities developed historically by fugitive slaves of African descent in resistance to slavery) communities’ land and self-determination rights became granted in Brazil’s Federal Constitution in 1988, but large economic interests in extractive industries have weakened these processes in practice (Thorkildsen, 2016). Their rights are further protected by the ILO 169, which Brazil ratified in 1989. The rights of Ribeirinho communities – small villages along the Amazon River’s margins, subsisting from fishing, extraction of fruits and nuts and raising animals, and who have Indigenous, African and European descent (Chernela, 2005) – are also reflected in the ILO 169 Convention as a Tribal people, but they have weaker legal protection in Brazil. Moreover, the Amazon is also the home of peasants and other Tribal peoples. Given
the cultural diversity and the differences in legal protection, some voices advocate overcoming the tensions between peoples through the creation of a common Amazon identity based on co-existence and territorial construction in opposition to extractive industries (Baletti, 2012). In the thesis, I use the term “Tribal” to reflect that these communities are right-holders. The state of Pará has the highest incidence of human rights violations and assassinations of environmental defenders in Brazil, which is already among the world’s top offenders in this field (Muggah & Franciotti, 2019). Maranhão state also has alarming numbers of human rights violations associated with land conflicts (Celentano et al., 2017).

Climate change in the Amazon and a green bauxite-aluminium mining sector
As a tropical rainforest, the Amazon plays a central role in the world’s climate system by storing carbon (Malhi et al., 2008). At the same time, large areas in the Brazilian Amazon are imagined as sites for future exploitation of natural resources (Iorio & Monni, 2020). These are irreconcilable positions, and since the late 1970s the Amazon region has been transformed by forest degradation, land-use change and, increasingly, the effects of climate change (Funatsu et al., 2019). Under the current right-wing Brazilian government, the situation for both protecting human rights and hindering deforestation of the Amazon has worsened (Neto, 2020; Raftopoulos & Morley, 2020). Amazon communities have borne witness to weather changes for some time already, in particular to irregular rain patterns and increasing variations in the temporalities of the phenomena enchente and vazante, which is when the rivers flood or dry up during the annual cycle (Katz, et al., 2020). In some regions, these and other changes cause unpredictability in access to forests, and therefore hinder fruit and nut extraction, navigation and fishing. Besides, are both the sudden, heavy rains and the prolonged dry seasons; the latter amongst the backdrop of the devastating fires in the Amazon in 2019 and 2020.

The eastern Amazon is also a site of extraction of different minerals that are components in green economies. Here I look at Amazon peoples’ experiences with the bauxite-aluminium mining model. The bauxite adventure in this part of the Amazon started in 1979 when the Mineração Rio do Norte (MRN) bauxite-mine was dug in the state of Pará in the Amazon. Norsk Hydro and Alcoa were among the original investors in this joint venture project. Today both companies have independent bauxite mines and alumina (a white powder made by bauxite, and later exported and smelted to aluminium) refineries elsewhere in Pará and the neighbouring state of Maranhão. Socio-environmental conflicts have unfolded around the two companies’ extraction-sites, frequently involving claims of violations of Indigenous or Tribal rights or environmental damage. In February 2018, Alunorte, the Norsk Hydro’s alumina refinery in the city of Barcarena, caused an environmental disaster. Heavy rains sent large quantities of red
mud, a waste product from alumina refining, flooding into the Murucupi River (Hoelscher & Rustad, 2019). The red mud mixed with rain flooding, polluting rivers and water sources in the city and surrounding communities. The event motivated widespread protests and a federal decision to temporary reduce Alunorte’s production by half. Restoration depended on the company’s commitments to secure future production and improve community relations. Despite the communities’ continued criticism, in 2019, the Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI), a global institution that certifies the sustainability of aluminium production, gave the all clear to Alunorte and the production reduction was also rescinded. Alcoa’s mining site in Jurutí Velho and the Alumar refinery were also certified, and in paper II, I highlight an antagonism between community demands and global certification standards.

**Methods**

The overall data construction lasted from March 2018 to September 2020. Each case study was organised in different ways to respond to the dynamics in each region.

In Saepmie (paper I and II), I initiated the research by attending open meetings during the constitution of the TRC in March and April 2018. Attending the hearings introduced me to some of the central discussions within the Saami community, and thus informed initial reflections of ways to sharpen the general research questions. In May 2018, I observed the first lawsuit between the reindeer-herding district, Fovsen Njaarke Sijte, and the wind farm joint venture company, Fosen Vind DA. I built a preliminary understanding of the main topics debated in the courtrooms. Equally important, I perceived what could not be expressed in the courtroom. The technical language in lawsuits did not for instance seem to capture the deeper meaning of reindeer herding for the Saami people involved. The ontological conflict (Blaser et al., 2013) of “what is a reindeer” became evident. While the slaughter-weight was debated in the courtroom, the “relational ontology” (Escobar, 2019), leading the Saami pastoralists to view the reindeer as a family member (see extract in paper I), found no expression in the courtroom.

The initial observation moreover allowed constructing relations in the field. For Indigenous people research is often loaded with a colonial meaning (Denzin et al., 2008; Smith, 2013), and risks reproducing epistemological violence (Teo, 2008). There are many historical examples of how research led to negative material and symbolic consequences for the Southern Saami (E. M. Fjellheim, 2020; S. Fjellheim, 2019). Therefore, a gradual approach to spaces where wind power was discussed allowed me to learn more and to make myself and the objectives of the research project known before inviting people to participate. Besides, developing a parallel action research project in the Saami context (Normann, 2019) allowed me to gain more preliminary insights and build relationships in the Saami community.
I later included the second case study (paper II), which is the Amazon communities’ confrontation with the bauxite-aluminium extractive model. This inclusion followed the environmental disaster that involved Norsk Hydro’s alumina plant Alunorte in February 2018. The Norwegian Committee of Solidarity with Latin America (LAG), of which I am a member, mobilized to support the communities’ demands for justice after the disaster. Together with their Brazilian partner organizations, the Landless Farmers Movement (MST) and the Movement for Popular Sovereignty in Mining (MAM), they denounced faulty compensatory procedures, and supported communities locked in a land conflict with Norsk Hydro which was broadcast on Norwegian (NRK, 2018). LAG members wanted to generate knowledge about the bauxite-aluminium value chain’s larger footprint in Brazil, and I was invited to collaborate with research on the social consequences of bauxite-aluminium extraction in the Brazilian Amazon from the communities’ perspectives.

The inclusion of this case study opened for a dialogical research process and co-construction of knowledge. I participated in Norwegian and Brazilian seminars where people discussed “green aluminium”. This case study allowed me to study lived experiences and meaning-making taking place in diverse Amazon communities, as well as to include qualitative data from communities affected in different ways by the vertical integration of the bauxite-aluminium value chain. The participants were recruited through MST’s and MAM’s networks, so even though their personal histories, cultural belonging, social positions, age, and gender differed, they all had participated in mobilizations against the extractive industry, and thus defended a critical position with regards to aluminium production. The data construction was made through two visits, from May to June and September to October 2019.

In the third case study (paper III), of the Guarani and Kaiowá peoples’ struggle for recuperating land in the context of agrofuel expansion, data construction drew on four visits comprising a total of six months between 2017 and 2019. I had previously lived in the region and counted on supportive networks of university personnel at the Federal University of Grande Dourados (UFGD), members of the Landless Farmers Movement (MST) and staff from the Indigenous Missionary Council (CIMI). With their help, my research proposal was presented to local representatives of the Guarani and Kaiowá Assembly, Aty Guassu, from the Te' ýikue Reserve in Caarapó municipality. This began a process of slow construction of relationships with people living in six of this reserve’s adjacent land recovery camps – Kunumi Poty Vera, Ñamoy Guavira'y, Jeroky Guasu, Tey' Jusu, Guapo'y, and Itagui. I joined organized activities or visited to drink the local beverage, Tereré, and talk. A limitation in researching the region was the sense of vulnerability among supportive networks, related to the political situation in
Brazil. I was recommended to avoid repetitive journeys back and forth to Caarapó, because of worries about surveillance, which could harm people living permanently in the region. The precautions I needed to take restricted my autonomy to construct the research as imagined. A measure I took was to approach other areas as well, through accompanying activities in the solidarity networks. These could be anything from delivering seeds to land recovery camps, documenting human rights violations, assisting as a car driver, etc. Hence, I carried out interviews in the land recovery camp Laranjeira Nhanderu; in the Indigenous demarcated land, Panambizinho, in the reserves of Jaguapiru and Amambai, and in the land recovery camps of Guyaroká and Guyrá Kambi’y.

Decolonial psychology’s emphasis on developing “non-extractive methods” endorses a critical reflexivity about the inter-subjectivity created during research. In all three case studies I sought to follow transparency, respect, and reciprocity in order to create spaces of knowledge co-creation and dialogue (Poopuu, 2020). The dialogical epistemology, outlined above, was a tool to ‘translate’ decolonial critiques to qualitative research. This ought not to be read as instrumental steps to ‘secure’ the ‘research access’, but instead as small actions to try and constitute the research process as a decolonizing practice, including through relationship building, accountability and knowledge co-creation (Denzin et al., 2008).

Data material
The thesis overall data material consists of 49 individual interviews and 21 group interviews, in addition to document analysis and field notes from extensive observation, including ethnographic methods in case 3. See table 1 for details:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study 1 (March 2017-Desember 2019, total of six months)</th>
<th>Individual interviews and group interviews</th>
<th>Document Analysis</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 24 individual interviews. This includes 15 individual interviews with activists (13 Guarani and Kaiowá, 1 farmer and 1 missionary). 9 interviews with people working in public or private health and child care institutions.</td>
<td>• Pastoral Land Commission’s (CPT) historical archive</td>
<td>• Ethnographic research of daily life activities, spiritual ceremonies, mobilizations, public hearings, workshops, school activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants were interviewed once. The majority of the interviews were audiotaped except in a few situations when I needed to improvise and took handwritten notes. The interviews were carried out after receiving authorization from the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD), an entity that oversees that research data are treated with caution so as to not make research participants vulnerable. The participants consented to take part in the study and were informed about their rights during and after the interviews. I used a semi-structured and open-ended interview guide with 11 items. Several interviews did not cover the full amount of items, but these remained important for structuring field notes and for planning additional interviews. The interviews were transcribed. In case study 3, a friend helped to transcribe and translate into Portuguese passages in the Guarani language.
Extensive field notes were useful. Particularly in case study 1 and 2, where I conducted participant observation of lawsuits, seminars, workshops, spiritual ceremonies and everyday practices, these were indispensable during the data analysis. In case study 1, I explored the use of ethnographic methods (Case, et al., 2014), and field notes were central in the posterior data analysis. What is meant by ethnographic methods in psychological research varies (Case et al., 2014). In this study, I think of ethnographic methods as seeking a fine grained-analysis of how (inter)subjectivity and meaning-making are constructed in daily life. Participant observation, on the other hand, may follow similar procedures but may be more event-based and limited in scope, and is supported by different literature. In this study, ethnographic approaches to everyday life practices were helpful in the Guarani and Kaiowá communities, while in the Amazon and Saami communities, I observed specific events, such as lawsuits, seminars, and protest actions. In case 3, I counted less on field notes. Intense dynamics during my visits to the Brazilian Amazon, a large number of interviews and long travels by riverboat brought my attention away from systematically taking notes. In retrospect, this would have been important, including for planning future research in the region.

Document analysis also informs the study. In case study 2, these are mainly documents related to the consultation procedures and environmental assessments leading up to the licencing of wind farms. Some documents are available on The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) web page, while people in the reindeer herding districts shared additional documents with me. Documents from the lawsuits were also included. In case study 1, I read anthropological studies related to the land demarcation and was allowed to photograph and read historical documents kept by the Pastoral Land Commission (CPT) in the city of Dourados. The latter documents allowed reflection on how the region’s land conflicts were framed historically.

Data analysis
To analyse individual and group interviews (paper I, II, III) I apply a reflexive version of Thematic Analysis (TA). Braun and Clarke (2006) originally suggested six steps for TA – transcribing and initially reading the data; coding across the data set; looking for common themes in the codes; reviewing if the themes are coherent with the overall data set; refining and naming each theme; and finally writing the report, identifying meaningful extracts and so on. As I am concerned with people’s lived experience, which has epistemological connections to phenomenology, I considered other analytic strategies, for instance Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). However, given the relatively large and diverse data material, the impromptu interview situations where people would enter or leave the interviews
(see paper II and III), and the dialogical epistemology, I found that TA’s flexibility made its analytic approach the best fit. Braun and Clarke wrote several articles critical of non-conceptual applications of TA, and research that confuses TA methods with methodology (Braun & Clarke, 2020). I adopt a reflexive version of TA, advancing a non-positivist, interpretative view of the data analysis process. TA does not predefine an epistemological orientation (Braun & Clarke, 2020), and hence researchers are invited to undertake independent thinking during the analytical procedure and clarify their epistemological positioning in the written narrative. In this thesis, I draw on epistemological critiques by decolonial and critical scholars who emphasise the need to develop more collaborative epistemologies (Denzin et al., 2008) that decouple knowledge production from Western hegemonic models (Dutta, 2018; Mignolo, 2011). In addition, I draw on a reworked version of Markova’s (2016) dialogical epistemology which emphasises the need to build research relationships of trust and responsibility. This approach views the research encounter as a window for shared development and, following a Bakhtinian view on dialogue, conceives the ‘findings’ in research as open-ended and unfinished (Marková, 2016).

I analysed the data for each paper separately and different concepts and theories guided the analysis in each paper in order to explore the specific research questions. Reading field notes in parallel was crucial to avoid a reifying analysis of transcripts, which risks reducing meaning to “verbal data” (Kvale, 1996). Detailed field notes helped me recall the interview situation, thus revisiting and exploring the possible meaning zone of the original interview (Kvale, 1996). The document analysis additionally helped to single out central topics that provided more context to the interview transcripts.

Methodological limitations

Research centring on lived experiences intertwined with strong negative emotions may also become a question of research ethics. In some interviews, I perceived that asking the question “what was it like?” would leave people emotionally affected. During transcription of the interviews, while listening to the recordings, I recalled how I sometimes steered the conversation back to topics that seemed calmer for the participants to discuss. Thus, there may be a tendency during data construction, to focus more on meaning-making and critical knowledge construction than “what something felt like”. This is a limitation in this study, given its research aims. However, while verbal data from the interviews on these issues could have been richer, the strength is the combination of ethnographic research and observation, allowing me temporally, or through glimpses, to place myself in the real-life environments of the participants. During the data construction, many situations suggesting the vulnerability of participants, or representing both hard and subtle expressions of racism occurred, which may
be less easy to verbalise in an interview but unequivocally shaped my analysis. Thus, the study is an example of how – when appropriate and viable – the increasing use of ethnographic methods in psychological science (Case et al., 2014) allows researchers to approach the subject matter in ways that can grasp the complexity of a phenomenon as lived in people’s everyday lives.

**Critical reflexivity and research ethics**

Decolonial thinking poses many questions for ethical research practice, but how these matters are to be put into practice is not always thoroughly discussed (Fernández, 2018). In my research, I have sought to engage with ‘critical reflexivity’, to evaluate the ethics during different phases of the research, through socio-historical analysis and introspection (Fernández, 2018) and dialogical engagement with knowledgeable others (Rogoff, 2003). Dialogical epistemology was one way of transferring the principles of decolonial theory to qualitative research as outlined in the previous chapter. In this section, I will discuss some other aspects of ethics in research.

**Research relationships**

An anecdote from a conversation with a young female community leader in a land recovery camp in Mato Grosso do Sul is indicative of how Karai people (white people, see paper III) may fail to practice responsibility. “When people visit us and we ask for their support, they answer that they are not authorities; that they don’t have resources; that they are here to listen. I ask myself, then why did they come here, who sent them? For us, when someone visits another community, it is in representation of something, we see people who come all the way here as having some kind of authority.” Her phrase is a subtle, but unambiguous critique of how karai people, like myself, fail to take responsibility. “Giving voice to”, or, in more cognizant words; “amplifying the voice”, of marginalized communities, sometimes stated as a goal embedded in research ethics, may collapse into convenience when the commitment ends in a thesis. As narrated in the ‘methods’ section, I sought to construct healthier research relationships during the research process. Working in so different sociocultural contexts shows that there is no standard research procedure to follow. However, values such as curiosity, respect, and attentiveness to sociocultural aspects – including the power dynamics traversing communities – guided the steps I walked in each case study. The dialogical epistemology outlined above sought to make the research process a dialogical and reciprocal endeavour. In addition, I sought to assist the participants when it was appropriate. This could be through contributing with perspectives, accompanying threatened people to increase their perceived safety or assisting with documentation of human rights violations; but also through assisting with commonplace
tasks as babysitting, dishwashing and car driving. During the writing of this thesis, the corona pandemic unfolded and sanitary and food conditions worsened in Mato Grosso do Sul. Integral to constructing responsible research relationships, has been to support economic solidarity campaigns.

Reifying terms

While I use the words “data”, and “participants” in the thesis, some critical appraisals can be made about this word use. Valsiner (2017a) problematizes what he calls a “manualization” in psychological science if primacy is given to the methods – data relationship, with a theoretical framework as an ‘umbrella’, somehow kept at a distance. The accumulation of “data” is in this view elevated to an “authorizing sign” so the researcher can make knowledge claims by having absolute data after following a method’s steps. In the decolonial aim of humanising the intersubjective relations that unfold during the research (Denzin, 2019; Maldonado-Torres, 2017), the conversion of people’s narratives to “data” in the aftermath of fieldwork, may also represent a kind of withdrawal from decolonising aims. Although this tension is unresolved in this thesis, to question the assumption of extractable naturalistic data I changed the description of research procedures from “data collection”, a term used in paper I, to “data construction” in paper II and III. This term communicates that data is constructed through the multiple encounter of socioculturally formed theoretical curiosity and research purpose; dynamic and mutable phenomena made the subject matter of a study (Jovanović, 2011); the relationships that unfold; and the methodological choices made along the way.

The term “participants” may also be discussed through analogous lenses (Valsiner, 2017). The generic term “participants” does not always transparently describe the intersubjective relations built from the “recruitment procedure” and throughout the research process. Standardized terms that function as “signs” that qualitative researchers share in scientific meaning-making processes facilitate writing but may distort deeper learning about the complexity of research. Terms as “data” and “participants” may make communicating with the research community easier but simultaneously become “filters” obscuring how research relationships are constructed, how non-extractivist methodologies are sought and how the participating subjects are constructed through researchers’ narratives (Cornish, 2020; Gaudry, 2011; Jovanović, 2011). While these questions are relevant in many research contexts; where epistemological violence has been harmful to Indigenous populations (Bulhan, 2015; Denzin et al., 2008; Gaudry, 2011), they could receive more attention as a part of practising critical reflexivity. At the beginning of the chapter, I asked about the meaning of standardized data collection methods in decolonizing research approaches. Systematizing and communicating
knowledge is a part of the development of scientific knowledge (de Saint-Laurent, 2018a) and facilitating the reading of the findings by the larger research and policymaking community, may be a way of paying respect to people who decide to participate in a study. In decolonial approaches to empirical research, one task is to rethink how science can display high standards of accountability in ways that respond better to demands in the communities where studies are done (Denzin et al., 2008; Gaudry, 2011).

Representing others
Research informs reports about, and creates representations of, ‘the other’ (Denzin et al., 2008). How can we practise responsibility when writing about others in contexts of colonial difference (Maldonado-Torres, 2011), asymmetrical power relations, or conflict (Moss, et al., 2019)? Is there a way to ensure that research is, at a minimum, non-injurious? In the research process, this was a matter of concern. I conceived critical reflexivity, not as introspection (Teo, 2018, p. 167), and rather as reflexivity enacted through dialogues with other researchers, participants and activists. Close relationships with knowledgeable people in the regions were fundamental for having regular conversations about what could be represented in the research reports, and in what ways. As a result of this critical reflexivity exercise, I kept some emerging themes out of the analysis presented in the thesis, because they may have exposed the research participants in already hostile environments. Anonymization is also strictly followed in order to protect individuals.

On another level, Rogoff (2003) highlights that transporting theories and assumptions from one’s own communities to the researched community may lead to erroneous inferences from the data. But, simultaneously, knowledge creation can be conceived as **dialogical**. This means that during qualitative research, different meaning systems are brought into cultural contact zones (Pickren, 2018), and from the tension between them, creative meaning-making can arise (Normann & van Alphen, 2021). In the thesis, I have sought to maintain accountability and transparency about possible research limitations, and conceive of the findings as open and inconclusive. I follow Pilgrim (2019), who highlights “epistemic humility”, asserting that researchers need to contemplate the unknown when they present research. Instead of considering the researcher as an “expert observer”, researchers bring previous assumptions into the research situation. The above-mentioned conversations became, in light of this, reflexive ways to try to work through possible misunderstandings of the webs of meanings in cultural communities different from mine. Instead of “researching about”, I have sought to “think with” the participants (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), and learn about how their perspectives and lived experiences can say something important to us about the current climate crisis.
Structural constraints

Notwithstanding these and other measures, I consider that the research project does not always break fundamentally with colonial dynamics. Time pressure, and structural constraints too, influence how we do empirical research and pose material limitations that can be difficult to get around (Gaudry, 2011), particularly for younger scholars on temporary contracts, like myself. Efforts to construct long-term relationships in the regions in which we study are done simultaneously as time constraints in PhD scholarships do not change (not to mention all the doctoral students who are not counting on scholarships!), making these processes stressful, and filled with emotions of not being able to ‘give’ enough. This tension illustrates how the political economy limits efforts to “decolonize the academy”, and that to rethink research methodologies it is necessary to re-think the structures of research – a task that requires institutional engagement.
## 5. Results

### Table 2

**Overview of articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Research Questions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green colonialism in the Nordic context: Exploring Southern Saami representations of wind energy development</td>
<td>Explore Social representations of wind energy development, and analyse these guided by critical and decolonial community psychology concepts.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Time is our worst enemy”: lived experiences and intercultural relations in the making of green aluminium.</td>
<td>Explore lived experiences and meaning-making with the use of decoloniality theory.</td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-living a common future when being confronted with ecological disaster: Exploring (elements of) Guarani and Kaiowá collective memories, political imagination and critique.</td>
<td>Explore meaning-making and collective memory as enablers of political imagination of the future, through connecting decolonial concepts with cultural psychological perspectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numeration signalises order of priority.

---

**Paper I – Green colonialism in the Nordic context: Exploring Southern Saami representations of wind energy development**

**Paper I** explored how members of the indigenous Southern Saami community experience the implementation of large-scale wind power industrial sites inside their reindeer herding lands in Norway. As I began observing during lawsuits and other spaces in which wind power was discussed, I got insights into the knowledge debates that were central aspects of the conflicts. I searched to narrow down the theoretical framework in a way that could help me analyse meaning-making as a form of knowledge construction. I thus combined Social Representations Theory (SRT) (Moscovici, 1981) with the analytical framework of “circuits of dispossession and privilege” (Fine & Ruglis, 2009). SRT resulted from Sergio Moscovici’s intention to reject the cleavage between expert and lay knowledge and to present as a central task for psychology the study of how communities build knowledge (Jovchelovitch, 2008; Moscovici, 1981). SRT had previously been applied to exploring how and why resistance to renewable energy projects propagates (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017; Upham, et al., 2019). This previous research drew on findings from Global North settings and did not focus on minority or Indigenous rights. SRT researchers identified a need for a more profound analysis of how power asymmetries and dissent operate in these cases (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015) in order to avoid interpretative reduction to the social-cognitive realm (Batel & Adams, 2016).
Applying SRT to analysing the data material thus enabled dialogue with other case studies on renewable energy working with SRT. By proposing a combined analytical framework of decolonial and critical community psychology and SRT, the article accentuated the latter’s critique of power asymmetries in energy transitions. Critical community psychologists Fine and Ruglis (2009) concept of “circuits of dispossession and privilege” considers how global, neoliberal politics shapes individuals’ and communities’ lived experiences and self-determination possibilities, and centres on the significance that positionality has in knowledge production. Their concept engages in a dialogue with decolonial theory in its attention to the epistemological location of the uttering subject (de Sousa Santos, 2014). Decolonial theories underscore how marginalized individuals and communities might construct unique knowledge about the nature of the oppressive structures they are affected by. More powerful people in these same structures can remain ignorant about their knowledge gaps and lack “epistemic humility” (Pilgrim, 2019; see also de Sousa Santos, 2016).

Through a Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) procedure, this paper illuminated how the participants shared social memories and their engagement in dialogues with other Indigenous communities. This provided them tools that allowed anchoring (Voelklein & Howarth, 2005) “green discourses” in the particular Saami–Norwegian colonial situation, and thus challenging those discourses. Three focal themes were organised through Thematic Analysis to reflect Southern Saami representations of wind power developments. “Wind power as ‘one more’ stage in the Lounge Durée of dispossession”; “Ignorance, as individual knowledge gaps or as structurally produced”; and “Individual and collective responsibility to guarantee herding in the future.”

Identifying with other Indigenous peoples’ struggles equally helped to embed the participants’ calamity into “what it means to be Saami or Indigenous” and to mobilize resistance. Social representations seemed to be created through anchoring the unfamiliar into what is known through collective memory, or innovative objectification (Markova, 2012). These intersubjective processes enabled the participants to question whether hegemonic green economies are sustainable the way they are implemented, and to continue defending the legitimacy, and even global importance, of reindeer herding as an ecological and responsible practice. In the paper, I argue that Southern Saami’s representations of wind energy development could be read as critical sources of knowledge, which Norwegian institutions have not appropriately considered. The downplaying of Southern Saami well-being and rights in the Norwegian green transition may be considered as manifestations of coloniality (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018). Finalizing the paper, I suggest that failing to uncover how
coloniality affects intercultural relations and institutional practices of knowledge production in the Saami–Norwegian context creates the conditions for institutional neglect and societal ignorance about the Southern Saami concerns.

**Paper II – “Time is our worst enemy”: lived experiences and intercultural relations in the making of green aluminium.**

**Paper II** explored lived experiences among the Southern Saami and the Amazon communities, whose ways of life are pressured by value and supply chains involved in the production of ‘green aluminium.’ Paper II builds on paper I in at least three ways. First, drawing on the same data material that I analysed for paper I, this paper expands the scope by also analysing data from the Brazilian Amazon (case study 2). Second, paper II explores the lived experiences structured by the interconnection of green-labelled mining industries and renewable energy projects in the Global North and South. When paper I focused on how the Southern Saami participants generated critical knowledge about green transitions, the more phenomenological and experiential narratives in the data material remained unexplored. This paper thus sets up a dialogue between the lived experiences in two socioculturally different sites, albeit interconnected through current models of green transitions. Third, paper II engages with decoloniality theory more carefully than paper I. I draw on the conceptual framework of the coloniality of being and knowing (Maldonado-Torres, 2007) to study the intercultural relations that manifest in green economies. In doing so I borrowed the Fanonian concept of “zones of non-being” that refers to racialized inferiorisation (Fanon, 2008; Gordon, 2015; Grosfoguel, 2018) to discuss the inclusion or exclusion of certain ways of life in hegemonic climate agendas.

The paper analysed the participants’ lived experiences of exclusion from climate agendas and their frustrating encounters with the state institutions and companies involved as forms of “bad faith” (Gordon, 2015). I generated three themes through Thematic Analysis: “Narratives of loss”; “Dealing with bad faith practices”; and “Experiencing violence and dehumanisation”. The three themes highlight how the green supply and value chains transformed the participants’ lifeworlds in ways they find irreconcilable with the maintenance of their desired ways of life and self-determination rights. Even though the level of direct violence varied – from virtually absent in Norway, to imminent and alarming in Brazil – ‘coloniality’ was a helpful lens to analyse their experiences. The Saami participants’ reflections may help to reconsider how “zones of non-being” are conceptualised. While some accounts spotlight direct violence as “always pending “in zones of non-being (Grosfoguel, 2018), others
point to access (or not) to “realistically claim rights” as the defining characteristic (de Sousa Santos, 2017). Saami participants were able to bring the companies to court, but as paper I also illustrated, they had trouble in attributing violations to institutions when their knowledge received little value, and intercultural translation was virtually absent. During my research, none of the lawsuits were successful. The paper thus illustrates the deep challenges that Indigenous populations confront in their struggle for cultural survival and self-determination.

The paper was written as a critical contribution to promoters of different versions of the “Green New Deal” (GNDs), understood in this thesis as an umbrella term for different proposals aiming for more socially just and inclusive green transitions (Eaton, 2021; Zografos & Robbins, 2020). I proposed that GNDs must become more international and decolonial in their scope to achieve their aims of inclusion and social justice. Finalizing the discussion in this paper, I opened a reflection on whether the terrifying experiences of loss that characterise our epoch may become something that can articulate and “re-member” (Mbembe, 2019) our communities.


Paper III analyses data material the context of the Guarani and Kaiowá people, articulating struggles to reclaim their land now occupied by national and transnational actors producing agrofuel (Pimentel, 2012). This paper expands this thesis’s scope through the inclusion of another case study, exemplifying how old agribusiness actors implement quick fixes and greenwashing strategies (Buseth, 2017). The alarming and “dystopic” human rights situation of the Guarani and Kaiowá people (Ioris, 2019; Naccache, 2019), intertwined with the production of agrofuels, was another reason to include this case study in the thesis.

Approaching the region, and thinking through the methodology cycle (Valsiner, 2017), I began observing how the participants’ collective memory, enacted through verbal narratives, spiritual rituals and political strategies, lay at the centre of their meaning-making processes. To explore the function of their collective memory in their articulation of resistance strategies, I anchored the case study in a conceptual framework that combined recent work in cultural psychology on the interactions between collective memory, political imagination and human action (de Saint-Laurent, 2018b; Jovchelovitch & Hawlina, 2018) with decolonial perspectives on “re-membering” (Mbembe, 2019) and “re-existence” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). I found that the Guarani and Kaiowá’s efforts to transmit and strengthen their collective memory inform their multiple strategies to improve their communities’ resilience.
Paper III hence expands the scope of paper I and paper II by proposing concrete ways in which cultural psychology perspectives on political imagination and collective memory can contribute to developing decolonial approaches in psychology. The paper also expands the scope of the thesis in the sense that I draw on data material constructed through ethnographic methods, and to a larger extent problematise psychological science’s theoretical and conceptual shortcomings when entering a cultural contact zone (Pickren, 2018) with the Guarani and Kaiowá cosmology and philosophy (Gonzalez & Guimarães, 2020).

Through Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I generated three themes; a) Disruption of freedom and abundance: “The bird has no boss, nor a farm”; (b) From abundance to disease and suffocation: “Disoriented as a dog when you’re moving”; and (c) Different paths to re-membering: “When we return to our Tekoha, we are re-living our future.” The narratives bear witness to the important role of collective memory in providing participants with the possibility of imagining a future that can be different from the “toxic environment”, configured through agribusiness development, in the region. Their collective memory became a tool for generating individual and collective action aiming to provoke ruptures in microgenesis (imagination) and sociogenesis (society’s development) (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2015) and recreate ecological resilience.

In the paper, I suggest that learning from the participants’ persistent efforts to defend a collective memory might inspire the current re-thinking of practices inside western academic institutions. In our epoch, in which future-oriented optimism in western societies is being replaced by anxieties, dissonant feelings and social retreat (Morselli, 2013), a community psychology praxis can engage more thoroughly in accompanying individuals and communities enacting similar processes of collective re-memberment (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015). I do not mean that the efforts of the Guarani and Kaiowá are replicable in very different sociocultural contexts, but that the recovery of the ability to imagine a different future – in their case through collective memories of a past of more freedom and abundance – can inspire other communities.

Regarding policy-making and the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledges in the climate agenda, in the paper, I reflect on how these knowledges often are connected to cosmologies and values that complicate their inclusion into hegemonic climate agendas based on continued growth and extraction of natural resources. In this case study, the agribusiness sector in the region framed parts of their activities as “agroecology”, building on Indigenous and peasants diversified and ecological soil practices, justified through limited technical fixes, while ignoring the sociocultural, political, and – in this research setting – spiritual meanings of “agroecology”. In paper III, I argue that rather than a creative innovation, this may be read as greenwashing or
‘co-opting’ practices (Giraldo & Rosset, 2018) and a de-politicisation of Indigenous Knowledges (Grosfoguel, 2016).
6. Discussion

This thesis explores the lived experiences and meaning-making among persons from Indigenous and Tribal communities who are currently confronted by the “double burden” of climate change and mitigation policies. Guided by a dialogical epistemology, and through empirical data from three case studies, I aimed to contribute to filling a gap in psychological research on climate change, as identified by authors writing from several subfields. Summarised, this “gap” is the virtual absence (with exceptions, as noted) of empirical psychological research on people’s lived experiences in Global South and Indigenous communities affected by both weather changes following the climate crisis and renewable energy infrastructures and other green-labelled industries (Teo, 2018), which, following the Saami conceptualisation of “green colonialism”, also renews coloniality. I developed a combined theoretical framework drawing on cultural and critical community psychology perspectives that engage with the “decolonial turn” in social science (Maldonado-Torres, 2017). This theoretical framework provided me with a diverse set of theoretical and methodological tools to approach three socioculturally contrasting research contexts. Along the way, I attempted to reflect critically on each perspective’s strengths and limitations in this particular research project. With the methodological cycle (Valsiner, 2007) as a tool which invites rethinking and further developing research questions and methodology through engagement with the phenomena and the people in the places one does research, I aimed to strengthen this research project’s analytical scope (Valsiner, 2017).

Through learning from the participants’ narratives, the three papers sought to provide answers to the two first research questions: 1) How do people in the Southern Saami, Amazon and Guarani and Kaiowá contexts narrate their lived experiences related to climate change mitigation and climate change? and 2) How did their lived experiences of confrontations with the industries lead to meaning-making and knowledge construction across the three research contexts?

In the following, I summarise and discuss how the main empirical findings may throw light on the coloniality of current hegemonic climate agendas and accordingly contribute to the development of a more inclusive ‘climate psychology’. The three case studies should be read neither as presenting localised or “isolated situations” nor as generalizable cases. Instead, they offer dialogical examples to both scientific and political communities of how hegemonic green economies reproduce coloniality and spaces of inclusion and exclusion (Zografos & Robbins, 2020), often interconnected globally by value and supply chains, as paper II illustrates (Haller et al., 2019). The ambition is that the three case studies may become more “steps on the ladder”
(Zadeh & Cabra, 2020) that build critical knowledge about Indigenous communities’ lived experiences with green colonialism.

The third research question, 3) How can the methodological approaches chosen for this study, and the main findings of the thesis, be contributions to develop a socially engaged and inclusive psychological research on human experiences with climate change?, has been explored throughout the thesis’ chapters. And in the implications section in the present chapter, I provide some further reflections for future research.

In the broadest sense, the thesis reveals some of the deep contradictions and structural problems of global climate agendas and illustrates shortcomings in the approaches from the mainstream, or hegemonic ‘climate psychology’, that has not done much to decolonise.

**Lived experiences and meaning-making**

I chose the two concepts of lived experience and meaning-making in this thesis, for several reasons. First, I assumed that people’s lived experiences are both connected to and precede meaning-making processes since they constitute the material that causes people to engage in meaning-making. This may particularly come to the fore when a lived experience involves a rupture, harm, a dissonance, or an experience that a person judges extraordinary or unfair. As suggested in the background chapter, I do not consider these meaning-making processes entirely intrapsychic phenomena, but rather as fundamentally social and political processes. People use various material and symbolic ‘tools’ and resources (Zittoun, et al., 2003), such as dialogic engagement (explicit or imagined), social representations (paper I) or collective memories (Paper III), to make sense of their life experiences. It is noteworthy that during the study, when I asked participants about their experiences of green-labelled industries, they did not ‘stop’ at describing their frustrating experiences. Instead, their own lived experience became a kind of ‘material’ to reflect critically on what they perceived as deeply unjust climate policies. Paper III illustrates how this was particularly present in the way the Guarani and Kaiowá developed what I described as a “decolonial and ecological theory’, generated from their own experiences of deforestation, “dismemberment”, and forced “confinement” in reserves, and projected onto contemporary global challenges. Generating critical knowledge, from their unique vantage points, can further be conceived as part of their strategies of resistance to moral exclusion, as illustrated by how Saami and Amazon participants rejected aluminium and wind power as green and socially just solutions as long as their lifeworlds were destroyed (paper I and II).

The thesis also sheds light on how the relationship between lived experience and meaning-making is bidirectional. The meanings we give to things in life also shape our lived
experiences, as Sara, a young reindeer herder, illustrated in an interview presented in paper II. I share the quote entirely:

> It is a scary profession. You expose yourself to many things; these are steep landscapes combined with ice. You need to know a lot about nature, how it acts, how the reindeer act, a lot about the weather, about winds... It was never an individual job. It’s all about family, about sijte: “community,” that we help each other. (...) The best part is when you follow the herd. You walk, keeping them together. You feel such serenity. Gathering the herd is the only thing in your mind. You are there, entirely present. There are no times to watch, no dates, no calendar. You are part of the environment. You are very clear-minded. You are not tired, you do not need food. You cannot sit down, you need to follow the herd, the animals decide. Evening arrives, and the herd starts pasturing. You sit down and just watch them. Maybe it’s incorrect to call it freedom, but it is another kind of life.

Sara describes the intense experience of following the reindeer herd, without rest or food and for many hours, in the challenging winter mountains, as (perhaps) a form of freedom. The awareness of doing an activity given to her by her grandparents was part of the positive feelings she experienced, illustrative of the role sense-making has in shaping our lived experiences.

Meaning-making thus gives direction to our experiences, reduces uncertainty (Zittoun, 2007) and allows us to judge whether our experiences are positive or negative for us. This, in turn, opens up for human purposive action on different levels (Valsiner, 2016). This view ties language to embodied lived experience via meaning, a point taken up in decolonial theory (L. R. Gordon, 2015). Thinking, feeling, and acting are interconnected phenomena in human experience, and because they are interconnected, examining all of them would guide psychological research towards a less fragmented understanding (Toomela, 2010). Experiences must be interpreted in their historical context, including the historical context and positionality of the researcher (Tappan, 1997). To a more or less explicit extent, cultural and community psychology and decolonial theory share these general ideas; however, this more holistic and historical-contextual understanding could benefit from reinforcement in mainstream perspectives of climate psychology.

The study has aimed at exploring and describing the lived experiences of people who are confronted with green labelled industries. In doing so, “lived experience” was a lens to investigate the effects of the green transition as a subjective and socially lived experience and not just as an intrapsychological one (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). Documenting these experiences and analysing the ideologies and politics that structure them is particularly relevant to psychology, as shown by Brinkmann (2005) on the “looping effects” that psychological concepts have on people’s self-understanding, as suggested in the background chapter. When ‘climate psychology’ constructs a scientific discourse that omits people’s experiences in the
Global South or Indigenous communities, this is problematic because it reproduces the colonially in both psychological science (knowledge) and intercultural relations (being) (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018) through naturalising Western lifeways, and rendering invisible the lived realities in Global South communities (paper II). This takes place in a colonial world where power remains concentrated mainly in a few centres of power. In paper II, I contributed with more empirical research to those research perspectives highlighting that even those more just and socially inclusive versions of green transition developed in Global North settings may be limited if they do not question coloniality and extractivism sufficiently (Eaton, 2021; Zografos & Robbins, 2020).

Lived experiences of loss

Research on lived experiences of loss due to climate change has grown in psychological (Adams, 2020) and interdisciplinary research (see Tschakert, et al., 2019). Those perspectives suggest that epistemological injustice occurs when certain communities’ experiences of loss, such as in terms of knowledge, sense of place, and identity, remains unquantifiable and is therefore not captured in existing databases on loss due to natural catastrophes or when policymakers judge some losses as acceptable and others intolerable (Tschakert et al., 2017; see also Wirtz, et al., 2014). This thesis contributes evidence to this international research and extends its scope in two ways. First, by demonstrating that losses are caused by climate change and by climate change mitigation. To reduce epistemological injustice (Tschakert et al., 2017), the equation must include not only the analysis of whose loss and loss of what in relation to climate change, but equally the analysis of who loses when someone else’s losses are to be reduced.

While human existence may ‘always’ have been enmeshed with the trauma of witnessing loss, it is the scale of destruction produced as a consequence of extractivist economics that deepened what de Sousa Santos called “epistemicides” (2014, p. 153), to refer to the destruction of knowledge systems and the cultural practices that depend on them. A related question is who must sacrifice something. In the court cases I observed (paper I), the wind company lawyers claimed that “we all have to sacrifice something for society’s development”, referring to the ‘unavoidable’ fact that reindeer herders cannot expect to remain untouched – by in this case, wind turbines – in the mountains they depend on. Such a statement downplays how the Saami have witnessed their environments transformed “piece by piece” (paper I, II) over many years already. Railways, highways, tourism, hydropower, and wind power have added to the “insidious loops” (Whyte, 2018) or the accumulated pressures on Saami communities. In other words, the sacrifices are arguably many, and for the Southern
Saami community, as described in the methodology chapter, this has brought into question the survival of their language and the continuation of herding. Some Southern Saami participants shared their fears that the threshold of existence/non-existence of reindeer herding is becoming reached, leading the young pastoralists to reflect on wind power as a form of gradual genocide (paper I, II), similar to what research on wind power in Indigenous lands in Mexico has identified (A. Dunlap, 2018). Michael, a Guarani and Kaiowá community leader, quoted in paper III, also connects the structural changes and losses to the idea of genocide:

Genocide is a set of things, making you lose your identity. The soybean plantations are a kind of genocide, because we can no longer plant what we had. Today, only sugarcane, soybean, and cattle. What you once had can no longer be born. That is why genocide is a set of things, identity, culture, and soil for growing. It is not only about killing as such. (…) Genocide does not hurt. When you begin feeling, it is too late. It all becomes unstructured (‘desestructurado’) and as a dog when you are moving; you feel, and become all lost.

Second, the thesis sheds light on the ontological dimension (Escobar, 2019) of these losses, an aspect that risks dismissal in Western epistemologies. The ongoing conflicts can be understood as disputes over “world-making” and the pathways for social transformation, and the related ontological question of what there is to be seen, experienced and so on (Blaser et al., 2013). In paper I, this ontological dimension is illustrated by how in the lawsuits elements related to the Saami herders’ spiritual connection to the mountains and the animals remained under-communicated and was supplanted by a more technical language that western-oriented minds might more easily understand. During the research process, I reflected on how it seemed that when talking to “Norwegian minds”, Saami pastoralists tone down their relationship with the animals, the connection they feel to the mountains, and other spiritual and ontologically plural elements, perhaps because they encounter a lack of will or capacity to treat such values with respect. Revealing these more spiritual values may seem too vulnerable an undertaking in contemporary Norwegian society, and one may not be willing to do so at the risk of ridicule. The negative consequence of this arguably “subtle resistance strategy”, which translates to absences, is that different knowledge systems remain in play without speaking to each other in spaces of deep power asymmetries. De Sousa Santos (in Dalea & Robertson, 2004) calls the process of actively rendering knowledge-systems non-existent through silencing them “the sociology of absences”. In the courtroom, critical aspects of the Southern Saami being and knowing remained only subtly hinted at and thus too easily ignored.

In paper III, this ontological dimension is evident in the way the Guarani and Kaiowá speak of disease as “spiritual” and “colonial”, versus how non-indigenous health workers
discussed disease as strictly “biomedical’ and evidence of “cultural anomalies”. The cosmology of the Guaraní and Kaiowá shapes their experiences of the fierce winds, drought, and heat currently blowing through their region. For example, the risk of loss of the specific types of Jaras/Járys, or spirits/guardians that, according to their intricate cosmology, maintain the Earth’s equilibrium (Mura, 2006), has been a central concern motivating multiple people to engage with ecological strategies and practices that would also be considered ecological and well-grounded from a Western epistemological position, even if the meaning-systems entangled in them are different. These issues point to the need for intercultural translation (de Sousa Santos, 2016), and acknowledgement of the multiplicity of social experience (Escobar, 2019; Jensen & Guimarães, 2018) in climate research’s focus on lived experiences of loss.

Lived experiences of dehumanisation

“Dehumanisation” has been explored from many disciplinary angles and in different historical contexts (Haslam, 2021). While the earliest psychological accounts of dehumanisation focused on extreme violence and mass atrocities (Staub, 1989), recent research includes its more subtle and complex expressions (Haslam, 2021). The amplitude in dehumanisation studies now includes such aspects as subtle discrimination, hierarchical domination, exploitation, oppression, social death, and outright social or moral exclusion from society (Kronfeldner, 2020, p. 16), to name a few. The diversification of dehumanisation studies made Haslam worry over possible “concept creep”, meaning that “semantic inflation” classifies too many human processes as dehumanisation, thus leading to disinflation of the concept and diminishing its strength (Haslam, 2016). In this thesis, the decolonial framework prompts consideration of dehumanisation as inseparably intertwined with racism and coloniality (Maldonado-Torres, 2007; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015). Although the participants experienced different levels and forms of violence they had in common that they reflected on how their ways of life were excluded in green transitions. In paper II, I reflect on the coloniality of intercultural relations reproduced in hegemonic climate action, arguing that some cultural ways of life are promoted, whereas others are excluded or sacrificed. “Green Sacrifice Zones” is proposed as a concept to describe the pressures on Indigenous lands to supply material for low-carbon transitions (Zografos & Robbins, 2020). Green Sacrifice Zones are a geographical concept but they have a semantic link to the decolonial idea of a “zone-of-nonbeing” that I drew on in paper II. Zones of nonbeing are not a geographical concept but a position in ethnic hierarchies (Fanon, 2008; Grosfoguel, 2018). However, the Indigenous and tribal communities’ ways of life were deeply territorially connected and dependent across research sites, showing that zones-of-nonbeing, when applied as a lens to analyse how green extractive industries affect Indigenous people as a
form of dehumanisation, have a geographical or spatial side because their territories are what supports their *being*. Simultaneously Green Sacrifice Zones become something more than a geographical concept because by taking away the material basis of Indigenous lifeworlds, the foundations of epistemicides are laid.

*Dehumanising narratives*

Across research sites, the participants contested what – drawing on narrative scholar Hammack (2011) – I would refer to as “dehumanising master-narratives”. These narratives dehumanised the participants’ cultural ways of life, framing them as backward and ‘out of date’, illustrated by how the Quilombola leader Joni described how the staff of a bauxite mine humiliated people by asking them to stop self-perceiving as “museums to keep history” (paper II). In disputes over extractive industries in rural communities, master-narratives of “sub-development” are frequent (Murrey & Jackson, 2020), translating to subtle traces of violence (Auestad & Kabesh, 2017), because they deny the value people give to their lifeworlds. Promises of work and infrastructural development (even if people and communities first ‘must’ be dispossessed of their territories and rights) can cause ruptures in the social tissue of communities; ruptures then used discursively to justify the expansion of extractive frontiers because the conflicts are described as internal community-conflicts (Arsel, et al., 2016). Paper II draws on data from the Amazon, where community leader Kevin was aware of how such master-narratives influence the youth. “If you let the dragon in, it eats you”, Kevin states, suggesting that part of the community resistance to bauxite mining was to impede the *dialogues* with the companies because of their persuading effects. Researchers working on renewable energy development elsewhere have coined such mechanisms “inclusionary control”, suggesting that promises of influence in decision-making are too often a form of pseudo-participation to convince people not to resort to more radical action (Verweijen & Dunlap, 2021).

In the Guaraní and Kaiowá context (paper III), the youth leader Dandara contested dominant racist master-narratives that blame the widespread social suffering in the reserves on specific “cultural traits”. She reflected on the reserves as a form of torture, because they systematically break down a person and the meaning of life for him or her:

> People look around here. The psychological torture from agribusiness starts messing with our minds, with our community. People think we have no chance, that ‘for me, there is no return’: no more forests, no more birds, no longer that nice wind, because the trees are all gone. This process leads people to think that it is all over, it generates many conflicts in their minds and people ask themselves: ‘will I ever be able to live, to live again the life I had before?’
Dehumanising toxicity

Dehumanisation was also experienced daily through embodied exclusion and structural violence. The case study of the Guarani and Kaiowá’s struggle to reclaim their lands (paper III) confirmed, as assumed when including it in the thesis, the most brutal experiences of violence and dehumanisation. The racism and violence resisted by the Guarani and Kaiowá are well documented (Ioris, 2019; Naccache, 2019; Urt, 2016). Observed from this region, global discussions concerning the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledges to the climate agendas seem quite distant because the violence intertwined with the green economy in this area of the world is so extreme (Naccache, 2019; Pimentel, 2012). I call their environment toxic, given both the extended use of pesticides and the toxic effects of racism, colonialism, alienation and direct and structural forms of violence in people’s lives in this region (paper III). This toxicity is directly connected with Brazil’s commitments to the Paris Agreements because the disputed lands occupied by the agro-fuel production are amongst Brazil’s contributions (Lima et al., 2020).

Despite the violence they suffer, many Guarani and Kaiowá families and community leaders put impressive efforts into multiple resilience strategies. However, their efforts are ignored and threatened by Brazil’s mitigation policies. Participants expressed their vulnerability to attacks and their frustration that even Human Rights bodies only appear “when the dust has settled” (paper III). Paper II also shows embodied experiences of “toxic violence” (Davies, 2019) from the pollution from alumina industries – in this case out of sight in the labelling of green aluminium. Participants narrated violent persecution, severe pollution with damaging effects on ecosystems and their bodies, ecocides, lack of respect, condemnation, high levels of insecurity, and depression. Both paper II and III thus showcase dystopic examples of human experiences inside Green Sacrifice Zones (Zografos & Robbins, 2020), out of sight of global policymaking forums, and arguably most of the time out of sight of mainstream perspectives of psychological research on the climate crisis.

Meaning-making and knowledge construction in confrontations with the industries

While the decolonial literature looking at knowledge production is becoming rich and diverse, on a very general level, to decolonise knowledge production is often suggested as starting from identifying and questioning the epistemic hierarchy that privileges Western knowledge over marginalised communities’ epistemic perspectives, cosmologies and philosophies (Escobar, 2019; Grosfoguel, 2007; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; de Sousa Santos, 2016). Each discipline has its colonial “ghosts” to illuminate and confront, and the “decolonial turn” in the social sciences often involves a ‘double movement’ – of documenting the immersion of a discipline in reproducing coloniality, and mapping out ways in which future (decolonized) research can
integrate a project of humanisation and social transformation (Kerner, 2014). Decolonial approaches in psychology arguably follow such a double route (e.g. Adams, et al., 2018; Fernández et al., 2021; Maldonado-Torres, 2017), and I position this thesis in a similar double movement, by identifying gaps in psychological research on climate change and reflecting on possible contributions from psychological science to support communities confronting “green colonialism” (Saami-Council, 2017).

Knowledge traversed the work with this thesis in multiple ways. From observing the absences produced by the lack of intercultural translation of different knowledge systems during lawsuits in Norway; to reflecting on the dynamics between communities’ value-systems, meaning-making and knowledge construction as it unfolded across the research sites; and to critically reflecting about how to construct non-extractivist research methodologies. I therefore searched for theoretical framings that could help me link lived experience and meaning-making to how knowledge is constructed. In paper I, I therefore applied Social Representations Theory (SRT), developed in Moscovivi’s project of constructing psychology committed to the study of how people constitute their common realities through construction and sharing of knowledge (Moscovici, 1981, 1990). SRT supported research on resistance against wind power in the UK (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015; Upham et al., 2019), allowing us to interrogate previous assumptions such as NIMBY-ism (not in my backyard) (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015; Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017) that consider the public as a “barrier to change”. SRT researchers identified a need for a more profound analysis of how power asymmetries and dissent operate (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015). In Paper I, I applied SRT to explore experiences with wind energy in the Southern Saami community, thus contributing to the research with reflections of colonial dynamics in wind energy development in Indigenous territories, a previously unstudied area for SRT.

Jovchelovitch (2008) finds that the theory of social representations intersects with phenomenology, “in bringing to light the structure of worldviews, of beliefs and forms of life that can produce a theory of everyday life and the knowledge it produces” (2008, p. 441). Paper I and II show that in the Saami participants’ meaning-making and their process of constructing social representations and their lived experiences, as in Sara’s “mountain phenomenology” (see extract above, reproduced from paper II), were important resources, along with their engagement in dialogue and exchange with other Indigenous communities. These dialogues strengthened their identity as Saami and as Indigenous people and thus allowed them to contest the more dominant representations (Howarth, 2006) of wind energy development as green and sustainable. Moscovici promoted an optimistic view of humans’ ability to construct knowledge
relevant to their everyday lives. Analysing the findings of paper I with analytical tools from critical and decolonial community psychology helped to position the social representations of wind power among the Southern Saami as unique knowledge produced from their epistemological position within a colonial structure.

The link between the meaning-making and social representations, and people’s lifeworld that Jovchelovitch (2008) identifies, allows us to move into the ontological multiplicity that some approaches to decolonial theory conceive as a necessary expansion of current epistemological frameworks (Burman, 2017). These perspectives underscore that related to the disputes over the value of different knowledges are fundamentally ontological questions over world-making (Escobar, 2019). Knowledges are both shaped by the materiality, the value systems and the purposes of our lifeworlds, and simultaneously build these worlds. Across the three case studies, the participants talked about their relations and affection to the landscapes, the mountains, the rivers, animals and other beings (that I, as an outsider, listened to stories about and reflected over, but were unable to observe). Keeping these relationships healthy and paying respect to the diverse non-human forms of life was a purpose of their knowledge building. This connection between meaning and value systems, lifeworlds, cosmologies, philosophies and knowledge production, pinpoints why simply ‘including’ Indigenous Knowledges into hegemonic green economy schemes may be complicated by the fact that their world-making purposes are so different.

As an example, in Brazil, I was told that the Norsk Hydro supported social programme ‘Sustainable Barcarena’, had promoted agroecology workshops among the local communities. A research participant told me that with disapproval. He related how it was humiliating to see how companies occupy and pollute their land, and thus expropriate the material basis for sustaining their agro-ecological knowledges, and returned these to the population in a version deprived of their meaning (and of the land that would be required to practice them fully). Paper III shows a similar story. In Mato Grosso do Sul, the ontological conflict (Blaser et al., 2013) exhibits itself in the deforested and evergreen sugarcane and soybean fields, at times interrupted by small land recovery camps, with groups of tents made of black canvas, and a larger diversity of plants. Planting diversity, according to the participants, is one way of curing the diseased soil; and curing the soil makes the elders’ prayers for the equilibrium of earth’s cosmos more potent again (paper III).
In this place where disputes over world-making are ongoing, and monoculture exists not only as a crop but also as the hegemonic model of life, agribusiness impresarios have come to frame parts of their endeavour as “agroecology” through undertaking limited technical fixes (paper III). The two situations suggest how the technical knowledges of agroecology were extracted from the meaning and value systems they are embedded in, and returned to the communities in depoliticised ways; deprived of their intentions and of their critical content. This throws light on the danger that including Indigenous Knowledges into wider development schemes may even be counter-indicative.

Implications of the study and reflections for future psychology and policymaking
This present study demonstrates that engaging with critical and decolonial epistemologies in empirical research on climate change leads us to different research results than the mainstream perspectives that have dominated the emerging climate psychology. To decolonize climate psychology, it is not sufficient to simply include previously excluded communities into established research schemes without critical epistemological and methodological reflection. In my research, trying out an explorative methodology allowed me to both reflect critically about the politics that structure lived experience, and to learn from people’s knowledges and collective efforts to resist exclusion and propose alternatives. Furthermore, I would argue that research in WEIRD contexts could also benefit from adopting a more optimistic human view, in line with both community and cultural psychology perspectives that have as their aim supporting human flourishing (Brinkmann, 2016). Following Brinkmann (2016), we can see that psychological research shapes reality through its discourses – perhaps even in a more solid
way than other sciences – because psychological science’s discourses affect human self-understanding. The treatment of western individuals as “passive reactors” to climate change policies, which I have argued is a tendency in psychological research on the climate, could be hypothesised as contributing to those discourses which are proving unable to combat the apathy and paralyzing future anxiety identified in western societies (Clayton, 2020a; Morselli, 2013). For instance, acknowledging people as evaluative beings could open for moving from such as cognitive dissonance as a barrier of change towards exploring whether perceived “societal dissonance” affects people’s adherence to climate policies. Could it be that the observation of a discrepancy between discourses of urgency on the policy level (Lynch & Veland, 2018) and the continued course of affairs, is a larger part of what renders people passive and beset with feelings of helplessness than psychological science has so far explored?

When I initially included Berta Caceres’ phrase “wake up humanity; there is no more time” in this project’s title to remember her, I did not realize that during my work with this thesis the quote would make me reflect repeatedly on the *time element* she had mentioned. The questions of time, speed and urgency seem to be relevant for future psychological research on climate change. The striving for speed and acceleration in WEIRD spaces, in everything from transportation to digital operations, generates high energy-demanding and therefore unsustainable structures and lifestyles (Trawick & Hornborg, 2015). For Mbembe (2019), “the acceleration of speed and intensification of connections” one has access to seems to correlate with *being* or conditions of invisibility or disposability in the contemporary world (Mbembe, 2021). To *be* is to move fast and easily. Decolonial psychologists have suggested that people in WEIRD societies end up naturalising such high-energy demanding ways of being (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018). The problem is the huge ecological footprint that high-speed demands produce, damaging the conditions for continued life in many places on earth (Mbembe, 2019). This is also what the geographical concept of Green Sacrifice Zones (Zografos & Robbins, 2020) is meant to capture. Mbembe’s argument seems to be that whereas ecological damage is advancing in certain “edges” of the world, the ongoing “technological escalation” (Mbembe, 2021) will demand so much energy that these edges will grow in the near future. Following this line of argument, the three case studies represent examples of global developments that, with time, will affect more people and more communities.

“How far away are we really from the time when there will be more carbon dioxide than oxygen to breathe?”, ask Mbembe and Shread (2021) in an essay written during the Covid-19 pandemic. Guarani and Kaiowá participants brought up a feeling of suffocation when they described the deforestation and confinement they are subjected to (paper III). In paper III, I
described the toxic conditions in which the Guarani and Kaiowá live as a kind of dystopic laboratory of human resistance faced with the adversity that Mbembe (2019) suggested is developing in the edges of the world. The youth leader Dandaras’ words were meaningful (paper III):

Nature wants to show that we will suffocate. Only today, experts started to talk about global warming. It started long ago, but they only discovered it now. Too late. But I think we can still prolong a while our survival.

A similar issue is advanced by the Brazilian Indigenous philosopher Ailton Krenak (2020) in his book Ideas to Postpone the End of the World. Krenak suggests that for many Indigenous peoples, their worlds have already ended, often in brutal ways, through the encounter with people from Europe (Krenak, 2020; see also Whyte, 2017). For the Guarani and Kaiowá, this event, the ‘sarambi’ (chaos, disorder, see paper III) had its onset around 1915, only a little more than a hundred years ago. There are still people alive who can narrate how they witnessed the deforestation, and thus dismemberment, of their lifeworld, from their new location inside the reserves. Similar experiences may make some subaltern communities imagine the future from their collective memories of the past. Their utopian thinking is built on representations of the past, because in the future that Western modernity builds, their ways of life are not contemplated. While in Western contexts, political projects recalling the past have often been considered nostalgic, my argument in paper III, in line with Brescó (2017), was that in this study, it was a critical engagement with the past that helped people to denaturalize both the agribusiness hegemony and the harmful representations of themselves and imagine the possibility of a different future. This exercise is contained in the concepts of “re-membering” (Kalafatic, 2020; Mbembe, 2021; Ngugi, 2009) and “re-existence” (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) that today articulate many anticolonial struggles.

Morselli (2013) suggests that on the contrary, in western cultural understandings of time as linear and unidirectional, which equalize future and progress, when encountering the uncertainty of environmental crisis, the positive sign of the future may be changed with one of threat and fear. The correlation between cultural modes of orienting toward, experiencing and perceiving time, and the ecological footprints a given culture leaves, was already suggested as a potential line of research to be strengthened in the APA report in 2009 that sparked climate research in psychology (Swim et al., 2009). In the report’s authors’ perspective, the decarbonization of the economy could be followed up by investments in time (de Graaf, 2003) to reduce our use of natural resources. This is in line with decolonizing perspectives asserting that high-energy and unsustainable lifeways in WEIRD societies are part of what leads to
reproducing colonial intercultural relations (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018) through resource extraction in the Global South (Zografos & Robbins, 2020). However, it underlines the entanglement between such ‘accelerated’ cultural ways and the forms of work organization in Global North societies where speed demands are not unrelated to worker exploitation. This underlines the importance of time perspectives in explorative research on climate change. I thus argue that for future psychological research, finding ways to study time frames as entangled in human lived experiences with climate change – as was already formulated as an option in the APA report that set in motion the emerging climate psychology (Swim et al., 2009) – could perhaps allow climate psychologists working close to policymakers to propose different things.

For Mbembe (2020), uncertainty and fear of loss in the Anthropocene may make people accept the greater exclusion of ‘others’ if their needs become seen as threats. These feelings can be strengthened by the sense of urgency in the Anthropocene. The paradox is that while the large impacts climate change have on Indigenous peoples, as documented by the IPCC (2019), are arguably part of what creates a sense of urgency and political consensus around global climate policy, the “double burden” of climate change and renewable energy development they experience is scarcely attended to. As paper II illustrates, if intercultural relations are affected by coloniality, even green transition proposals seeking inclusion and social justice through building green job opportunities can fail to make visible the distant social and environmental consequences of the resource extraction that renewable energy infrastructure depends on. Psychological research on climate change could do more in making visible these harms.

In paper II, I argued that perceived urgency might block more profound social transformation processes (de Sousa Santos, 2014; Lynch & Veland, 2018). This can occur in very concrete ways – in for instance time pressure during the licencing of wind energy development in Norway – and hinders more democratic processes in which a project passes through a larger political discussion and all legal settings in meaningful ways before it is approved. In chapter 2, I pointed out that even in countries in which international legal frameworks guaranteeing Indigenous rights are ratified, there is a risk that consultations remain tick-box procedures with little room for substantial change if financial and time pressures are high enough (Hanna & Vanclay, 2013). For future psychological research and practice committed to Human Rights (Patel, 2020; Sveaass & Wessells, 2020), raising awareness of the power dynamics involved that lead to imperfect implementation of Indigenous rights in these contexts, and generate spaces to reflect on alternatives, could be valid contributions.
On a more general level, what seems to be at stake is our ability to redirect the often-traumatizing experience of loss into something that can mobilise efforts to re-member humanity. I formulated this opening towards the end of paper II, because of the very substantial lived experience of loss that the participants reflected on. Adams (2020) asks if recovering loss as a shared denominator for human and non-human experiences in our epoch might help to identify the tools to question colonial and corporate power, despite the fact that we experience loss in unequal terms. It seems to me that the contribution of community psychology in the context of the ecological crisis could be to engage in changing the sign of loss from one of anxiety and distance, towards something different and shared, which can build bridges and strengthen the solidarity between communities (Teo, 2018, p. 204). While there are differences in the experience (and severity) of loss, there may also be commonalities. A passage in Gordon (2015, p. 88)’s book What Fanon Said is interesting in this regard. Here, he critiques Fanon’s view on white people’s appropriation of blues, in which Fanon considers whites listening to the blues as entertained by the suffering that their political location in a racist culture has created (Fanon, 1967 p. 37). Gordon states that, on the contrary, people may connect to aesthetic experiences emerging out of experiences other than their own. In his view, the blues express “modern suffering” in an “absurd and unfair world”; and thus transcend its particularity “into a more universalizing practice”. While Gordon is writing about an aesthetic experience in this passage, his views may be relevant for thinking about the human experiences of loss. Krenak (2020, p. 47) writes that “What I have learned over these decades is that we all need to wake up, because whereas before it was just us, the Indigenous peoples, who were facing a loss of meaning in our lives, today everyone is at risk, without exception.”
7. Concluding reflections

This thesis has explored people’s lived experiences, meaning-making and knowledge construction in relation to climate change and extractive industries labelled “green” in three Indigenous and Tribal contexts. In their communities, bauxite mining, wind energy development and agrofuel production – all ventures positioned within hegemonic green transition frameworks – have provoked conflict and resistance. I drew on perspectives from community psychology, cultural psychology and decolonial theory to provide a theoretical framework for the study. In this thesis, I have presented three case studies that I advance as dialogical examples to both scientific and policymaking communities, to address how hegemonic climate action can reproduce coloniality and exclude Indigenous ways of life, value-systems and knowledges. The material suggests that people’s painful experiences of loss, exclusion, and what I described as dehumanising narratives and ‘toxicity’, are signs of deeply problematic aspects of hegemonic climate action frameworks.

I have taken implicitly both a normative and pragmatic position, arguing that climate action frameworks must protect the diversity of meaning-making, ecological values and knowledge-systems, and find ways to learn from them rather than deny them. This position is pragmatic due to an assumption that diversity of social practises and knowledge-systems suit humanity’s best needs in an epoch in which the climate crisis is forcing us to map out alternatives. We need this diversity to imagine different routes and courses of action (Bradbury, 2019; Lynch & Veland, 2018; Ndlovu, 2014). Global climate and biodiversity reports recognise the importance of these knowledges, but the three case studies throw light on the detachment between these global aims of including Indigenous Knowledges in climate agendas and how, in reality, green-labelled extractive industries can structure people’s lived experiences of loss, exclusion, and dehumanisation. In the theoretical framework chapter, I considered how the sense of urgency in the Anthropocene might block more profound social transformation and reproduce the ignorance towards and exclusion of Indigenous world-making and knowledges in current climate action frameworks. I would therefore argue that, rather than scientific complexity, a central weakness hampering the pursuit of socially just and sustainable green transitions is the Anthropocene’s entanglement in coloniality which limits social institutions’ capacity to learn from the diversity of knowledge systems already existing on the planet. As a first step, psychological science on the climate issue could in the future expand the scope from the individual barriers of climate action, arguably a focus of today’s mainstream perspectives, towards the dynamics of institutional and structural barriers.
At the same time, the argument that climate action frameworks must protect the diversity knowledge-systems and find ways to learn from them is also a normative position. In the thesis, I outlined how cultural, community and decolonial perspectives in psychology, although following somewhat different routes, are guided by ethico-political frameworks. Their ideal of “human flourishing” (Brinkmann, 2016), or the practice of plural systems of knowledge and meaning, cosmologies and philosophies, is a moral and ethical, and thus normative, affair that unites these research fields. One suggestion in this thesis has been that even in countries that have ratified international legal frameworks to protect Indigenous rights, such as Brazil and Norway, rights can be violated when economic or time pressures are strong, or if the dynamics of coloniality weaken the institutions capability of inclusion. Psychologists defending Human Rights (e.g. Patel, 2020; Sveaass & Wessells, 2020) could orient their practice toward generating awareness of those power dynamics at play that limit opportunities for learning and change. Moreover, the thesis has highlighted the view of humans as intentional and evaluative meaning-makers (Shweder et al., 2007). I asserted that Brinkman’s argument that mainstream perspectives in psychology tend to portray humans as passive “reactors” (Brinkmann, 2016) – and through “looping effects” (Hacking, 1995) influence humans’ self-understanding – may be observable in the emerging climate psychology if it establishes a view of people as “reactors to green policies”. I want to extend that argument to propose that, confronted with the current climate crisis, opening up to learn from people’s diverse lifeworld’s knowledges, value-systems, and relational ethics, as a subject matter of psychology, might lead us to more constructive ways of seeing ‘the other’ and ourselves, mirrored in the current climate crisis. As argued in this thesis, to decolonise psychological science is not to include marginalised communities into established research schemes, but to question and disrupt the assumptions and consequences of these research schemes including in non-indigenous settings. This would open up for the construction of a more critical vocabulary in psychology on the climate, which is urgently needed to reclaim the creative potential of critique and crisis (Jovanović, 2021).
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Abstract
This paper explores social representations of wind energy development within reindeer herding lands among the Indigenous Southern Saami living within Norwegian borders. For this matter, the paper combines Social Representations Theory (SRT) with the analytical framework of "circuits of dispossession and privilege" and decolonial approaches within community psychology. Data consisted of seven individual semi-structured open-ended interviews, three collective interviews, and observation in three lawsuits, public meetings, protest actions, and reindeer herding activities. The findings suggest that for the subjects in this study, the onset of wind power represents the renewal of historical processes of dispossession through accumulation and colonialism, enabled by harmful knowledge gaps in Norwegian society and institutions, contrasting Southern Saami’s values of responsibility and ecological practices. The implication of these findings suggests an urgent need of rethinking renewable energy and including indigenous knowledge in climate change agendas.
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“For centuries, it was the land of the reindeer, not that of the strong and electrified man. A new and white man spread out his three wings, and dispossess centuries and future memories.”

Sara Emilie Jåma, Reindeer herder and poet (in Fjellheim, 2016).
(This article author’s translation from original in Norwegian)

1 INTRODUCTION

This article explores how large-scale wind power industrial sites are implemented in Norway and experienced by the Indigenous Southern Saami community. Although large-scale wind energy projects are framed as climate change mitigation strategies, they can simultaneously endanger sustainable life systems, violate human rights, or add an “insult to the injury” of communities already striving to adapt to climate change (Avila, 2018; Dunlap, 2019; Marino & Ribot, 2012). In such a context, some populations are not only vulnerable to climate change, as policies of climate change mitigation can also put their life systems at risk. Among the Indigenous Saami population, tensions concern the survival of their ancestral reindeer herding, which given its cultural centrality is protected by international law. Winters are becoming unstable, causing threats for both herders and animals (Riseth & Tømmervik, 2017). Large-scale wind power facilities can further reduce resilience in herding by dispossessing Saami herders of their pasturelands. In Norway, Aili Keskitalo, the Saami parliament’s president, has summarized this policy and development practice as “green colonialism” (The arctic circle, 2020), pinpointing that the processes around wind energy development might intensify colonial losses of land and rights in Norway.

In the current Anthropocene, or capitaloscene era (see Adams (2020) for psychological perspectives on these concepts), generating more knowledge about how green discourses can renew colonial legacies is crucial. Examining wind energy development in the Southern Saami territory, I advance community psychology’s (CP) engagement with the experiences among individuals and communities exposed to large-scale renewable energy projects, affecting their human rights. Critical orientations in CP have long traditions of questioning power imbalances and working for social justice (Kagan, Burton, Duckett, Lawthom, & Siddiquee, 2019; Montero, 2009). These and the more recent epistemological discussions in CP that have followed the decolonial turn (e.g., Dutta, 2018; Dutta, Sonn, & Lykes, 2016) could contribute with research on possible consequences of climate change mitigation or adaptation projects. From social psychology, the social representations theory (SRT) (Moscovici, 1984) has been applied to explore how and why resistance to renewable energy projects is becoming so common (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017; Upham, Bögel, & Johansen, 2019). Their research has complexified how we understand resistance to change and helped to overcome previous assumptions such as NIMBY (not in my backyard). Yet, research has focused on research sites in the Global North, in which issues concerning minority or Indigenous rights are less evident. Furthermore, SRT researchers themselves identified that there is still a need for a more profound analysis of how power asymmetries and dissent operate in practice (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015). This should avoid reducing interpretations of findings to the social cognitive realm (Batel & Adams, 2016).

Proposing a combined framework of critical CP and SRT, this article seeks to accentuate the latter’s critique of power asymmetries in processes of energy transition. The article combines SRT with decolonial and critical CP to explore the lived experiences among the Southern Saami confronting with wind power development. I engage with the works of Michelle Fine and her colleagues (Fine & Ruglis, 2008; Fine, Greene, & Sanchez, 2016; Weis & Fine, 2012) to contribute to this forming literature, as their work building on their framework of "circuits of dispossession and privilege" provides fertile bridges between CP and broader frameworks of decolonization and...
political ecology. Their optic of “circuits of dispossession and privilege” considers how global neoliberal politics shapes individuals’ and communities’ experiences and possibilities for self-determination (Fine & Ruglis, 2008), and is attentive to the relevance of positionality in knowledge production. This further provides a good dialogue with decolonial directions in psychology (Maldonado-Torres, 2017) and their attention to epistemological location (Sousa Santos, 2014).

Thus, Fine and colleagues offer analytical conceptualizations useful to interpret findings through SRT in this study. Their concepts, taken together and combined with SRT as a framework for analysis, underscore how marginalized individuals and communities might construct unique knowledge about oppressive structures, and how the more powerful in these same structures can develop ignorance about their own knowledge gaps and lack “epistemic humility” (Pilgrim, 2020; see also Sousa Santos, 2016). The application of these concepts in the forthcoming analysis illuminated how participants’ shared social memories and their engagements in dialogues with other communities provided tools and sources of critical knowledge that allowed participants to anchor, position, and challenge “green discourses” in the ongoing particular Saami–Norwegian colonial situation (Bastien, Kremer, Kuokkanen, & Vickers, 2003). Such critical knowledge is highly due in Norwegian political agendas, and this study underscores the relevance of current decolonizing discourses in the Norwegian context.

1.1 | Wind power in Norway

Related to its international climate change mitigation commitments, the Norwegian government is facilitating an expansion in large-scale wind power projects in multiple sites across the country. Even if this development progressed slower than in other European countries, related to the vast hydropower resources in the country (Inderberg, Rognstad, Saglie, & Gulbrandsen, 2019), currently, a shift from a history where policies aimed for state control and national sovereignty (Christiansen, 2002) toward a more volatile situation where transnational capital and global interests set the agenda has been observed. The field is currently moving quickly. Otte, Rønningen, and Moe (2018) found that the increase in wind energy development is inspired by Norwegian commitments to European electricity markets and domestic consumption. Likewise, this is intertwined with national and transnational companies related to aluminum smelting and energy-demanding servers, such as Norsk Hydro, Alcoa, Google, and Facebook (Bakke, 2019), purchasing renewable energy. Through renewable energy purchases, these industries can “green” their activities and gain market shares in the wake of the Paris Agreement (Gunderson, Stuart, & Petersen, 2018). Among the investors, we find a mix of public and private capital. Whereas relatively small companies tend to initiate the license applications for wind power projects, the rights are frequently sold to big, transnational investment funds (Hovland, 2020). The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) is central to facilitating licensing processes. In 2019, NVE published a report mapping potential wind energy expansion sites, in addition to already granted licenses (Lee, 2019). The report was widely contested, and government withdrawal to redesign the process.

When wind power industries claim negligible social and environmental impacts, research from around the world suggests that significant socioecological impacts persist, which adversely affect the livelihoods of vulnerable communities (Dunlap, 2019; Gorayeb, Brannstrom, de Andrade Meireles, & de Sousa Mendes, 2018; Siamanta & Dunlap, 2019). This is also the case for Saami territories in Sweden (Lawrence, 2014). Thus, wind energy development has generated significant opposition (Devine-Wright, 2005; Dunlap, 2019; Gifford, 2008; Pasqualetti, 2011; Siamanta & Dunlap, 2019; Wolsink, 2006). Norway is no exception. Environmentalist organizations observe a rise in memberships due to wind power (Strandén, 2019), and new local and national protest networks are emerging. These movements build their discourses on combinations of environmental, health-related, political, and social arguments (Oil and Energy Department, 2020), which are slowly generating greater awareness amongst the Norwegian public.
1.2 | Southern Saepmi and violations of indigenous rights

Several of the large-scale wind power projects in Norway are implemented within mountain regions where the Saami people have reindeer herding rights based on their historical land use of the areas. The Indigenous Saami, in fact, is an Indigenous people with great internal linguistic and cultural diversity who populate areas that today are under Swedish, Norwegian, Russian, and Finnish sovereignty. The Saami’s self-determination is, therefore, inhibited by these countries’ borders and state institutions. In each country, the Saami population struggles to advance certain rights, meanwhile highlighting the persistence and continuity of colonial relationships and legacies (Spangen, Salmi, Åikäs, & Lehtola, 2015). In the Norwegian Saami context, this is illustrated by the arrival of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in 2018 (Normann, 2019). In 2022, the TRC shall deliver a report on how fornorståningspolitikk (“norwegianisation politics”) has inflicted colonial injustice on the Indigenous Saami and the country’s Kven/Norwegian Finns minorities, and propose pathways for reconciliation. The Norwegian government has ratified the United Nations International Labor Organization’s (ILO) 169 in 1990 as well as enshrined Saami rights into the constitution. Yet, in many cases concerning diverging interests in land use, the advances of Saami self-determination have experienced setbacks (Broderstad, 2014).

The Southern Saami is one among the Saami populations. Whereas their traditional territory is extensive, the Southern Saami are a minority in the cities and settlements where they live. Norway has no ethnic register, but the Southern Saami cultural center, Samien Sijte, estimates a population of around 2000 people, distributed across Sweden and Norway. This includes approximately 500 native language speakers, with the Saami language, òarjel-saemien gïele, listed by UNESCO as in danger of extinction (Steinfjell, 2014). Reindeer herding is at the heart of the Southern Saami culture. Years of colonial and state assimilation practices have affected their community, leaving them with few remaining spaces to strengthen and transfer knowledge, language, and cultural practices, except those generated around herding (Normann, 2019).

In Southern Saepmie², an enduring conflict concerns the nationally established “thesis” about when and how the Saami populated these areas. Yngvar Nielsen, the first Norwegian professor in ethnography, alleged in his dissertation in 1889 that the Southern Saami had only arrived in the province of Trøndelag in the 18th century (Fjellheim, 2020). This “authorized truth,” however, is contested by Saami researchers with archeological evidence that suggests Saami presence in the region as early as 800–1200 AD (Fjellheim, 2019). This authorized truth can be understood as one of the strong expressions of epistemological violence (Teo, 2011) that has produced material and symbolic consequences for the Southern Saami. Although historical negation is harmful in itself (Sibley, Liu, Duckitt, & Khan, 2008), the “thesis” supported claims about who came first in lawsuits over land rights between Norwegian farmers and Saami reindeer herders. Saami researchers continue to demand from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), in Trøndelag region, to rewrite the history books. As late as 2005, the publication of a three-volume history of the Trøndelag region continued to omit the Saami from the history of the region (Fjellheim, 2019).

Media discourses might also be having a negative effect on Saami reindeer herding. Rather than focusing on how climate change affects herding districts, the Norwegian government and the media appease the distorted belief that reindeer herding is an environmental “offender” (Benjaminsen, Reinert, Sjaastad, & Sara, 2015). The expressions of climate change on herding vary between regions, but the impacts are expected to worsen in the coming years (Riseth & Tømmervik, 2017). In 2017, for instance, in one of the districts under study in this article, Jillen-Njaarke sijte (see below), around 100 reindeers slipped on the snow-covered ice produced by an unstable winter and fell down a steep mountainside (Namdalsavisa, 2017). The herder, clinging to a tree, barely saved his life.

Hence, while reindeer herders are working to adapt to increasing climatic instability, in the last decade, Southern Saami lands have additionally turned into sites of contestations over wind energy development.

²Saepmie is the land of the Saami people, covering extensive parts of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Kola peninsula in Russia.
The Southern Saami claim that industrial-scale wind turbines will have a disastrous socioecological effect on herding. The turbines bring increased human activity, the construction of energy infrastructure, and new road networks that will negatively affect reindeers’ pasturelands, thus threatening Saami herding practices, livelihoods, and consequently their cultural survival. The Saami parliament’s current president, Ailo Keskitalo, calls wind energy development “green colonialism” (The arctic circle, 2020), linking current trends of renewable energy development with historical processes of dispossession and subjugation inflicted on the Saami.

1.3 | Psychology and climate change

Since the American Psychological Association, Task Force on the Interface Between Psychology and Global Climate Change (2009), publications on “climate” and “psychology” have proliferated. In 2015, researchers clustered psychology’s main contributions into three main categories: public perceptions, behavioral drivers, and the relation between climate change and psychosocial well-being (Clayton et al., 2015). A risk is that individualizing tendencies in mainstream psychology are transferred to how we understand climate change and distract our attention from the structural political context where human behaviors are embedded (Batel & Adams, 2016). Furthermore, although concern for the consequences of climate change for the world’s vulnerable communities is emphasized (Swim et al., 2011), only recently this awareness centered also on how climate change politics can affect vulnerable communities (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2017).

SRT is suitable to study processes of change and has been applied to comprehend the dynamics of protest against renewable energy projects (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015). SRT originates in the works of Moscovici (1984) and was initially developed as an alternative to both Marxist determinism and scientific positivism (Moscovici & Marková, 1998), exploring how people create meanings in processes of change. SRT scholars focus on meaning constructions created in the interface between the individual and the collective that propel social action. Even when SRT has an awareness of power as one of its foundations, researchers have suggested that SRT has not escaped neoliberal influences in academia’s practice and conceptualizations (Gjorgjioska & Tomicic, 2019). This can result in social-cognitive reductionism (Batel & Adams, 2016), downplaying focus on power asymmetries when researching resistance to renewable energy (Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015).

Critical CP focuses on uncovering and transforming power imbalances (e.g., Burton & Kagan, 2005; Montero, 2009), and thus provides a framework to correct this emergent social-cognitive reductionism associated with some uses of SRT (Batel & Adams, 2016). Contributing to this approach, below I combine SRT and critical CP to understand the effects of wind energy development in Saami territory. Whereas SRT has less frequently been applied within CP, its focus on the dynamics of meaning construction, and how these can open up (or shut down) processes of social change and resistance, structures the analysis. Further, the below outlined framework from critical CP and decolonial approaches was useful in interpreting the findings.

Critical community psychologist Michelle Fine (2014) and her colleagues provide a useful conceptual basis foundation. Fine’s work develops an interdisciplinary and critical CP through three relevant analytical concepts. First, the concept of “circuits of dispossession and privilege” (Fine & Ruglis, 2008) captures how neoliberal politics throws people into circuits that dispossess them of possibilities to achieve self-determination. Their work thus connects CP to such as political ecological research that has centered on David Harvey’s (2004) now classical work on accumulation by dispossession. Second, Weis and Fine (2012) urge psychologists to adopt a “critical bifocality.” This implies redirecting our gaze from asking “what’s wrong with these victims?” toward asking “what’s wrong with their environments?” Critical bifocality analyzes how politico-economic structures and histories across scale, place, and sectors move under the skin of people, affect psychological well-being, and widen or constrict possibilities for individuals and communities (Weis & Fine, 2012). Adopting this perspective is central for resolving problems of social determination and victim blaming in psychology, as it holistically approaches social structure and individual/collective agency (Fine, 2014). By considering how politics affect people, we also gain knowledge about the nature
of political cultures and processes enacted. Third, the related concept of "prec(ari)ous knowledge" (Fine et al., 2016) offers a bridge between these critical-‐psychological theories, developed in the peripheries of the Global North, with decolonial critiques of development from authors such as Arturo Escobar (2018), Walter Mignolo (2007), and Sousa Santos (2014). They all demonstrated the importance of different epistemologies of location and the pluriverse of knowledge (Escobar, 2018). These broad theoretical schools view the world and modernity as shaped by coloniality, the outcome of how imperialism and colonialism have formed the world. Our epistemological position within the colonial structures (or within circuits of dispossession, as Fine would say) generates the locations from which we can observe the world and produce knowledge. In effect, these scholars deconstruct the geographical south/‐north binary, demonstrating how the colonial system subjugates different knowledges and epistemologies to the functioning of racist social and economic orders. In the above mentioned word game of Fine et al. (2016), a “precarious position” enables “precious knowledge” and social critique. Although Fine’s framework was developed within urban peripheries in the United States, researchers adhering to the decolonial project have adopted these concepts to theorize narratives around settler colonial dispossession (Quayle, Sonn, & van den Eynde, 2016). Thus, below, I adopt a framework that combines SRT with critical CP and decolonizing epistemological perspectives that highlight the issue of positionality within such circuits of dispossession in knowledge construction. Conversations between critical CP and decolonial approaches can generate insightful knowledge concerning climate change mitigation policies and how they might actually accelerate ecological crisis and coloniality as opposed to correcting them.

2 | METHODOLOGY

To explore individually and collectively constructed meanings among Southern Saami individuals about complex processes of change, this article builds on semi-‐structured interviews (N = 7) and three collective interviews (total N = 24). This also included observing three legal procedures, four TRC preparation meetings, multiple protest mobilizations, and accompanying Saami herders in some of their activities. On all occasions, my presence as a researcher was transparent. I established contacts with people at meetings, on social media, or through common friends or acquaintances. I sought to interview people who identified as Southern Saami, who belonged to different herding districts (sijte), and were from different age groups and genders. I also sought to interview people possessing different knowledges, related to their relations to or position within the sijte.

All the research participants are engaged in struggles against wind energy development in herding lands in some way, either as reindeer herders, as professionals, or as activists and members of the Southern Saami community. Herding was a part of everyone’s life at some point. All participants have some kind of relation to the projects presented in Table 1. To maintain anonymity, extracts from the data set are presented without reference to the wind power projects. The Southern Saami community is relatively small, and research participants could easily be identified. There is an ongoing conflict and power imbalances at play, which stress the importance of making research participants anonymous. There are, however, no clear boundaries between expert knowledge and lay knowledge. I should acknowledge that this study benefits from the insights of the research participants who have been anonymized. Although this dilemma remains unsolved in the present study, I want to call attention to this tension in research ethics, particularly so in studies situated in colonial contexts where research has led to much harm and Indigenous knowledges have been ignored, as in the Southern Saami community (Table 2).

2.1 | Participant-‐researcher relationship

The research took place in a colonial context, where “research” does not always have a positive connotation (e.g., Fjellheim, 2020), because it can risk reproducing epistemological violence (Teo, 2011) against the Saami
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of turbines</th>
<th>Companies involved</th>
<th>Status, July 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fosen Vind DA (Complex of six separate units)</td>
<td>Fosen-Njaarke</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>Fosen Vind DA, Joint Venture by Statkraft, Trønder Energi and Nordic Wind Power DA</td>
<td>Almost constructed, though still in the legal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokkfjellet vindpark</td>
<td>Gåebrien Sijte, Saantin Sijte</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Trønder Energi</td>
<td>Construction started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalvvatnan</td>
<td>Voengehl-Njaarke Sijte, Åarjel-Njaarke Sijte</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fred Olsen Renewables</td>
<td>License retracted in 2016 after complaints to the Ministry of Petroleum and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øyfjellet Vindpark /Øyfjellet Wind AS</td>
<td>Jillen-Njaarke Sijte</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Eolus Vind, Aquila Capital</td>
<td>Construction started. Lawsuit announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
communities. Researchers have, therefore, taken the initiative to develop new ethical guidelines (Stordahl, Tørres, Møllersen, & Eira-Åhren, 2015), but these have not yet been turned into a policy. As I am a woman external to the Saami community, several steps were sought to construct an ethical research process. I pursued a dialogical approach, both during interviews (Poopuu, 2020) and in the overall process. Demonstrating transparency, respect, and contributing with perspectives into the conversation when I found it constructive, both during and after interviews, intended to create a space of knowledge co-creation. I was outspoken about my views derived from years of working in solidarity movements around indigenous and small-farmer communities in Latin America. My parallel engagement in a different action research project in the Saami context further increased transparency (Normann, 2019). This openness disposition shaped the conversations and helped build relations of trust. Some people who expressed support for this study project, and with whom I have shared perspectives in manifold informal conversations, either declined invitation to participate in an interview or I decided not to ask, explained by the sometimes tremendous burden experienced by them to defend their rights. There has been an increasing interest in the wind energy conflicts among researchers, and especially master students and journalists, and I can sense exhaustion from research participants when it comes to offering accounts of their lived tragedy and struggle, perhaps without seeing that researchers have contributed to their case. To avoid becoming yet another burden to a large number of individuals, I decided to combine different types of data sources. Participating in meetings and public events allowed me to mutually be supportive and construct relations, and reflect on how social representations are produced, contested, and denied in context (Jovchelovitch, 2019).

2.2 | The interviews

Interviews were conducted with the use of a semi-structured open-ended guide. Each participant was interviewed once and the sessions lasted from 60 to 90 min. All individual interviews were recorded and transcribed. One group interview (N = 3) was recorded, whereas I took notes for the other two. Four of the interviews were carried out together with another researcher. During interviews, I encouraged free narratives to take place, thereby adding follow-up questions, to cover research questions and to explore additional aspects drawing my attention to the interviewee’s narratives. All the interviews were carried out in the Norwegian language (my mother tongue), a language that the Southern Saami people speak with no more difficulty than do other citizens in Norway. However,

| TABLE 2 | Overview of interviewed participants |
|------------------------------------------------|
| Pseudonyms/group code | Gender | Age range | Where interview occurred | When interview occurred |
|------------------------------------------------|
| Anders | Male | 45–55 | Public place | August 2019 |
| Per | Male | 20–30 | Office | September 2018 |
| Lars | Male | 20–30 | Phone | March 2020 |
| Thomas | Male | 20–30 | Phone | March 2020 |
| Sara | Female | 20–30 | Home | September 2018 |
| Johannes | Male | 50–60 | Office | June 2019 |
| Anne | Female | 44–55 | Office | June 2019 |
| Group A (Berit, Kristine, Marie) | Females (3) | 18–45 | Home | June 2019 |
| Group B (Peder, Tom, Martin) | Males (3) | 45–65 | Home | September 2018 |
| Group C | Mixed (18) | 18–70 | Community house | September 2018 |

*Pseudonyms omitted, as there are no direct quotations in the text.*
some of the deeper meanings, for example, related to herding, might fail to be captured in translation from åarjela-
saemien gièle.

2.3 | The analysis

I follow guidelines from thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), searching for manifest and latent meanings, noticing particularly how silences during qualitative research might be culturally sensitive sources of knowledge, particularly in studying traumatizing experiences (Richardson & Allison, 2019). Thematic analysis is flexible and applicable to different kinds of data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Given this study’s methodological pluralism (Jovchelovitch, 2019), I find its flexible approach well suited. I read the transcripts of the interviews several times and grouped themes, also searching for associations between themes, while relistening to the audios when possible, and reading my notes to search also for latent meanings. I also read the detailed memos from the observations of trials and the other events, and then read these together with the interviews to strengthen the analysis of how the meaning making is shaped in these contexts.

3 | RESULTS

The thematic analysis allowed organizing three main social representations of wind power development inside reindeer herding lands, which will be described below.

3.1 | Wind power as “one more” in the Lounge Durée of dispossession

All participants reflected on wind power as yet another project in a long history of dispossession. Accumulated burdens caused by infrastructural and extractive projects along with failed politics have dispossessed the Saami of land and autonomy. This was often called piece-by-piece politics, and their accumulation was considered to threaten Southern Saami existence. There was a wide frustration about how governmental instances such as NVE fail to consider the total number of projects affecting the reindeer herding. Sara explains:

There are always new challenges. Particularly related to the lands; challenges that we feel all the time. There is pressure from all sides. Construction of new cottages, hydropower. Power lines and cell phone towers, internet, constructions, roads, spear time houses. Expansion of, yes, construction everywhere. So we have become pressured more and more, and we have seen a reduction in the areas.

Anne pointed to contradictions between, on the one hand, strengthened legal frameworks guaranteeing Indigenous rights and, on the other, a high number of interventions that the herders must consider and eventually contest. She emphasized how the huge amount of projects makes it impossible for the reindeer herders to be herders, as herding requires people to be in the mountains and not in an office answering to all the emails requiring quick replies. Lars agreed: “We have a line of challenges, actually giving me ulcerous. (…). All things take a piece, and thus takes parts of the night’s sleep. Wind power is probably one of those.”

Narratives of continuity are also expressed in how Baajh vaeride årrodh—“let the mountains live” became the wording in protest actions. Forty years earlier, during a hard struggle to defend the rivers against the Alta–Kautokeino hydroelectric power station (Broderstad, 2014), “let the river live” was the catchphrase. Alta became a turning point in Norway, and the case is widely memorized within the Saami community. Remembering
Alta became a collective anchoring process, wind power development is placed as one more element in the continuing colonial situation.

Dialoguing with other indigenous people concerning their experiences added to this narrative of continuity, inserting their struggle into a broader Indigenous context and reflecting on the particularities of wind power. Anders explains:

I saw that the Apache indigenous, they have a way of viewing life. They experienced rough things, several of theirs were massacred... (...) and their consolation was that the mountains will last forever. Only the mountains will be there for the next generations. I found that incredibly beautiful, but at the same time, it scares me that today when I see the wind power industry and all their plans, here not even the mountains will remain forever.

Other younger participants understood the loss of lands as expressions of “racism” (Per) or elements of “cultural genocide.” (Kristine) Kristine remembers her speech in a protest: “More of us were behind that speech, we all meant the same. Without herding, ‘Who are we then?’ We will disappear. And that is exactly what it is about, that thought of genocide.” Their protest made its way to media, and in their case, the license was canceled.

In 2022, the TRC will deliver a report that documents the Norwegian colonial legacy in Saami territories. During the preparatory meetings of the TRC, several participants said it should not only document past injustices but also include the current land conflicts and the consequences of energy development on herding practices. During negotiations concerning the composition and mandate of the TRC between the Saami Parliament and the Norwegian Parliament, the Saami parliament did not get through with the proposed representative from Southern Saepmie. Later, the TRC secretary was positioned at the Arctic University of Norway, far north from Southern Saepmie. This provoked a weaker representation of the TRC within its Southern Saami community, where people often expressed being a “minority within the minority.” Anne compared the weak inclusion of Southern Saami representation to the TRC in New Zealand, where the Maori had demanded a more fundamental inclusion in all phases. She contrasted the unwillingness to respect the Saami self-determination with Norwegian engagements outside the country’s borders:

Why is it so difficult to fix your own house, when you manage to travel out to the world? I have asked myself that question. We will not have reconciliation if they will only study how one lost the language in boarding schools. That was peanuts in comparison to everything else.

3.2 Ignorance, as individual knowledge gaps or as structurally produced

Lack of knowledge among the general population, politicians, and scientists was considered to affect the processes in manifold ways. One such way was the ignorance about the Southern Saami’s existence within certain municipalities. Sara remembers high school:

There was very little knowledge, and they did not believe that the Saami live so far south, and less so that there is reindeer herding. So I see, that many people have not understood that there is reindeer herding here. And, if you don’t know that, you won’t take a position either (...) I have heard several say, “Oh my God, I did not believe there was reindeer herding here.” And then, when you read about the case, we are not even mentioned. That is disappointing to me. Disappointing, and I think it is strange that it is even allowed to invisibilize in this way. But the media is powerful, it has great power.
Sara’s view on lack of knowledge in her county, Trøndelag, is supported by the referred research (Fjellheim, 2020) on how leading universities historically have committed epistemological violence (Teo, 2011). Knowledge disputes were also central during lawsuits. During the three lawsuits I observed, weaknesses in the environmental impact assessments preceding NVE’s licensing of wind power parks were discussed. Both parties’ lawyers cross-examined the researchers who had been selected by the wind power companies to do the environmental impact assessments. During coffee breaks, some conversations had to do with how Saami researchers’ and herders’ knowledge virtually becomes disqualified in these fundamental processes. Some Saami expressed their perception that this is due to misrepresentations of Saami people within Norwegian institutions, where Saami knowledge might be taken as biased, putting empathy with other Saami over what comes to be considered as “value-free knowledge” and defending a “hidden agenda” favoring reindeer herding. Conversely, their perception was that the consultants, who are picked out by the companies, were not necessarily preconceived as biased by actors in the Norwegian bureaucracy, even when, as it appeared during the trials, a frequently used consulting company was partially financed by one of the state companies with interests in the construction of a wind park.

The decisive consultation procedures, guaranteed by legal and normative frameworks on Free, Prior, and Informed Consent and facilitated by NVE, were also considered to be too limited in time, sometimes reduced to a workday only. Anders reflected, “How can we explain to them in such a short time, what we have learned through generations of experience?” He had asked the NVE bureaucrats in a meeting if they had previous knowledge about reindeer herding, and their answer had been negative. Another leader of a herding district, during a public meeting, had put forward the strain with which he experienced the dialogues with NVE: “I was taken as a hostage in dialogues sessions with lunches.”

Knowledge hierarchies or the coloniality of knowledge (Mignolo, 2007) is a pressing topic in discourses on decolonization, expanding also in Norway (Normann, 2019). The perceived dismissal of the Saami’s unique and profound knowledge about reindeer, transferred through generations, was a sore and central issue put forward in all the interviews, which mirrors the global climate change debate, where Indigenous knowledges are ignored too often (Leff, 2015).

In the courtroom, I observed translation issues. First, while proceedings centered on issues of economic efficiency in herding, a proper language to describe the deep, and even spiritual, connection that many Saami maintain with animals and mountains was absent. Saami concerns were confined to technical and economic considerations. Second, there are more cultural-specific ways of being and speaking. On occasion, I sensed that judges and lawyers might have misunderstood key aspects in witnesses’ accounts, considering how they speak about herding. Saami witnesses seemed to be taking for granted certain fundamental knowledge about the reindeer’s movement, so things were left unsaid, and perhaps not fully understood by the judges.

3.3 | Individual and collective responsibility to guarantee herding in the future

Strong feelings of responsibility were defined for the participants’ identity. There is literally “no choice” but to continue defending the herding, as individuals, as members of a particular sijte, and as a broader Saami, and even global Indigenous community. Per explains:

Historically, we are a people that has had to struggle to exist. This is perhaps an extension of that; we see that if we do nothing, we disappear. Because many also neglect their Saami identity, they select it away. Many are worried about that, and the ones who are proud of their identity, are very concerned that it must continue existing and flourishing.
Waking in the footsteps of older relatives gave senses of pride, safety, and belonging:

I often imagine the reindeers as my big family. And without that family one is nothing. Yes, of course, idtjie and aehjtje are my parents. But I feel that the mountain is a big part of me, it is a big part of my social life. In a way, it is a part of me, and if it is taken away, who is one then, and what will happen. Maybe I could have found an A4 life, and lived an office life, but it would not have been me, it would not have been real life. You know when you invite someone home, you rather take them up to the mountains, and you tell them “here and there, behind there”...It is so much bigger, those are paths with history, you see (Berit).

As keepers of an ecological tradition, which enables close ties with mountains and animals, narratives of freedom and love for the animals were strong. The thought of failure in defending the mountains for future generations equally provokes sadness. Sara coined what she feels as “future anxiety,” and continues:

On the one hand, you have to stand up against wind power, on the other, predators, and everything. “You have to follow up everywhere.” That you can never be in peace at any time and do what you are supposed to be doing. That we spend so many hours in meetings and such stuff when we are supposed to be outside. So, it is a hassle. But the youth, they know what’s it all about, they understand. They have such power. So it is stressful to follow up all the time, but the reason one continues is that it means so much. We cannot let it go.

In the city of Mosjøen, Øyfjellet wind AS would provide renewable energy to the city’s aluminum-producing fabric, owned by the transnational Alcoa, a company that requires renewable energy contracts to sell the final products as a green product (Fjellheim, 2020). Offering paid work to many of the city’s inhabitants, there was what some environmentalists I met during data collection called “a silent and latent protest” in the city, as many people also depended on Alcoa. This placed an even greater responsibility on the Saami’s shoulders: “More and more people say they are against it. But the reindeer herding is pictured as what might stop the onset of wind power here. So we feel alone in this” (Anders).

Responsibility for other districts was also strong. Several people revealed how the infliction of wind power in other herding districts would be so painful also for themselves that there would be no real celebration, even when they had won a case:

Many feelings there. It was a shame, because the same day that they acknowledged the license to a company elsewhere, they said no in our case. So then, we should be happy, while other reindeer herding Saami people were receiving the sad message that it would come to them? (...) So it feels like a common sorrow that all reindeer herding Saami share, we can never be happy over such a victory, there will always be happening some kind of intervention in other places. Always... (Kristine).

Responsibility connected the Saami experience to that of other distant people. One Southern Saami woman witnessing during a lawsuit pointed during her testimony to how the enclosure and loss of land in the wake of the construction of a wind energy industrial site in Sweden had forced her district to implement soybean-based food during winter. In her view, this was highly problematic: “It is extremely harming to know that the compound feed we are now using, is made out of Brazilian soybeans, contributing to the genocides of other indigenous peoples.”

She testified again in the appeal court 18 months later. She made the same point, adding that now her district had invented a food mixture to prevent contributing to deforestation and not extending their own lived tragedy to other people.

Many people underscored the contrasting irresponsibility in a climate change mitigation, which injures a reindeer herding that has lasted for centuries and that produces food with low ecological footprints.
Peder disclosed this by calling the wind company representatives "cowboys" and compared them to a Norwegian TV series Exit (2019) that portrays the daily life of quite ruthless and misogynist business elite in Oslo. Per pointed to an old saying, representing a "pact" between humans and reindeers that the whole animal must be used, and nothing should be thrown away. Sara posed a question to how the ecology in herding is ignored in public discourses:

We have tried to mention it, but perhaps it has not gained enough space. People are very interested in what concerns ecological food. That it should be environmental and sustainable. So reindeer meat should have gained more attention, yes. A bigger homage, actually, for the way it is done. Because it is very environmentally good.

She continues:

Because, what is "green"? One could ask oneself that, right. Wind power, I favor it. It should be a good energy form. But who must pay the price? Because someone always pays the price. No matter what happens, one will have a bad outcome. And in our case, I believe there are some imbalances if I can call it so. It is difficult to put words on this, but I believe they are only able to see numbers.

4 | DISCUSSION

I have forwarded three main themes to reflect Southern Saami representations of wind power developments. Representations were created through anchoring the unfamiliar into what is known through a common collective memory or through innovative objectification (Marková, 2012), such as in the case of Peder, who was picturing the actors in the wind power industry as the cynical, but also miserable, figures of the Exit. Identification with, and through, other Indigenous people’s struggles likewise served to embed the lived tragedy and distress into "what it means to be Saami, and Indigenous" and mobilize resistance both individually and collectively. These broader intersubjective processes enabled participants to contest whether green discourses are truly sustainable and to continue defending the legitimacy, and even global importance of herding as an ecological and responsible practice.

Salient was the representation of wind power as continuing dispossession, threatening the Saami existence of herding, or, in the words of the younger participants, even as racism or cultural genocide. During interviews, when such strong expressions were used, I sensed that we were entering emotionally loaded terrains: either it was said very silently or it followed after pauses. The Saami appear to be cautious in using strong words to describe the current conflicts. This might be related to hesitance in polarizing relations to the Norwegian state and society, or even acknowledging the relative well-being in comparison with other Indigenous peoples living under circumstances of direct violence. However, Anders pointed to that even if it is better to be colonized by "a pen" than by "a gun," silencing and invisibilization can indeed be detrimental. The "stronger" communicative strategies among some of the younger participants can be related to how they participate in internationalized dialogues, through arts, gatherings, and social media, where other Indigenous peoples’ experiences come to mirror their own. However, it might also reflect the increased burden on their pasturelands, generating insecurity about the future to a bigger extent than has been the case for their parents’ generation. The relevance that the figure of "cultural genocide" can have to describe consequences of land disposessions to large-scale extraction industries for Indigenous Peoples is eloquently described elsewhere (i.e., Bachman, 2019; Short, 2010; Dunlap, 2020) and is beyond the scope of this study, but these narratives among young Saami should not be dismissed as a "simple" discourse by Norwegian politicians. For instance, the inclusion of åarjel-saemien gïele in the UNESCO list of threatened languages should generate alarm within Norwegian political institutions. Furthermore, it should be alarming that in Southern Saepmie, very few people have resisted as full-time herders. In this vein, I identify a tension between the TRC aiming to undo the harm and the ongoing disputes over wind power. Such a tension resonates with international scholarship, pointing to the challenges such commissions encounter in working for truth and reconciliation while structural violence and land conflicts persist (James, 2018; Nesiah, 2016).
The theoretical framework applied in this study, where social representations are interpreted through the optics of decolonial theories that forward the relevance of epistemological location, and critical CP’s focus on how our positions within circuits of dispossessions allow us (or not) to construct critical knowledge support us to move beyond the cognitive reductionism risk identified by Batel and Adams (2016). I argue that the Southern Saami representations should be taken as sources of critical knowledge, which have not been considered properly by Norwegian institutions yet. This underscores the importance of decolonization discourse in Norway. Decolonization of academia became an issue in 2018 (see Normann, 2019), and it is in its place to suggest that the epistemological underpinnings of such discourse could, if worked into the country’s higher education, generate a stronger culture of critical reflexivity and epistemic humility (Pilgrim, 2020; see also Sousa Santos, 2016) within Norwegian institutions. Following the findings in this study, such “humility” and “good faith” are what the Southern Saami participants perceive as missing in the practices inside Norwegian institutions. Uncritical, epistemic fallacies might be detrimental for the Saami in these cases, if researchers behind the environmental impact assessments and the bureaucrats who interpret their findings are unaware of the shortcomings in the “maps” with which they guide themselves, and the Saami knowledge remains discarded as common sense, mere opinions (Sousa Santos, 2016) or even as activism. Such epistemic fallacies might then hinder that the different knowledge systems at play speak to each other. In this way, procedures following licensing processes in wind energy development, created to guarantee that Norway’s commitments to Indigenous rights are followed, can fail. Thus, the injury from research (Fjellheim, 2020) can continue to produce harm.

Indigenous peoples have denounced how climate change mitigation through quick fixes and large-scale interventions not only dispossesses them of lands and life systems but also limits how we comprehend the current ecological crises. The subjects in this study observed a kind of “dissonance” between what is being projected through public messages about “saving humanity” in climate change mitigation and what actually happens to them in practice. This critique, which is in line with Fine et al. (2016) concept of “pre[ar]ious knowledge,” seems broadly ignored within Norwegian institutions, despite recent United Nations reports (IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2019) documenting land use as a major cause of environmental destruction, calling for the inclusion of indigenous knowledge in policies of climate change mitigation. Greater awareness of decolonial epistemologies, also within Norwegian institutions, could enable that the herders’ unique knowledge may be included, instead of lost, in the making of political agendas.

On the level of methodology, within decolonial and dialogical perspectives, there is an emphasis on constructing long-term collaborations rather than “entrepreneurial relationships,” providing a “return” as in a capitalistic investment (May 2012; in Murrey, 2019). Here, knowledge construction can be one element. In this study process, I have maintained contact with several participants, disseminating relevant research when I can, and particularly bringing perspectives from the Latin American context into our conversations, instead of adopting a value-free position that this study’s findings identify as questionable.

There is a fine line between exposing the seriousness of this “Saami suffering”—which should be acknowledged—and promoting a victimization narrative. Through the concept of “Critical bifocality,” I have sought to redirect this gaze, and emphasized that the stress inflicted on the Saami conveys more about Norwegian politics than about themselves. In the ongoing decolonizing project within psychology, one of the strategies is to question how theory and practice in mainstream psychology might promote the interests of power (Adams, Kurti, Ordóñez, Molina, & Oroppeza, 2018). Biased research on renewable energy risk makes NIMBY assumptions permeate within Norwegian bureaucracy, creating a kind of blindness toward the content of protests. The failure to uncover the manner in which colonial attitudes affect intercultural relations (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Ordóñez, 2018) and institutional practices in the Saami–Norwegian context creates institutional neglect and societal ignorance regarding Saami issues. In decolonial literature, it is established that majority populations can develop shortcomings in awareness about how colonialism influences knowledge production (Mignolo, 2007). Coloniality in Saempie was manifested through the ways in which the Southern Saami well-being and rights were downplayed in green discourses. Decolonizing psychology in Norway means recognizing these issues.
5 | CONCLUSION

This article explored Southern Saami social representations of wind power within reindeer pasturelands. SRT was useful for the analysis, in combination with critical CP and decolonial epistemologies. Power asymmetries entangled in these complex processes of energetic transition can make some social representations more widely defunded and supported (see Batel & Devine-Wright, 2015). Future research could disclose how Norwegian media cover the ongoing disputes and how representations of the Saami and reindeer herding are created and perhaps sustained within public institutions. Parallel to a lawsuit that I observed in December 2019, in which the Saami had taken a wind power company to court, claiming that the wind power project is so detrimental to the herding, and therefore to their cultural survival, that it violates international law, the COP25 occurred in Madrid. At COP25, the Indigenous delegation demanded a stronger human rights framework, ensuring that mitigation is implemented without harm to Indigenous communities (Abdellatif, 2020). Back in the Norwegian courtroom, references to these international developments were absent. Rather, lawyers representing the state-owned company Statkraft, the main owner in the Fosen Vind DA project, did what they are hired to do, breeding uncertainties about whether or not the wind turbines will deter herding, and thus downscaling the value of Saami knowledge. This “dissociation” between highly politicized international debates and the technical and alienating framing in a courtroom with little audience was striking. An inclusion of caution in developing mitigation politics to avoid inflicting a double burden on vulnerable communities is only the first step. Stronger inclusion of Indigenous knowledges and values is a prerequisite for a responsible environmental agenda. Critical CP and its decolonial directions can play an even more systematic role in engaging with the overarching issue of climate change and socioecological catastrophe.
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“Time is our worst enemy:” lived experiences and intercultural relations in the making of green aluminium.

I would like to speak about the paradox of green colonialism. When colonialism has dressed up in nice, green refinery, and we are told that we have to give up our territories and our livelihoods to save the world, because of climate change (...) As an Indigenous people, we do not only carry the burden of climate change; we also carry the burden of mitigation.”

Aili Keskitalo, President of the Saami Parliament (the Arctic Circle, 2020)

Introduction

Anthropogenic climate change is spreading numerous droughts, fires and hurricanes, producing irreversible ecological losses and moving larger parts of our planet towards uninhabitability (Mbembe, 2019). Among the global hegemonic solutions to climate change are green economy frameworks premised on climate goals built on continued economic growth, paradoxically often contributing to more Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and socio-environmental damages (Cavanagh & Benjaminsen, 2017; Verweijen & Dunlap, 2021). In this context, climate justice developed as a concept, a research approach and a framework of action that highlights and seeks to transform the uneven distribution of climate change and mitigation policies’ burdens among groups and communities (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014). Climate justice frameworks prompted progressive parties and Workers’ Unions in the Global North to embrace varied elements of the US Green New Deal (GND) (Zografos & Robbins, 2020). These emerging GND proposals are not uniform, but they share the aim of de-carbonising the production and restructuring it around green technological innovation, redistribution of wealth, renewable energy, and green jobs (Eaton, 2021; Zografos & Robbins, 2020). Albeit the inclusive premises, scholars and grassroots communities highlight the risk that GND’s may reproduce colonial legacies (Zografos & Robbins, 2020). The transitions to green jobs in the Global North depend on renewable energy, ‘smart’ digitalisation and other products associated with modernity that require the extraction of rare-earth minerals and metals, such as cobalt, lithium, and bauxite smelted to aluminium (Dunlap, 2021; Paul, 2020; Zografos & Robbins, 2020). The extraction of these minerals is often located in the Global South and associated with human rights
violations and environmental damage (Taylor & Paul, 2019, p. 3). If marginalising these realities, even progressive GND proposals risk preserving or even boosting the “green extractive industries” of hegemonic green economy frameworks, dispossessing many rural communities and Indigenous peoples’ territories (Eaton, 2021; Verweijen & Dunlap, 2021; Zografos & Robbins, 2020;). Aili Keskitalo, current president of the Saami Parliament in Norway, conceptualises this as “green colonialism” in this article’s opening quote (the Arctic Circle, 2020).

From a decolonial psychological perspective, these impasses call for scrutiny of how even progressive models of green transition can reproduce coloniality in intercultural relations (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, & Gómez Ordóñez, 2018; Bobowik, Valentim, & Licata, 2018). Decolonial scholars study how the colonial dynamics continue to influence and configure economies, politics, knowledge production and lived experience (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, et al., 2018; Maldonado-Torres, 2007, Quijano, 2007). In this article, I hypothesise that if these colonial systems act upon GND promoters, for instance, through naturalising their ways of life over those of Indigenous communities, they can contribute to set up an “abyssal line” (de Sousa Santos, 2014) between which ways of life become reflected in climate agendas and which ones remain invisibilised or sacrificed (Zografos & Robbins, 2020).

In the article, I hold GND as an ‘umbrella term’ for the various proposals, discourses and policies emerging to ensure inclusive and just green transitions (Zografos & Robbins, 2020, p. 543). Hereafter, I study the production of ‘green aluminium’ in Norway as one illustrative case of how the search for green inclusion may make Worker Unions and progressive political parties in the Global North end up reproducing colonial intercultural relations with Indigenous or other populations in the Global South. Norway, whose economy depends on fossil-fuels, currently attempts to re-position in front of energy transitions (Moe, Hansen & Kjær, 2021). Worker Unions and progressive political parties in Norway have, as part of their efforts to prevent the loss of workspaces from limiting the fossil industry, adopted aspects of the GND in their programs and aim for socially inclusive and green industrialisation (Schnell, Heiret & Vernegg, 2021). In this context, the aluminium industry portrays as an exemplar for generating green jobs and innovation (Moe, Hansen & Kjær,
2021). The world-leading companies Norsk Hydro and Alcoa run the aluminium industry in Norway. Both companies extract the raw material bauxite in the Brazilian Amazon, where socio-environmental conflicts around mining proliferate. Furthermore, to satisfy global demands of “greening” aluminium, in Norway, both companies obtained energy contracts with the wind power industries Fosen Vind and Øyfjellet Windpark. These large-scale windpower projects also dispossess the country’s indigenous Southern Saami reindeer herders of their pasturelands (Normann, 2021). This empirical article presents a multi-site study of the lived experiences of Indigenous and Tribal people and communities in Norway and Brazil, whose struggles become interconnected by Alcoa and Norsk Hydro’s “green” value and supply chains. I present findings, first, from communities in the Brazilian Amazon affected by Alcoa and Norsk Hydro’s bauxite-mining sites and alumina industries. Second, I explore the lived experiences among indigenous Southern Saami reindeer herders in Norway, affected by the large-scale wind power industries that supply the aluminium plants in Norway with renewable energy.

To support the analysis, I draw from the conceptual framework of coloniality of being and knowing, and work specifically with these decolonial approaches to reflect on intercultural relations. Borrowing Fanon’s concept of “zones of non-being”, which described racial inferiorisation (Fanon, 2017; Gordon, 2015; Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018), the paper discusses the inclusion or exclusion of certain ways of life in climate agendas. The research presented here aimed to explore the participants’ lived experiences confronted with the green supply and value chains. Despite sociocultural differences across research sites, participants discussed experiences of loss, bad faith, dehumanisation and violence, and constructed broader critiques of green agendas out of them. Whereas Norsk Hydro and Alcoa arguably epitomise green capitalist industries, the way Worker Unions’ and progressive political parties embrace the aluminium industry as a positive pathway forward suggests, in agreement with Zografos and Robbins (2020), that coloniality also influences current GND proposals. Therefore, the study contributes to green
economy research and GND promoters by identifying fundamental challenges that the pursuit of socially just green transitions must overcome.

The aluminium-wind power interconnection

Within schemes of greening industries, aluminium has global strategic importance. As a light, flexible and recyclable metal, it is a component in energy and lower-carbon infrastructures (e.g. power lines, substations) and can substitute heavier metals, like steel, enabling lighter vehicles that need less energy input (Brough & Jouhara, 2020). However, aluminium smelting impacts on the environment are severe, increasing GHG emissions (Haraldsson & Johansson, 2019). Sheller (2014, p. 5) moreover writes that:

> Tracing the silvery thread of aluminium across time and space draws together some of the remotest places on earth alongside some of the centres of global power, some of the richest people in the world alongside some of the poorest, and some of the most pressing environmental and political concerns we face.

To ensure that aluminium’s production, use, and recycling follow sustainability and human rights principles, The Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI) developed a third-party certification program (ASI, n.d.). Certificates position final products in an international market where financial mechanisms make green options rentable. Alcoa and Norsk Hydro are currently certifying their production. Norsk Hydro’s majority owner is the Norwegian state, whereas Alcoa is of North American origin and maintains two aluminium plants in Norway. Both companies ship raw material from the Brazilian Amazon to aluminium plants elsewhere, including Norway. In the Amazon, diverse cultural identities co-exist (Indigenous, Quilombola, Ribeirinho, Peasants and others), and people have advocated for a common Amazon identity and territorial construction in opposition to extractive industries (Baletti, 2012). Socio-environmental conflicts involving violations of international legal frameworks, such as the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention 169 of the
International Labour Organization (ILO), have proliferated around the extractive sites in Brazil (e.g. Arregui, 2015; Nascimento & Hazeu, 2015), calling into question the human rights principles in green certification schemes.

To achieve certification, the companies must guarantee long-term contracts with renewable energy producers. Norsk Hydro and Alcoa purchased energy contracts with Fosen Vind DA and Øyfjellet wind farm for their Norwegian aluminium plants (Normann, 2021). These wind farms, of considerable size and finalising constructions in 2021, sparked political and legal struggles between the Norwegian state and the Saami community because wind turbines occupy the ancestral pasturelands of Saami reindeer herders. The “greening” of aluminium thus exemplifies how communities’ local struggles may be interconnected through complex, global supply and value chains, producing enclosures, not only in the geographical South, but also in the “hinterlands” in the North (Haller, Breu, De Moor, Rohr, & Znoj, 2019).

Decolonial psychology, intercultural relations and climate change

Contributions from critical psychology to climate justice research are increasing (Adams, 2021). Decolonial scholars additionally offer theoretical foundations for understanding climate change as a symptom of coloniality of power, knowing and being (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, et al., 2018; Grosfoguel, 2016). Coloniality intertwines with extractivism, understood as the current hegemonic economic system that impulses limitless extraction of natural resources (Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018), leading to ecological destruction, a primary cause of the climate crisis. In this perspective, if GND proposals fail to question resource extractivism sufficiently, they may reproduce coloniality and climate injustice (Zografos & Robbins, 2020) because neither the burdens of climate change nor the burdens of extractive industries distribute evenly around the world (Sovacool, 2021). Postcolonial scholar de Sousa Santos (2016) suggests divergent time frames between the senses of urgency that characterises the climate agenda and the need for (decolonial) civilisational change can block a social transformation (p. 19). Global
warming demands urgent action, as we are far from achieving the minimum established goals of reducing global warming (Lynch & Veland, 2018). However, urgent actions might be unable to address the long-term civilisational issues linked to coloniality insofar they act within the paradigm they seek to confront.

This article holds GND’s as an umbrella term of discourses, concrete actions and policies that shape intercultural relations (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, et al., 2018; Bobowik et al., 2018). I borrow Fanon’s concept of “zones of non-being”, further developed in postcolonial and decolonial theory (Fanon, 2017; Gordon, 2015; Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018). Fanon analysed racialised dehumanisation in a time when people fought formal colonies. Fanon stressed the continuing damaging effects of colonialism after formal independence, but he did not live to witness the current capitalist and neoliberal global expansion with profound consequences for future life possibilities on our planet. Current scholars apply his concept to analyse different forms of contemporary marginalisations, and in this article, I use it specifically to illuminate the intercultural relations intertwined in green agendas. A difference between the zones of non-being and being, or between those living above or below the abyssal line, as conceptualised by de Sousa Santos (2016), is theorised to be that although oppression exists within both zones, in the zones of being, it is mitigated by people not suffering dehumanisation (Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018). Zones of non-being, on the other hand, are temporalities and spaces of negation and epistemicides, a term that refers to the destruction of knowledges, lifeworlds and memories of groups of people (Burman, 2017; de Sousa Santos, 2016). Critical theory developed from within zones of being may lack conceptual criteria to comprehend the oppressions lived in zones of non-being (Burman, 2017; Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018,), and reproduce epistemic violence if failing to admit knowledge produced in subaltern locations (Escobar, 2007). Exploring the participants’ lived experiences guided by these concepts let us reflect on dehumanisation mechanisms in two distant geographies, such as Brazil and Norway, while the participants’ narratives may contribute to developing decolonial theory. Moreover, my argument is that although GND-inspired programs in Norway struggle for inclusive green
transitions, they risk reproducing these colonial patterns when negligent of raw-material extraction’s socio-environmental impacts elsewhere.

Critical and decolonial psychologists engaging with environmental and climate justice have so far produced few empirical studies (Fernandes-Jesus, Barnes, & Diniz, 2020). Instead, postcolonial directions in political ecology and geography have advanced such studies (Álvarez & Coolsaet, 2020; Asiyanbi, Ogar, & Akintoye, 2019). Frosh (2013) notes that postcolonialism needs theories that attend to peoples’ complex affective lives to avoid essentialising the socio-historical. A growing interest in subjective experiences among people affected by extractive industries has developed in these interdisciplinary fields, frequently drawing on Foucauldian conceptions of governmentality or technologies of the self (e.g. Asiyanbi et al., 2019; Fletcher & Cortes-Vazquez, 2020; Nepomuceno, Affonso, Fraser, & Torres, 2019). Thus, this study contributes to emerging decolonial approaches in psychology and interdisciplinary fields by focusing on the intercultural relations that emerge through, materialise in, or sustain current environmental policies, and even GND proposals, that affect peoples’ lifeworlds and psychological possibilities (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, et al., 2018).

**Methodology**

I organised the study through a partially collaborative methodology encouraged by activists in the international peasant movement Via Campesina and the Norwegian Comittee of Solidarity with Latin America seeking to build up an ecology of knowledges (de Sousa Santos, 2016) to demystify green aluminium. My connexion to this network of organisations is through work in Brazil in 2014/2015, coordinating an exchange program. In 2018, I researched wind energy development in reindeer herding pasturelands in Norway and its connection to the aluminium sector when Norsk Hydro’s alumina refinery in Brazil poured large quantities of red mud into the areas’ river network, causing an environmental disaster. Communities mobilised in Brazil and Norway to demand justice. Grassroots movements facilitated my research in Brazil, and upon writing this article, there is a still-ongoing collaboration with them. To
generate critical dialogues with Norwegian progressive parties on aluminium production’s socio-environmental impacts has been a primary goal, but the 2020/21 pandemics initiated a pause. I call the methodology “partially collaborative” because while the research process in Brazil was co-constructed, I retained autonomy in the recruitment of participants in Norway and the data analysis and writing process. Below, I provide information about the research settings and data construction procedures in each site.

The Brazilian Amazon and bauxite-mining

In the Brazilian Amazon, communities have protested the impact of extractive industries for years. Under the military dictatorship (1964–1984), the Amazon became a clear economic expansion horizon. The Amazon state of Pará has large water basins supporting the mining sector, and development schemes hence destine Pará for expanded future exploitation (Iorio & Monni, 2020). Pará shows the highest rates of human rights violations and assassinations of environmental defenders in Brazil (Muggah & Franciotti, 2019). In Pará, the bauxite adventure began in 1979, with the installation of Mineração Rio do Norte (MRN). Today, the yearly extraction of 80 million tons of bauxite places MRN among the world’s largest bauxite-mines (Arregui, 2015). Norsk Hydro and Alcoa were among the original investors in this joint venture project. Both companies moreover have independent bauxite-mines and alumina refineries elsewhere in Pará and the neighbouring state Maranhão. For this study, I recruited participants from the following locations:

In February 2018, Alunorte occasioned an environmental disaster. Heavy rains brought large quantities of red mud, a waste product from alumina-refining, to pollute the Murucupi River and water sources in the region (Hoelscher & Rustad, 2019). This motivated popular protests and a federal decision to reduce Alunorte’s production by 50 per cent. Restoration depended on the company’s commitments to secure its future production and improve community relations. These commitments materialised in a “deferred prosecution agreement” (Termo de Ajuste de Conduta, TAC), a conflict-mediating instrument used by prosecutors in Brazil to oblige companies to “un-do harm” against social groups. Despite the communities’ continued criticism that several TAC-items remained unsolved, in 2019, ASI certified Alunorte, and a federal court removed the imposed production reduction. Alcoa’s mining site in Juruti Velho and refinery Alumar were also certified in 2019, indicating discord between community demands and certification standards.

Data construction in Brazil
Data construction took place in May/June and September/October 2019. Activists from the movements mentioned above helped recruit research participants. The overall data material includes individual (N=18) and group interviews (10 groups, total N=112) with people from Quilombola, Ribeirinho, and Indigenous communities, missionaries, alumina refinery workers ad NGO staff at different stages of confrontation with Norsk Hydro, Alcoa, or the joint venture MRN. Interviews were conducted in Portuguese, without translation. They followed a semi-structured open-ended guide with 11 items that explored how people described and gave meaning to their lifeworld, what the climate crisis and industries had changed for them individually and as communities, and their individual and collective responses and thoughts about the future. During the first phase of data construction, activists joined the interviews, turning them into dialogues and often covering unexpected topics, which helped to study meaning-making in context (Jovchelovitch, 2019). This way, the interviews became a construction site of knowledge rather than a neutral instrument (Kvale, 1996). The activists’ presence generated an environment of trust in a context characterised by high levels of vulnerability. Participants agreed to have the
interviews recorded. Participants invited me to public meetings, workshops, and seminars, allowing me to improvise participant observation. Such methods resemble ethnographic methods, increasingly applied by psychologists (Case, Todd, & Kral, 2014). Fine-grained ethnographic analysis would require extended research periods, but the approach enhanced my understanding of participants’ lifeworlds.

Wind energy development in Saepmie

The Southern Saami are among several indigenous Saami cultures whose territory, Saepmie, is under Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, and Russian sovereignty. For centuries, the Saami resisted colonial assimilation politics targeting their religion, language, political institutions, and land rights. Today, Norway commits to the Saami people’s cultural survival through international and national legal frameworks (Ravna, 2014). Reindeer herding is central to Southern Saami cultural survival and has special protection. Nonetheless, multiple infrastructural projects fragment the mountain areas where reindeers migrate. Variations in weather conditions in Arctic regions caused by climate change make winters unpredictable (Jaakkola et al., 2018). For instance, thinning ice-cover over lakes makes winter migration routes dangerous for animals and humans. Consistent with the literature on climate justice (Schlosberg & Collins, 2014), green transition inflicts a “double burden” (the Arctic Circle, 2020). Copper mining and wind energy development on herding lands reduce the herd’s ability to adapt and threatens reindeer herding. This triggered political and legal struggles shedding critical light on the Nordic countries’ will to guarantee Saami cultural survival (du Plessis, 2020). Two wind power projects are relevant in this article. I focus on the Fosen Vind DA complex, which with over 1000 MW capacity, became Europe’s largest onshore wind power complex, selling one-third of the energy to Norsk Hydro. Second, I focus on Øyfjellet Wind Park, Norway’s largest independent wind farm when finished in 2021, owned by green-profile investment fund Aquila Capital, selling the total produced energy to Alcoa’s aluminium plant in a neighbouring town (Normann, 2021).
Data construction in Saepmie

Data construction took place between March 2018 and May 2020. In addition to seven individual interviews and three group interviews (N=24), I observed four lawsuits between Southern Saami reindeer-herding districts and wind power and energy infrastructure companies; meetings involving a broader Saami community; reindeer-herding activities, and protest actions. Whereas no organisational ties facilitated the research as in Brazil, my engagement in another action research project (Normann, 2019) allowed participants to identify the focus in earlier work before deciding on being interviewed. The Saami community has suffered epistemological violence (Teo, 2010) on many occasions (Fjellheim, 2020), making transparency about the focus of research a paramount concern. Participants were interviewed once, in Norwegian, without translation. I recorded the interviews with their agreement. These lasted from 60 to 90 minutes and were guided by a similar open-ended semi-structured guide as in Brazil. I conducted four interviews in collaboration with another researcher.

Data analysis

I followed Thematic Analysis’ (TA) original procedures (Braun & Clarke, 2006), transcribing, anonymising, and coding interviews before identifying patterns of meaning/themes across the data set. Braun and Clarke (2020) later emphasised TA’s openness towards diverse epistemological approaches. Based on this, this study’s focus on lived experience and framing in decoloniality theory inspired a critical-phenomenological (Guenther, 2020) orientation to the analytical strategy. This encourages reflection on the material structures and politics embodied in people’s subjective experiences. I sought to identify participants’ lived experiences with green transitions, and I was particularly interested in how they constructed critiques out of their own lived experiences.

The entire data set consisted of 25 individual interviews and 13 group interviews, and extensive memos. Reading memos in parallel to the analysis of each transcript helped me reflect on each interview’s possible meaning zone (Kvale, 1996). In
each research-site, the interviews followed specific events that shaped participants’ intentions and focus, and contextual information from memos reduced my distance from the original dialogue (Ibid, 1996). A risk in multi-site research may involve reducing the variety of accounts to cover-all explanations of a phenomenon (Parker, 2004). In this perspective, the three themes presented below may stand as approximations of some central and shared experiences among participants from diverse sociocultural contexts.

Findings

Narratives of loss: “Who are we then?”
Across research sites, lived experiences of loss related to the physical disruption of access to, dispossession of, or pollution of land and rivers. The participants narrated the losses as either occurred, happening now, as predicted future losses or combinations of these. Saami participants noted how loss and fragmentation of pasturelands happen “piece by piece” and gradually (Normann, 2021). This forces a reduction of herds and hence the number of families that can live from herding. In Norwegian and international law, the latter constitutes a violation of their rights and is thus a central question in ongoing lawsuits. Saami participants emphasised the unprecedented scale of losses following wind energy development. “I remember that the possible future wind park was mentioned when I was younger, but it was so big that I always thought that it just would not be possible. It’s not going to happen,” Sara, a young reindeer herder, recalled. Participants felt strong ties to the mountains and responsibility for protecting the knowledge defended by earlier generations. The thought of losing these ties produced “future anxiety” (Sara) (Normann, 2021) and a sense of losing the collective self (Hogg & Williams, 2000) and the meaning of life. In explaining the meaning of loss, Sara allowed a glimpse into her lifeworld:
It is a scary profession. You expose yourself to many things; these are steep landscapes combined with ice. You need to know a lot about nature, how it acts, how the reindeer act, a lot about the weather, about winds... It was never an individual job. It’s all about family, about sijte: “community,” that we help each other. (…)The best part is when you follow the herd. You walk, keeping them together. You feel such serenity. Gathering the herd is the only thing in your mind. You are there, entirely present. There are no times to watch, no dates, no calendar. You are part of the environment. You are very clear-minded. You are not tired, you do not need food. You cannot sit down, you need to follow the herd, the animals decide. Evening arrives, and the herd starts pasturing. You sit down and just watch them. Maybe it’s incorrect to call it freedom, but it is another kind of life.

Kristine, a young herder, highlights the weight of the issue: “Without herding, ‘who are we then?’ We will disappear. And that is exactly what it is about, that thought of genocide.” (Normann, 2021). Her observation is akin to research on large-scale wind power industries’ gradual genocidal effects in other Indigenous contexts (e.g. Dunlap, 2018). Lars, another young herder, questioned whether these losses were justified:

Why must my future be ruined so that others can gain millions on our pasturing lands? I believe we should do to others what we want them to do to ourselves. And if I haven’t done anything wrong, why should I have to bear these constructions’ worst burden?

In Brazil, people from the communities close to the alumina refineries in São Luís and Barcarena narrated historical losses threatening their collective identities. Thomas, a Quilombola member, said, sadly: “We are no longer who we were.” The Quilombola and Ribeirinho communities are today surrounded by multiple industries and port-complexes (Júnior, Pereira, Alves, & Pereira, 2009; Nascimento & Hazeu,
impeding the continuation of social practices associated with how former generations lived, remembered by the participants as a more peaceful life. Marcos, a Quilombola member in his forties, reflected on the psychosocial consequences from a historical perspective:

People were dying, and we had no word for depression. We said that they died from passion. But he [the imagined, historical man] cried over losing his field, for losing the açaí fruit, for not having more manioc (...). This development took the calmness and the peace away from people.

Participants negotiated self-blame or guilt for not feeling able to defend the social practices passed on through generations. The Saami participants projected this towards the future, while in Brazil, people looked to their past. Mary, a ribeirinho woman, reflected: “If we changed our habits, it was because there was no choice. They took over our home.”

Dealing with bad faith: “If you let the dragon in, it eats you.”

A salient concern was the participant’s experiences of dealing with the companies and public institutions. This contact had its particular temporal-spatial look in the different research-sites. Participants reported, “faulty dialogues”, “structural ignorance” (Normann, 2021), little transparency, companies evading responsibility for pollution or accumulated burdens, manipulation, practices that split communities and entering the territories illegally or illegitimately. I call this theme “bad faith”, drawing on Gordon’s (2018) work on anti-black racism, but transferring his concept to the institutional practices that participants problematised. Gordon noted how subjects and institutions might lie to themselves to evade acknowledging certain truths, responsibilities, or ways of acting (Maldonado-Torres, 2008, p.120). Therefore, epistemologically, bad faith can manifest through only admitting perfect evidence to change one’s opinion (Gordon, 2018). The presence of many extractive industries and infrastructures made it, according to Silvia—a health worker in Barcarena—challenging to prove the causation of people’s health problems to the companies. “We have the right to distrust these companies,” she insisted,
advocating the legitimacy of community concerns. Saami participants mentioned pressure, short time, and significant knowledge gaps among Norwegian bureaucrats as structural barriers impeding a meaningful knowledge exchange during the consultation procedures carried out under wind power licencing processes (Normann, 2021).

Bad faith can appear in attitudes that lock people into asymmetrical relations of “lordship and bondage” (Maldonado-Torres, 2008, p. 120). In Norway, the conflict-mitigating dialogues set up between reindeer herding districts and companies can be analysed as expressions of bad faith. Participants held them as frustrating experiences that gave people no real say. During lawsuits, the wind power companies’ lawyers presented logs of every time they entered into dialogue with reindeer-herding districts to demonstrate a goodwill policy. On the other hand, if a reindeer-herding district hesitated to participate in the dialogues, it was claimed a sign of little collaboration. One herder responded in the courtroom:

I was taken hostage in a dialogue forum (..) The most stupid thing I ever did in my life was collaborating to create that dialogue. We were promised that the dialogue would be decent, collaborative, that reindeer herding would be taken seriously, and that the premises for reindeer herding would be decisive for licensing.

In PAE Lago Grande in Brazil, Kevin, a social leader, expressed that communities have much to lose in dialogues. “If you let the dragon in, it eats you”, he remarked, referring to how mining companies’ promises of work and dialogue techniques persuaded youth. For Lara, an NGO worker, dialogues represented sophistication compared to violent practices but added that mining activities had expanded in parallel. Companies would conduct dialogues separately with each community, generating distrust among people. Betty described how Norsk Hydro staff approached her, and how she enacted covert resistance:
She [Alunorte employee] sent me Whatsapp messages every day, asking, “How are you my flower,” with lots of emojis (..) She thought I was coming to her office alone, and she wanted to buy me. Imagine, a woman against another woman! I did not tell her I’d be coming with my lawyer and companions. After that meeting, I never got another message from her.

A worker in the Alumar alumina plant questioned the value of certification processes in general:

Each time, there is first a study within Alumar’s installations. Whichever certification Alumar receives, there is preparatory work … maybe at least for six months, where the workers are prepared with questions and answers.

He continued:

Alumar keeps producing conflicts or worse, making these environments dependent on Alumar. They call the community to give away a piece of cake, arrange a little party. That’s philanthropic stuff, not social responsibility. Alumar maintains the “shut up” [cala a boca] way, as we call it here. It needs to keep people controlled to stop them from speaking the truth.

These and similar bad faith experiences made participants question aluminium’s certification as “green and sustainable.” Paul, a missionary, said:

For us, when they talk about green aluminium, it seems like Pará is ignored. The companies’ entry was so traumatic that we no longer believe that anything like greening the aluminium can happen. Is it just another buzzword [mais uma conversa]?

Experiencing violence and dehumanisation.
“Yes, visit us, so you learn that we are human too,” was the quick text-message reply from Joni, a Quilombola leader about to receive us in his home. The quick comment displayed his clarity of a colonial difference between us (e.g. Maldonado-Torres, 2007) but also his openness towards our potential for decolonial learning. This theme overlaps with previous themes, insofar bad faith implies dehumanisation, and losses through dispossession are forms of structural violence (Galtung, 1969). However, this theme organises the participants’ experiences with dehumanising structures in the “long dureé” and reflects how violence expresses in multiple ways.

Saami participants experienced *racism, invisibilisation, neglect* and *dispraise of their knowledge systems*. Per noted how young Saami herders had increased suicide risk (see also Stoor, Kaiser, Jacobsson, Renberg, & Silviken, 2015), relating it to how gradually disappearing pasturelands shake the foundations of herding, and hence the meaning of life. Among the psychosocial consequences of wind power, Saami participants noted *future anxiety, getting ulcers, suffering insomnia, and stress.*

Per describes how people remain silent about such “individual problems”:

> Talking about individual problems is seen as narrow; we are not “individuals” enough to do so. Not that we always *must* behave so individualised, but it has a relation to our psychological health. If we do not speak out about issues, how can things get better for us? We use our strength in solidarity struggles against forced slaughter, mining and windpower. Then, in our society, there’ no room for feeling tired or feeling anxiety.

Several Saami participants reflected on differences between their own and other Indigenous peoples’ experiences in places where direct violence occurs (Normann, 2021). This affected how “entitled” some seemed to feel to denounce their situation. Anders said, “it is better to be colonised by a pen than by a gun,” but then added that silencing and invisibilisation are indeed harmful (Normann, 2021). In the same vein, Per reflected:
We are less discriminated—or we’re not exposed to extreme racism or extreme hatred. In comparison to other Indigenous peoples, we are all right. But we are ignored and neglected. And that can be just as bad, even if right there and then something doesn’t feel like an assault. With the [windpower] areas, we see that the consequences of not being seen and heard can be just as harmful as direct forms of discrimination.

Participants in Brazil described denial or dispraise of knowledge systems and ways of life. Referring to the staff in the bauxite-mine affecting his community, Joni observed: “They say to us that we are not museums to keep history. People get carried away by that, so they change.” In Brazil, participants reported violent persecution, severe pollution with damaging effects on ecosystems and bodies, ecocides, lack of respect, experiencing dispraise, high levels of insecurity, and depression. Some received death threats through telephone calls, WhatsApp messages, or bullets fired at their homes. Perpetrators remained unknown, but participants saw the threats resulting from activism and claimed that the widespread violence against land defenders in Pará made people hesitant about openly criticising the companies.

Discussing the violence’s psychological impact, participants had ambiguous points of view. Linda had received death threats and was living under protection measures. She held that talking about psychosocial health was not regarded as important: “..as if it was snobbish [frescura]. In the past, people saw talking about depression as irrelevant. We see that people try to hide their suffering. They suffer in silence”. Several participants expressed loneliness and personal vulnerability. While grassroots-organisations supported them in intense moments of struggle, they tackled the aftermath, which could mean increased threats or unemployment resulting from publicly confronting companies individually.

In Barcarena and São Luís, the precarious health situation was salient. Participants mentioned headaches, stomach pains, allergies, and dizziness and suspected that the toxic environment of many industries caused high incidences of stomach cancer and Alzheimer’s. They brought us to forests and gardens to observe white dust on leaves, dried-
out fruit trees, and dirty streams. For Ribeirinho communities, rivers are the heart of their ways of life. We visited one such community by boat in which the river had a foul smell and was uninviting. People pulled up their sleeves, exposing multiple small scars caused, according to them, because the dirty water infects even trivial scratches, and they described losing their hair. “We can no longer touch the water,” explained Teresa.

After the February 2018 occurrence, the TAC-agreement involving Norsk Hydro granted hair and blood tests to some people to discover possible elevated metal concentrations in their bodies. One and a half years later, few people had received their results. According to participants, these few results indicated elevated concentrations of various metals. Each person received the frightening results on a “piece of paper,” no health assistance, and “returned home with feelings of anxiety” (Linda). In February 2020, a court fined the Pará state’s health laboratory for failing to distribute the remaining results (Carneiro, 2020). Participants demanded an independent study on the public health situation in Barcarena. Mina, a neighbourhood association leader, worried that people were getting used to living under toxic conditions and abandoning their claims for justice. In the interview, she repeatedly said, “The time is the worst enemy of all struggles”, mirroring research on how violence, like climate change, may unfold slowly and incrementally and “out of sight.” (Nixon, 2011, p. 2). Linda added that “aluminium should not hurt the lower classes. It brings progress to the city, but also diseases. Before becoming a piece of a cell phone, it has left many people sick along the way.”

Discussion

Despite sociocultural differences, the three themes suggest how the making of green aluminium in the context of this study reproduced colonial intercultural relations across research sites, pushing more people, and in particular their cultural ways of life, into zones of non-being. The theme “dealing with bad faith” suggests how participants experienced the contact with the companies as frustrating or directly harmful, pointing particularly to the dialogues as forms of bad faith. The findings thus indicate dissonances between certification standards
and peoples’ lived experiences. In green-labelling extractive industries, certificates as the Aluminium Stewardship Initiative performance standard often contain items to endorse Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). While CSR literature puts forward that CSR may improve companies’ approaches to communities (Jamali & Karam, 2018), critical scholars highlight their limitations and evasion of structural change (Verweijen & Dunlap, 2021). In the “Norwegian corporate model”, CSR and dialogue-based conflict mitigation are particularly strong-rooted (Ihlen & von Weltzien Hoivik, 2015). However, violence can take subtle expressions (Bulhan, 1985) and be overt and covert (Auestad & Kabesh, 2017). This awareness is central to Kevin’s analysis that if the communities accepted dialogues with the corporations, “the dragon would eat them”. People balanced fine lines between confronting companies directly and claiming, for instance, monetary compensation with the risk of feeling absorbed into development schemes transforming their ways of life in undesirable ways.

Psychologists suggested that oppressed groups’ resistance is also covert and overt (Rosales & Langhout, 2020; Vollhardt, Okuyan, & Ünal, 2020). In this article, I focus on participants’ critiques of green transitions that emerged from their lived experiences rather than their general resistance strategies. Nevertheless, one point can be noted: Their avoidance of confrontation with the companies may indicate “bystanderism” (Oliver, 2011) in intercultural relations. The failure of progressive political parties, solidarity organisations and critical researchers in supporting communities over time may make active resistance unaffordable (de Sousa Santos, 2016, p. 25) or dangerous for them. “Slow” or covert dissent, as when Betty resisted the Norsk Hydro staff’s persuading intents, is best explored through “slow research” (Murrey, 2016), in resonance with decolonial psychological perspectives on accompaniment (Adams, Kurtiș, Ordóñez, Molina, & Oropeza, 2018). An event during data construction was illustrative: four young men armed with sabres disrupted an interview organised by local activists, surrounding us quietly in the interviewee’s rustic courtyard. They split up when her husband suddenly returned. Husband and wife exposed extreme
fear afterwards. I was unsure whether my likely unanticipated presence had attracted the men’s attention or caused them to hesitate. The experience illustrated the high vulnerability and insecurity that may unfold ‘out of sight’ in industrial cities (Davies, 2019), an understated aspect in corporative discourses, doubtlessly affecting people’s safety perceptions when deciding whether to be outspoken with their critiques. But it also places fieldwork in a demanding light. The incident prompts reflections about caution in research in violent environments (Moss, Uluğ, & Acar, 2019) and illustrates that each actor’s risk can be unequal even in collaborative methodologies.

The theme “experiencing violence and dehumanisation” amplified the discussion on various forms of violence, exclusion and dehumanisation in socioculturally different contexts. Violence is studied and conceptualised in many ways, as structural (Galtung, 1969), slow (Davies, 2019; Nixon, 2011), or extractive (Verweijen & Dunlap, 2021). Dehumanisation is also conceptualised variously (e.g. Kronfeldner, 2020), and for decolonial scholars, coloniality in itself represents dehumanisation (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). For Indigenous communities, dehumanisation materialises in epistemicides, and denial of their meaning-systems and self-determination. The destruction of Indigenous and Tribal peoples’ territories is a form of violence with serious psychosocial impacts (Gonçalves, 2017), particularly traumatising when indigenous cosmovisions conceive natural elements as humans’ relatives (Porsanger, 2010; Ruiz-Serna, 2019). In this perspective, the Saami participants’ reflections on the difference between experiencing direct violence and their own lived experiences may contribute to the further conceptualisation of zones of non-being. Some accounts forward direct violence as “always pending” in zones of non-being (Grosfoguel & Rodriguez, 2018), whereas others indicate access to “realistically claim rights” or not as defining (de Sousa Santos, 2017). The Saami had better access to legal institutions than the Amazon communities but in seeking to evidence violations to Norwegian institutions, their knowledge systems received little value (Normann, 2021). They found their herding practices and ways of life, meaning-systems
and knowledges excluded from green agendas. Rather than belonging to the “zone of salvation”, in wind power licencing processes, their ways of life were “hindrances” or, in the words of Maldonado-Torres (2017, p. 123), “entities whose very existence is regarded as problematic.”

In Brazil, people described anxiety and observed health problems imposed on them by toxic life conditions, consistent with research on slow violence “out of sight” in polluted cities (Davies, 2019; Nixon, 2011). People lacked the means to prove the causes of the precarious health-situation they witnessed, and Mina’s reiteration that “time is our worst enemy” shows her worry that people would resign and adapt to living in toxic conditions as time passes. Her reflection likewise prompts reflection on this article’s overall discussion: Time frames, urgency and acceleration single out as essential issues intertwined with climate change. Whereas senses of urgency in the Anthropocene crisis may hinder more substantial, decolonial transformations (de Sousa Santos 2016; Lynch & Veland, 2018) and even incite GND promoters to accept green certificates uncritically, acceleration appears to correlate with existence below or above abyssal lines; between zones of being and non-being (Mbembe, 2019, p. 8). Modernity’s desire for speed, for Sheller (2014) characteristic of the kind of society that aluminium builds, impulses high-energy and unsustainable ways of life (Adams, Estrada-Villalta, et al., 2018) that Global North-societies seem unwilling to renounce on. On the abyssal line’s opposite side, we often find slower ways of life with lower ecological impact and those slow increases of toxic violence that Mina denounced. The American Psychological Association’s (APA) Task Force’s Report on Climate Change suggested already in 2009 how Western culture treats time as a resource, maximised at the expense of natural resources, as energy is required to execute more tasks in less time (Swim et al., 2009, p.39). The APA report increased psychologists’ research on climate change, but its suggestion of further research on the relationship between cultural time frames and sustainable behaviour seems to go unaddressed. Time frames may be relevant to future decolonial approaches to climate change research as it opens
for exploring the connection between colonially and work conditions in accelerated Global-North societies.

Finally, the theme “narratives of loss” illustrates that the losses of many communities in the Anthropocene result not only from climate change but also its ‘remedies,’ exemplified in this study by the interconnection of wind power and aluminium production. Climate change produces mourning over losses, grief and anxiety, including in Global North-settings (Adams, 2020). Mbembe (2020) writes that as mobility ascending tremble, the resulting anxieties might dispose people to cling to what seems to be left, even if it leads to the destruction of lifeworlds out of sight (Burman, 2017; Davies, 2019). If senses of urgency invade GND promoters in an era when, alongside the Anthropocene urgency, neoliberal reforms and technological innovations cause precarisation of work conditions and engender future anxieties, the outcome may be that the social inclusion they seek remains limited in scope. At worst, GND proposals reproduce the coloniality of hegemonic green economies. Scholars suggested that reclaiming loss as our epoch’s shared denominator for human and non-human experiences may open pathways for identifying common tools to question colonial and corporate power (Adams, 2020, p. 125). Losses resulting from imposed transformation, as in this study, are likely experienced fundamentally differently from anxieties projected towards the future in Global North-settings (Adams, 2020). Yet, despite differences, sharing the terrifying feeling of loss may be among what can guide people and movements, such as the network that facilitated this research, to explore ways of re-memberment and coexistence in a breaking planet (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2020; Lynch & Veland, 2018).

**Conclusion**

The study provided insights into Amazon and Southern Saami communities’ lived experiences along a ‘green aluminium’ value and supply chain. Through the three themes loss, bad faith, and experiencing violence and dehumanisation, the study may contribute to developing critical psychological research on climate change, primarily through forwarding that psychological research on climate change must include a focus on the economic and
colonial structures that interact with climate change in producing people and communities’ experiences and adaptive possibilities. Presenting diverse experiences within the frame of a paper is a compound exercise. How the gender system connected to coloniality (Lugones, 2009) interacts in this and similar cases can be developed in further research. The study provides the policy field and climate justice frameworks with evidence about structural problems related to the greening of aluminium. While transnational capital drives aluminium production, the fact that Worker Unions and progressive parties in Norway present the aluminium industry as a positive example of inclusive green jobs makes this study relevant as a reminder of how GND proposals need to be both international and decolonial in their scope to achieve their inclusive and justice aims. Losses entangled with climate change will increase in the future. Technological escalation (Mbembe, 2019) and extractive industries’ growing demands for natural resources move the abyssal line (de Sousa Santos, 2017) towards the inclusion of more people below it, making groups of people live through painful processes of loss. These losses of humans’ diverse ways of life are followed by epistemicides with planetary consequences at a time when creative imagination is required to map out alternatives: However creative the human mind, our imagination is limited in the sense that it needs materials to innovate (Bradbury, 2019), and therefore it needs cultural diversity. So, while calls are to re-think, re-imagine and re-member the world, current versions of GND’s may limit our possibilities of doing so, as exemplified in this study, where green jobs in the aluminium industry in Norway are linked to territorial loss and epistemicides among Southern Saami and Amazon communities.
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Abstract
How to re-member a fragmented world while climate change escalates, and green growth models reproduce coloniality, particularly in Indigenous territories? What can be the concrete contributions from different scholarly disciplines to a broader decolonial project? These questions are debated by decolonial scholars who call to re-think our practices within academic institutions and in the fields that we study. This article contributes with a decolonial perspective to sociocultural psychology and studies on Indigenous knowledges about climate change. Through ethnographic methods and individual and group interviews, I engage with indigenous Guarani and Kaiowá participants’ knowledges and practices of resilience opposing green growth models in the Brazilian state Mato Grosso do Sul. Their collective memory of a different past, enacted through narratives, rituals, and social practices, was fundamental to imagine different possible futures, which put in motion transformation processes. Their example opens a reflection about the possibilities in connecting sociocultural psychology’s work on collective memory and political imagination to the broader decolonial project, in supporting people’s processes of re-membering in contexts of adverse conditions caused by coloniality and ecological disaster.

Introduction
Indigenous peoples denounce how ‘green’ economies and projects of climate-change mitigation implemented in their territories often add to the burdens that adapting to dramatically changing weather patterns pose to their ways of life. Their demands are slowly gaining traction in international forums and include greater emphasis on guaranteeing their rights when mitigation projects are implemented (Newell & Taylor, 2020). However, these advances run parallel to increasing pressures on Indigenous territories by extractivist industries often promoted as ‘green’, or climate-friendly.

In 2019, two UN reports recommended states to include Indigenous knowledge (IK) in mitigation agendas (IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2019). Research on how IK can help in dealing...
with ecological disaster can be organised into two main areas. One approach focuses on the technical aspects of specific climate-change adaption in Indigenous communities, proposing ways to include these and other technical knowledges in global or national mitigation agendas. (See for instance Ajani et al., 2013; Nyong et al., 2007). Other studies, with an expressed or implicit systemic or decolonial critique (Ndlovu, 2014; Whyte, 2017), recognise Indigenous knowledges in plural and have forward how they often are fundamentally opposed to hegemonic Western models of climate-change mitigation. These scholars understand the development of unsustainable modernity and ecological crisis as intrinsically connected to the history of colonialism and continuing coloniality (Adams et al., 2018a; Trawick et al., 2015) that acts to dispossess many Indigenous peoples of their territories and future self-determination possibilities.

Within the critical sub-disciplines of psychology, such decolonial perspectives have undergone a resurgence, with internal critiques of how hegemonic psychologic science may have acted to maintain oppressive systems (Adams et al., 2018a; Bhatia & Priya, 2018). Such studies explore possible contributions from psychology to the broader interdisciplinary decolonial project (Maldonado-Torres, 2017; Pickren, 2018b). Sociocultural psychologists have echoed this growing interest in decolonial approaches (Bradbury, 2019; Pickren, 2018a; Glăveanu & Sierra, 2015), in particular, studying the historical colonisation of psychological science itself, where the emphasis on meaning is replaced with fragmentation or positivism (Jovanović, 2019; Pickren, 2018a). This article seeks to contribute to the broader project of developing decolonial psychological thinking and practices by presenting an empirical study. Combining a loose framework of recent sociocultural psychology work on collective memory and political imagination (de Luna, 2018; de Saint-Laurent, 2018b; Jovchelovitch & Hawlina, 2018) with decolonial theory, I explore meaning-making about climate change and climate-change mitigation among the indigenous Guarani and Kaiowá of the southern cone of the Brazilian central-western state of Mato Grosso do Sul (MS), where an agro-export model based on cattle, and sugarcane, soybean and corn as ‘flex crops’, has developed.

Studying the situation of the Guarani and Kaiowá is both meaningful and challenging. The region’s agribusiness sector originated in an epoch when climate change was absent from globalised discussions. In recent decades, however, increasing the production of biodiesel and ethanol from soybean, corn and sugarcane, re-branded as ‘green’ and ‘sustainable’, have been included in Brazil’s commitments to the Paris Agreements (Lima et al., 2020). The hardships imposed on the Guarani and Kaiowá, who were displaced from their lands, are widely recognised (Ioris, 2020; Brand, 2004; Benites, 2012)—indeed, almost as a dystopic worst-case scenario of the violent consequences that green economies may have on Indigenous ways of life. Certain ways of life—even humans—may become disposable in such green models, reflecting what political scientist and philosopher Achille Mbembe (2019b) conceptualised as necropolitics. According to Mbembe, the sum of extractivism, politics, anthropogenic climate change, biodiversity losses and land-use change, and other changes may soon turn places on earth into uninhabitable hothouses (EGSVL, 2019). As the pace is uneven, places and times where adversity is high can turn into laboratories of possibilities of human (and non-human) life resilience in conditions of adversity (Ibid).

While this all-encompassing and escalating situation brings shifts in how we frame the future of life (Mbembe, 2019a) and dystopia replaces progress-optimism, the re-prefix appears frequently in diverse disciplines that study climate change (e.g. Federici & Linebaugh, 2018; Jepson, 2019; Woodbury, 2019). Postcolonial and decolonial scholars note the importance of the recovery of memories and practices, re-membering
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(Mbembe, 2019a; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2020; wa Thiong’o, 2009), and re-existence (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) to change our planet’s dangerous course.

My study started with an open research question concerning the knowledge, meaning-making and collective strategies aimed at increasing resilience among the Guarani and Kaiowá confronted with climate change and ‘green’ agribusiness. Realising the central position of memory work in their multiple political strategies, I focus on exploring how the enactment of collective memory among the Guarani and Kaiowá informs their multiple strategies for building resilience. The study seeks to contribute with a decolonial perspective to the psychology of climate change. I anchor it in a conceptual framework that combines sociocultural psychological approaches to the interactions of memory, imagination, human action, and transformation with postcolonial and decolonial work on re-membering. My main objectives are two: to contribute to the political field that positions Indigenous knowledges as fundamental in climate change mitigation agendas and to explore how sociocultural research on collective memory and political imagination (de Saint-Laurent, 2018b; Jovchelovitch & Hawlina, 2018) can contribute to the broader decolonial project, and in particular to re-membering and recovery processes in communities resisting the adverse conditions engendered by ecological devastation. I find that in this research setting where the agribusiness model creates a toxic environment of human alienation, the Guarani and Kaiowá participants’ engagement with collective memory provided possibilities of imagining a different future. Their collective memory became a tool for generating individual and collective action, putting in motion processes to provoke ruptures in sociogenesis (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2015), and generate ecological resilience.

Theoretical Background

Decoloniality, Re-existence, and Re-membering

Decoloniality has profound and diverse roots within Latin American realities, scholarship, and anticolonial struggles (e.g. Fanon, 2017; Martín-Baró, 1994). The concept of re-existence (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) points to how Indigenous peoples and other marginalised communities who live colonial difference enact ways of being, thinking, knowing, theorising, analysing, feeling, acting, and living that can disrupt ‘modern/colonial/capitalist/hetero-patriarchal matrices of power’ (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018, p. 101). Quoting the Afro-Ecuadorian pedagogue and historian Juan García Salazar, Mignolo & Walsh (2018, p. 43) explain this way of learning as learning casa adentro: reclaiming the ‘collective memory, philosophies and knowledges inherited from the ancestors, histories of acts of resistance, and other elements that mark and permit our difference, our forms of life in community’.

From the African continent, postcolonial scholars highlight the relevance of ‘re-membering’ (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015; wa Thiong’o, 2009) for African communities after lengthy colonial dismemberment. In such re-membering, language recovery and memory work have been fundamental. Mbembe (2019a) suggests the relevance of this for all humanity, in the face of fragmentation within and between communities, escalating colonialism, and ecological destruction with planetary consequences. The concept of re-membering is also used within feminist research, connecting it further to the body and subjective experience after exposure to violence and trauma (Bueno-Hansen, 2018); in
critical Community Psychologists’ PAR designs (Fine & Torre, 2004); and in revitalisation processes among Indigenous communities, where language and other cultural features are recovered (Kalafatic, 2020). It has been linked to narrative therapeutic practices challenging Western cultural individualist and self-isolating beliefs (White, 2007); and to matters of de-ideologisation and recovery of meaningful identity and relationships (Afuape, 2011; Martín-Baró, 1994). All these works connect memory to recovery from trauma or the re-construction of meaningful intersubjectivity or connection between communities, frequently in colonial situations where human communities have been literally dis-membered, or torn apart. ‘Re-membering’ entails a creative innovation, not a recovery of the original etymological meaning. The ‘re’ prefix means to recover, but ‘member’ here is unrelated to the word meaning body parts or group membership: it is related to ‘memoir’, and the b reflects phonetical transitions over time (Dictionary, n.d.).

These processes of re-membering, re-existence, and resistance unfold across many places and times. But what can be the roles of scholars interested in supporting or promoting a decolonial praxis? In the next section, I propose one possible contribution from sociocultural psychology on collective memory and political imagination to supporting such re-humanisation processes.

**Cultural Psychology, Collective Memory, and Imagination**

Cultural psychologists have discussed how their field can contribute to the broader decolonial project (Bradbury, 2019; Glăveanu & Sierra, 2015; Pickren, 2018a) and support social transformation processes (Alphen & Normann, 2020). Work connecting collective memory to human imagination may be one such contribution. Psychological research on individual and collective memory, and the linkages to the present, has long traditions (Brockmeier, 2002). de Saint-Laurent (2018b) is among those who propose a more direct link between how we consider the past and how we imagine our future. Memory is seen as an active reconstruction (Bartlett, in de Saint-Laurent, 2018a, b) that requires a level of imagination. Simultaneously, memory becomes transformed by imagination to produce something new (Vygotsky, 2004; de Saint-Laurent, 2018b)—like engaging in the search for political goals (Brescó & Wagoner, 2015). The narratives we create about our past also announce the future we are enacting, providing the ‘material’ for imagining and constructing this future, also for utopias or dreams of a better future that can guide sociogenesis (Jovchelovitch & Hawlina, 2018). As decolonial scholars and communities alike call for re-thinking, re-imagining, and re-membering our fragmented world, the meticulous theoretical work of various sociocultural schools on understanding the processes of collective memory (Brescó & Wagoner, 2015) and their linkage to collective action, imagination, and individual and social transformation (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2015) may contribute in further developing the decolonial project.

**A Brief Background: A Toxic Environment**

Cultural psychology is well suited for studying disruptions and change (Valsiner, 2014; Cole, 1998). However, on the level of sociogenesis (Zittoun, 2019), the environment that structures Guarani and Kaiowá life-experiences in the reserves in Brazil’s state Mato Grosso do Sul (MS) could appear as nearly static and suffocating. Movement is so slow that there are few signs of change. Here I define this material and symbolic reality as a toxic one, not only because of the pesticides applied in the agribusiness sector, poisoning
the land, the air, and water resources but also because of the toxic patterns and effects of racism, colonialism, direct and structural forms of violence, and human alienation (Urt, 2016; Ioris, 2020). Numerous research reports document the history of dispossession in the region; it is beyond the scope of this study to add to this detailed work (Benites, 2012; Brand, 2004; Pereira, 2012; Pimentel, 2012a, b). Hence, I will concentrate on giving just enough information for the reader to imagine certain developments that are central to this article’s arguments.

Land Dispossessions

The original populations in this region of Brazil were left in relative freedom by colonisers until the end of the nineteenth century, when the first agro-company, Cia Mate Laranjeira, was established and the federal Indian Protection Service (SPI) began displacing Indigenous peoples from their lands to newly created reserves (Urt, 2016). The Guarani and Kaiowá people’s gradual dispersion away from their ancestral forests has been described as *sarambi* (Chamorro, 2015), meaning ‘dis-order’ in the Guaraní language. Under the gradual development of the agribusiness order, where transnational and national capital and the Brazilian state’s geopolitical interests colluded (Oliveira, 2016), Indigenous populations were both made invisible and envisaged as cheap labour for the plantations: the reserves were therefore established close to the new cities. However, many Guarani and Kaiowá families continued to seek return to home territories. During Brazil’s Military Dictatorship (1964–1985), this could lead to detention and torture, as documented by the Truth Commission’s report (Brasil, 2014). The new Constitution of 1988 guaranteed the return of the lands to Indigenous peoples through a land-demarcation process; however, in MS, plantation owners continue to profit from agro-industrial extraction on Indigenous lands. Most of the approximately 45,000 Guarani and Kaiowá individuals still live in over-populated reserves, generally in extremely precarious conditions, lacking the most basic human rights. These suffocating conditions have been analysed as an ongoing genocide (Naccache, 2019; Ioris et al., 2019). Many Guarani and Kaiowá families engage in multiple strategies to defend their cultural survival, often articulated through *Aty Guasu*, which is the General Assembly of Guarani and Kaiowá people. This includes moving back into their *Tekoha*, the ancestral lands now under the control of plantations, and creating land recovery/re-occupation camps (*retomadas* in Portuguese) (Benites, 2012). This subjects them to violent persecution and uncertainty, but many prefer it to existence in the reserves.

Agribusiness and Clean-Energy Demands

The agribusiness sector in MS developed following patterns of global emerging ‘flex crops’ and commodities (Borras et al., 2016), as well as national financial, state-making, and geopolitical goals featured in the Brazilian version of the ‘green revolution’ (Oliveira, 2016). Through the ‘March towards the West’ from the 1940s onwards, cattle and soybean gradually expanded in MS (Urt, 2016). *ProAlcool* was a national public policy aiming for a transition from fossil-fuel based gasoline that gained momentum during the 1970s Military Dictatorship and brought sugarcane from highly exploitative plantations in North-Brazil to many of the country’s regions (Sauer et al., 2017). In MS, however, soybeans and cattle dominated until around 2000, when the Kyoto Protocol increased the global demand for clean energy, and ‘flex-fuel’ cars were introduced in Brazil (Porto-Gonçalves, 2008). From then, ‘flex crops’ of sugarcane (fuel, food) and corn/soybean (biodiesel, food, feed)
expanded in MS, backed by extensive financial support from the national development bank BNDS, and investments from world-leading petroleum companies and food producers (Sauer et al., 2017; Wilkinson & Herrera, 2010) such as Shell, Petrobras, Bunge, and Cargill. Brazil figures among the world’s chief producers of agrofuel (ethanol fuel and biodiesel). These world-leading companies and investors, enjoying climate-friendly labelling and access to ‘green’ financial mechanisms, contribute to deforestation and GHG emissions and are silent yet omnipresent actors in the land conflicts. MS is now among the Brazilian states most affected by climate change, with increasing drought and heat, the backdrop of the devastating fires in this state’s Pantanal wetlands that we witnessed in 2020.

Methodology

This empirical study explores Guarani and Kaiowá study-participants’ knowledge and goal-oriented practices of resistance confronted with ‘green’ economies and climate change, emphasising their enactment of collective memory as a tool in transformative processes ranging from microgenesis to sociogenesis (Zittoun & Gillespie, 2015). I seek to contribute to expanding decolonial research on Indigenous knowledges about climate change by exploring how sociocultural perspectives on collective memory and imagination can help to explain what activates re-membering and re-humanisation processes. These questions came to me, as a non-Brazilian woman, in 2014/2015 when I spent 5 months in the region engaging in a collaborative project with the Landless Farmers Movement (MST) I found myself having to deal with feelings of profound alienation and toxicity, facing the violent conditions in this region, on a daily basis. People from MST introduced me to the Guarani and Kaiowá retomadas; with other individual members of the network Via Campesina and activists in the region, they have supported the research process in many ways. Importantly, before the onset of research, they presented me to regional leaders belonging to the Guarani and Kaiowá people’s political representation, the Aty Guasu assembly. Presenting the objectives and methodology to them before the onset of research was done to pursue more ethical relationships of trust and transparency, and open up for their criticism, and even possible disapproval of my project.

Data Construction

The Guarani and Kaiowá participants’ processes of collective meaning-making, re-membering, and imagination must be studied in the context in which they occur, making methodological pluralism (Jovchelovitch, 2019) crucial. My data derive from ethnographic methods combining individual and group interviews with fieldnotes from observations, conversations, and document analysis (Case et al., 2014). I followed political mobilisations, spiritual ceremonies, public hearings, and everyday life in reserves and retomadas and participated in ad hoc emergency activities when human rights violations occurred. Of particular significance was the participation in three agroecology workshops that brought together farmers, scholars, and indigenous participants, enabling me to study how re-membering also occurred through dialogues with others. Data construction drew on four visits of altogether 6 months, 2017–2019.
Research Setting

I constructed this research process from Dourados, the region’s biggest city, established in the 1950s to serve the growing agribusiness sector. With longer stays in Dourados, the city’s toxicity became increasingly apparent. Extensive cultivation of genetically modified (GMO) soybean surrounds the city’s borders. Families from the nearby Jaguapiru reserve come to do low-wage work, often shouted at or ignored as they move about in posh neighbourhoods. Less than 1 km from the city limits lie the Guarani and Kaiowá retomadas Nhu Verá I, II, and III: these are often attacked, the families’ tents of black canvas burned, and people shot by rubber or even real bullets. Precarious material resources and safety among the solidarity networks limit the human rights work to support them. Researchers and journalists become persecuted subjects, living under safety measures and avoiding publicity. As a human rights worker who had previously lived in Dourados explained: ‘The spark of living has gone out, and I cannot light it again’.

This precariousness also influenced my research. Many safety measures were aimed at protecting research participants’, supporting networks’ and friends’ safety (Moss et al., 2019). This included reducing movements to and from the reserves and the retomadas, leaving me with less independence to construct a well-planned and less messy (de Saint-Laurent, 2018a) research process. While focusing mainly on the Te’ ýikue Reserve in Caarapó municipality, and six adjacent retomadas; Kunumi Poty Vera, Namoy Guavira’y, Jeroky Guasu, Tey’ Jusu, Guapo’y, and Itagui, I sought to make my research process more open and flexible. By responding to ad hoc necessities, which might be anything from delivering seeds to a retomada to helping with the documentation of human rights violations, assisting as a car driver, etc. I could approach other areas as well. Hence, research was also done in the retomada Laranjeira Nhanderu in Rio Brilhante municipality, in the Indigenous land Panambizinho, and in the reserves of Jaguapiru and Amambai, and in the retomadas Guyraroká and Guyrá Kambi’y. Interviews (N = 9) with public servants working in welfare institutions were conducted in the city of Dourados.

Interviews

Participants were recruited for interviews after establishing prior contact. Sometimes other researchers or people from the retomadas joined in, re-shaping interviews into dialogues with multiple participants, often sharing a warm Chimarrão drink in the early morning or a chilled Tereré when the sun was high and temperatures rising. Interviews were conducted on timber banks, in the comforting shadows of a tree or inside educational centres. The interviews in Dourados (N = 9) took place in institutional buildings, more convenient for participants. In advance, participants were told about the objectives of the study and their rights, and gave their informed consent. Interviews were recorded or written down. The individual (N = 15) and group (8) interviews ranged from 15 to 130 min. Interviewing was conducted in Portuguese; when some collective interviews slipped into Guarani, parts of the narrative were translated. However, deeper meanings, perhaps untranslatable, may not have been captured.

Community dynamics sometimes subverted the possibility of following standard interview procedures, as individual interviews would transition into family interviews, and some participants would enter or leave the conversation during group interviews. People would propose questions additional to the interview guide. Such constant improvisation may concern researchers, as the ‘messiness’ challenges assumptions about scholarly
Normann

precision (de Saint-Laurent, 2018a). However, I soon learned that this had not only a critical ethical aspect, providing internal transparency concerning the objectives of my visit: it also generated dynamics that opened for rich and diverse dialogues, and allowed for more careful reflection on the interview not as a neutral instrument, but as a social practice (Brinkmann, 2016). Ethnographic writing can place oppressed populations at increased risk if researchers fail to reflect sufficiently on what they can write about (Case et al., 2014). Given the lack of safety in this research setting, participants’ names and which areas they speak from were anonymised; further issues as to what could be presented in this article were determined through careful reflection and conversation with researchers in the region and Guarani and Kaiowá activists.

Data Analysis

Collective memory conveys people’s accounts of the past through rituals, social interaction, artefacts and text. Narratives help to give form and meaning to the past (Brescó de Luna, 2017) and are thus essentially political (Hammack, 2011). Fifteen individual interviews and eight group interviews in this study were transcribed (except on four occasions, where audio had not been recorded) and analysed. Through procedures from Thematic Analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I identified shared themes across accounts. I searched for both latent and semantic meanings (Braun & Clarke, 2006), as meanings might not always be directly expressed. Nine interviews of public servants in welfare institutions were treated differently; except from one excerpt below, they are not presented in this study, but helped me understand the institutional entanglements of coloniality and the context in which study-participants’ strategies unfold. As Kvale (1996) points out, the term ‘transcript’ may imply a reifying analysis that reduces meaning to ‘verbal data’. The parallel reading of extensive fieldnotes helped me recall the interview situation, vital for exploring the original interview’s meaning zone (Kvale, 1996). For outsiders, the web of meanings in a given community may be hard to interpret (Rogoff, 2003), and linguistic-epistemic translation risks failing to capture, or may even erase, the depth in meanings (Vázquez, 2011). Aware of the possible epistemological fallacies of interpretation, I emphasise the dialogical aspect of this ethnographic study. The community narratives I identified may best be understood as a synthesis between the meanings carried by participants’ accounts or practices, the research questions as an optic that zooms in on specific aspects of a narrative, and the culturally moulded tools researchers have for interpreting and creating meanings through these stories. Perhaps all qualitative research can be described as a dialogue between such different ‘ways of seeing’. Nevertheless, in settings where coloniality is a concern, dialogical jargon about the interview can mask the further reproduction of power asymmetries (Kvale, 2002). Methodological-epistemological transparency and humility about possible misunderstandings are essential in pursuing valid and ethical research.

From my data analysis, I organised three main narratives: (a) disruption of freedom and abundance: ‘The bird has no boss, nor a farm’; (b) from abundance to disease and suffocation: ‘Disoriented as a dog when you’re moving’; and (c) different paths to re-membering: ‘When we return to our Tekoha, we are re-living our future.’
Findings

Disruption of Freedom and Abundance: ‘The Bird has No Boss, Nor a Farm’

Central in the participants’ narratives were the timepoints when the Guarani and Kaiowá ways of life suffered disruptions, and the dismembering of their communities either started or deteriorated. These narratives were often presented together with reflections about the meaning of being Guarani and Kaiowá. Petrus, a man in his fifties, deeply involved in agroecology projects in several communities, summarised his understanding of the mission of the Guarani and Kaiowá on our planet:

_**O bem viver** [living well], is when God made the earth, the forest, the water, the soil, the light and the stars, and there was no one to admire this work of God, right? So the Guarani and Kaiowá people were sent to admire it. They called us _Yvy poty_, flowers of the earth. (...) we came here to admire and celebrate it. And help in taking care of it too. Valuing, that is our role.

Through the term _bem viver_’ (Spanish, _buen vivir_; in English ‘wellbeing’/’living well’) Petrus connects how he observes the Guarani and Kaiowá ways of life to an extensive decolonial and post-development literature developed from Latin American realities that promote models of sustainability and reciprocity learned from Indigenous cosmologies (Grosfoguel, 2016). Guarani equivalents to _bem viver_, like _Teko Porá_\(^1\) (enacting beauty/good), _Teko Joya_ (enacting reciprocity), and _Teko Katu_ (enacting the person’s abilities), were mentioned in many of the interviews. Guarani anthropologists explain that Teko means how one moves through a space (Benites & Ramos, 2017). This could be translated as ‘enacting’, but also carries a normative value regulating individual behaviour. These positive ‘Teko’s’ defined the Guarani and Kaiowá identity in opposition to the _Karaí_, a term today denoting white or non-indigenous persons, often with negative, clearly colonial connotations. Dandara, a woman in her twenties who is active in the youth movement, explains how her identity is shaped through involvement with the past, and in opposition to Karaí (white) society:

_[The plantation owner] does not have _Teko Rexai_ [health], _Teko Joya_ [reciprocity], _Teko Vy’a_ [enacting and inspiring happiness]. Because he thinks about himself, does not consider us as humans: that we are alive, that we preserve (...). He does not have anything of what we have, all the _Tekos_ that we have. We can say he is without a soul, without a heart. That’s why he kills us. We have this spirituality, we respect a person even though he is bad. He does not. He is not concerned if we die of pesticides, or from a rubber bullet or a real bullet: he’s not even there to witness it. So he does not have the _Teko Mborayhu_ (enacting love) that we have so much of. The love for people, animals, nature, this is what we have and use, it was always like that (...). The _ypy_, the humans from past times, initiated all of what we have today; they made it very clear how we should live, what rules are there for us. So, we always have these rules about life and sustenance. So we do the _Jerosy_, which is the baptism of corn: all that we plant is blessed through [the spirit of] Jakaira. We plant and harvest what we need to live, for humans and animals. This is how we live.

---

\(^1\) I have read Mura (2006) and João (2011) for a tentative translation of the different ‘Teko’ in this article. Any inaccuracies in the translation are my responsibility.
Arturo, a man in his fifties, explained how several signals appeared before the displacement of his family: ‘First came the Fusca, then the Rural (a car model used in rural Brazil in between the 1950s and 1970s), then the cattle, and then the forests were cut down. Before I could think, I was in a chiqueiro (pigsty).’ According to study-participants, ‘the de-structuring’, ‘confinement’, and ‘crowding people together’ severely disrupted the Guarani and Kaiowä ‘good practices’ and spirituality necessary for maintaining equilibrium in the cosmos, a responsibility that the cosmology and creational myths emplace on the Guarani and Kaiowä (Mura, 2010). Such practices cannot be conducted just anywhere: they must be done in the sacred areas where the families have historical ties.

The spiritual guide Dalia, with whom I spoke in a situation of uncertainty and tension but also of shared optimism in a small Tekoha that had been recovered only 14 days earlier, had, at the age of 94, returned to where she was born—after having spent most of her adult life living inside the reserves, and 11 years in a provisional camp near the BR-163 highway. She still remembered how she had been displaced 83 years earlier: ‘Here is my land, I was born here. Here lived my father and mother. Now things will be better than before. We can breathe fresh air. We were massacred, and thrown into the map; they burned down our prayer house. Everything we had was burned.’

I believe that the ‘map’ reference in her account concerns how borders drawn into the map and fences are a fundamental aspect of the earlier-mentioned sarambi (Chamorro, 2015). The reserves were demarcated, so being ‘thrown into the map’ may mean being locked into the reserve, perhaps into the Karai (white society) logic, or into the logics of agribusiness expansion (Sauer, 2018). Carlos, an energetic man in his 30s, told me, significantly: ‘The bird has no boss, nor a field [roça].’ In the Guarani and Kaiowä cosmology, birds have deep meanings as guardians incorporated in the human body (João, 2011). Carlos shared his reflection as we were sitting by a fire one night after returning from an excursion to his family’s ancestral lands, where he had helped as an interpreter in several interviews. It left me thinking. The boss-reference seemed an explicit criticism of exploitation and of the replacement of the Guarani and Kaiowä cosmologic-political system with the captains inside the reserves (Faria & Martins, 2020). The field reference was more challenging: today, the roça/field is a space for growing food, for generating resilience and for recovering ancestral practices. This made the sentence look contradictory to me. Unable to reach Carlos while doing data analysis, I contacted Dandara through WhatsApp and asked what the sentence might have meant. She responded:

The bird does not have a boss, because he wakes up and does what he has to do. When he plants, I do not think he needs any payment. Birds eat fruit and spread the seed around, and their field is the whole world, right? The bird carries fruit, and the seed falls on the ground wherever it passes. He will not stay in only one place. (...) Another day, another bird will pass by the same place, and that one seed that the first bird left will grow, sprout, and sustain other birds. So, the field is immensely big: it is the whole world. There is not one specific, unique place. It is like us. That’s how our life is based as well, as Indigenous people.

Several participants mentioned ‘freedom’ and ‘abundance’ as lost through borders. Research describes the Guarani jeguatá/oguatá (‘the walk’/‘to be walking’) as a vital ethos in the long history of the Guarani peoples, connected to senses of freedom (Pimentel, 2012a, b). This freedom to move requires abundance, since when migrating people cannot carry their maintenance (Johnson & Adoue, 2020). The bird in Dandaras
account, moving freely and generating abundance for those who come in the future, seems to exemplify this connection. The movement to return to the Tekoha’s can perhaps be seen as a resignification of *jeguatá* (Ibid, p. 229) in the contemporary context of agribusiness hegemony.

Lucia, a woman in her forties, explains the *sin qua non* of a fence: ‘Everything you steal needs to be protected’. In a region where trees and forests have become rare, and the plantations frequently control the small, reserved forests, study participants spoke of their difficulties in fishing, hunting, and finding natural remedies. Michael explains the lived experience of these borders:

… we find a barrier in the border. Not the border with Paraguay; let us say the territorial border. The farm-owned forests. I cannot enter there, the farmers expel us, and they can even kill. They can enter the forest and cut down [trees]. But we cannot get [plant] medicine. This makes our daily life difficult.

The processes of destruction of the forests during the period of *sarambi* were an issue discussed by several participants. As Tomas explained in an interview:

In some places, the community destroyed the forest, demolishing, and cutting trees. But they did not realise that they were cutting down the remaining future for their grandchildren’s family. That was psychologically so… He did not realise that he would suffer now (…). We did not make this loss of autonomy. The government made the mess.

Lucia observes in a similar pattern:

We were Kaigua, which means the ‘forest people’: now we are just called Kaiowá. We became dominated; we started to have confidence and trust in the Karaí (…). We felt secure, and that is when we gave away our world. Today, it is difficult to recover.

Her vision of what happened historically is then projected into her understanding of the current situation:

In this world, when things are at the most brutal, you continue doing what destroys, as if we were hitchhikers with no control over where we are going. The desires of the Karaí are big, like an incurable virus.

**From Abundance to Disease and Suffocation: ‘Disoriented as a Dog When You’re Moving’**

Sugarcane fields, or *canaviais* in Portuguese, enclose the Te’ ýikue reserve and adjacent retomadas. These are operated by large farms, which today have possession of the claimed ancestral lands. The farmers deliver sugarcane to Raízen, a joint venture enterprise owned by the multinationals Shell and Cosan, and a leading biofuel producer. Over the years, the retomadas have repeatedly been targeted by threats and attacks, and during interviews the participants kept reminding me of how many Guarani and Kaiowá have lost their lives to *pistoleiros*, armed men, allegedly with links to neighbouring sugar plantations. During fieldwork in 2018, tensions rose in the wake of the presidential election, and several study participants received death threats. Distrust increased, particularly against white and non-indigenous people. For instance, if we were uncertain about the route while driving to certain communities, and stopped the car to ask a pedestrian, the chances were that we could be sent in the opposite direction, and suddenly end up lost in the canefield (*canavial*).
Inside the canavial, labyrinths of paths create shortcuts from one area to the next, at times preferred over muddy and rocky roads, where vehicles risk getting stuck during the rainy season or to coming under surveillance. Farther south in the state, closer to the city of Naívirai, the canavial is an alternative to the use of BR-163 for pedestrians from the Indigenous communities, as fatal collisions pose additional dangers. But when the cane grows tall, pistol men or roaming youth gangs (see works of Morais, 2020) may hide there. Dina, a Nhandesy (spiritual guide, woman) and leader in a retomada, explains:

Here in Mato Grosso do Sul, we are very victimised and suffering. We can’t even go to the city because it is dangerous. Nowadays, anything can happen if you go through the canavial. Look, just right there on the edge. (...) It looks all calm and quiet but at times... I ask everyone to try to stay awake and remain vigilant. They can only sleep around 3 am.

The sugarcane and soybean/corn flex crops pose other dangers to wildlife and humans. Health vulnerability through excessive use of pesticide received attention in MS in 2016, when a study showed that each individual consumed, through food and water, an average of 40 L of pesticide per year, against the national average of around 7 L (Douradosagora, 2016, 25/10). Guarani and Kaiowá reserves and camps are further exposed to continuous pulverisation of pesticides from tractors and small planes (Pignati et al., 2017). I was frequently told of toxic white clouds, blown by the wind towards the communities, producing diarrhoea, vomiting, confusion, headache, respiration problems, and psychological trauma. Sometimes the tractors or planes appeared so near schools or homes that they were understood as direct toxic attacks. As Michael put it:

Where is the United Nations? They always come when the dust has settled. We feel they push forward, and then they pull out again. (...) At least, they and the MPF [Federal Prosecutor’s Office] could instruct us about what to do. No one defends us. While we sleep, we think, or we are awake, we can never rest.

Whereas soybean and corn cultivation employ few people, manual work is still required in the sugarcane plantations. During the harvest season, buses pick up men at 2 a.m. and return them at dawn. The work is hard; the wages are low, and their bodies tired. Cristian described his work in the nearby sugarcane plantations: ‘It is like not getting enough air.’ According to Thomas, the entry of sugarcane in the late 1990s exacerbated the ‘de-structuring of the Kaiowá system’. During intensive harvest seasons, the families were separated for many months, when men left their homes for the plantations. In his view, this was how alcohol and drug abuse joined the line of problems facing people inside the reserves.

Study participants characterised the reserves’ situation, as ‘disorientation’, ‘confinement’, ‘confusion’, like a ‘persistent illness’ or ‘spiritual disease’, produced by deforestation and the displacement of the Nhanderu and Nhandesy (male and female spiritual guides) from sacred places, causing miscommunication between them and God. Their prayers may be weakened, no longer able to maintain the cosmic equilibrium, with consequences felt on many levels, including the planetary level, through climate change, manifesting through fierce winds, drought, and heat in the region during this research. Guarani and Kaiowá participants spoke of the connection between the manifestations of disequilibrium or spiritual disease in the human psyche, and disequilibrium at the level of the family, the community, and eventually the whole planet. Disturbances on one level have consequences for the other levels and recovery strategies needed to target all levels.
Locally, this spiritual disease may find an expression in the alarming waves of youth suicide in the reserves, and in alcohol-abuse related violence, that increased since the 1980s. For a long time, research and public discourses reproduced biases through attributing the high suicide-numbers among the Guarani and Kaiowá to anomalies or cultural traits (Pimentel, 2017, pp. 289–291). I noted how Maria, an administrator working in a network of institutions promoting Child Protection, interviewed in Dourados, termed the situation a ‘disease’, but her concept of disease was a different one, with little historical awareness:

At night, people are frightened. They do not walk around in the community because of the violence. Many people say, ‘Ah, it’s because of the land loss.’ No. You can’t blame it all on the fact that they do not have access to land. Today you need a whole [medical] intervention to treat almost everyone there.

Later in the interview, I asked what she thought about a common criticism voiced by study participants, that health and childcare institutions lack cultural awareness, she replied:

People say, ‘Oh, you take culture away from them.’ What culture? The children there are living in canvas tents (…) I went there myself, and you see there, what culture are they preserving? When you see reports from Amazonas, you see indigenous people doing those dances; there they have all their culture preserved in the community. It’s different here.

Her words seem to fit in the discourse that Pimentel (2017, pp.304–305) identifies among the political elite in MS. In this, the Guarani and Kaiowá are blamed for their calamities. Dandara (quoted above: a woman active in the youth movement) differ, and reflects on the current situation as a form of torture:

People look around here. The psychological torture from agribusiness starts messing with our minds, with our community. People think we have no chance, that ‘for me, there is no return’: no more forests, no more birds, no longer that nice wind, because the trees are all gone. This process leads people to think that it is all over, it generates many conflicts in their minds and people ask themselves: ‘will I ever be able to live, to live again the life I had before?’.

For Michael this agribusiness model even leads to a genocide:

Genocide is a set of things, making you lose your identity. The soybean plantations are a kind of genocide, because we can no longer plant what we had. Today, only sugarcane, soybean, and cattle. What you once had can no longer be born. That is why genocide is a set of things, identity, culture, and soil for growing. It is not only about killing as such. (…) Genocide does not hurt. When you begin feeling, it is too late. It all become unstructured (‘desestructurado’) and as a dog when you are moving; you feel, and become all lost.

Lucia also finds a connection between human disease and ecology, and claims the disease is not only affecting her own community: ‘Today what rules is the ideology of dominating the rest, and all of us get sick.’ She continues, ‘This society that robs all, cuts everything down, with no compassion is a psychopathic society’. Dandara, reflecting on possible ways out, sets Indigenous practices in opposition to white, colonial ‘ways’:

First, we need to change how the latifundio (large plantations) work. Most polluters are among them, cutting down trees and planting much more than they should.
(…) Nowhere will you find Indigenous people producing plastic, or petrol. Natural resources cannot recover anymore; they are extracted exaggeratedly, as with the mining. Then nature herself starts killing humanity. Nature wants to show that we will suffocate. Only today, experts started to talk about global warming. It started long ago, but they only discovered it now. Too late. But I think we can still prolong a while our survival.

**Different Paths to Re-Membering: ‘When we Return to our Tekoha, We are Re-living our Future’**

Onildo’s words while we were walking to see an agroecology field were clear:

We bring together allied people and researchers who want to know how we are doing in the villages. Have we had only deaths, since nothing else is spoken about? In Dourados, it is when bad things happen that we are described in newspapers, right? A dead person, a beheading. That’s how it goes. [It would be] better with, ‘Ah look, the school, it’s doing a great job, just look and see!’ But no one speaks like that!

Whereas the two previous narratives point to how losses, disease, and dismemberment are entangled with climate change, this theme explores connections between the participants’ collective memories and some of the strategies enacted to construct criticisms of the causes of climate change, to recover from trauma, to build resilience, and finally re-establish the cosmic equilibrium.

I noticed how elderly and front political figures would often begin narratives with ‘In the old days…’ (‘Antigamente’). This seemed to be not only a dignifying act of a people’s historical memory, but equally an insistence on the possibility of another way of living. The memory of earlier ways of life, still alive in older people’s minds and passed on through stories and rituals, was central in the community initiatives and political actions I observed.

Similarly, Deborah, a youth assembly leader, reflected after our joint meeting with an elderly Nhanderu visiting the opening of a prayer house from another region in the state. She had looked amazed while speaking with him. I had been sitting close by, only offered little translation, and, from my perspective, noticing how his way of speaking had a melody to it that resembled the prayer chants. Returning to Dourados in the late afternoon, I asked her what had happened. She answered:

In the past, Indigenous psychology was a complete process. I am doing research, not for the university, but for myself: how to become stronger. It is a challenge to understand. To find the way of Teko Porã, to walk the right path. To achieve that, which is difficult, you need to be humble and good; that process exists for us Indigenous people also. He told me the whole story, the cosmology, why that bird always sings. But writing it down in Portuguese will be tough. The Nhanderu speaks in an ancient language; even I need to pay close attention.

**Recovering Through the Roça**

‘Agroecology’ is a recent word in Guarani and Kaiowá communities, but historically, growing food through particular agricultural practices has been vital, not only for food
self-sufficiency but also according to study participants, closely connected to spiritual rituals. Confinement in reserves prevents proper care of the soil. In the retomadas, reviving the practice of caring for the soil was a fundamental and yet demanding task because of the little space, the poisoning of the soil, and the loss of seed varieties. Research has noted the importance of agroecology for climate change mitigation, resilience, and trauma work (Einbinder & Morales, 2020; Rosset et al., 2011). In my research setting, agroecology had also become a space for meaningful dialogue, involving exchange of knowledge and seeds with people from other communities, and ranging from university personnel to missionaries and members of the global peasant network Via Campesina, which has long advocated a political version of agroecology. As Marvin, an experienced agroecology promoter in his 30s, reflected:

It is a challenge to recover and to create more happy persons again. Health and emotions; we need to approach that again, recuperate it. So, when we speak about the practice of cultivating: In the past, it was a recreation, right? It was not work; it was leisure. (…) As the activities developed, you made fun, you sang. You did not have to keep an eye on the clock. When it was cold, you started a bit later. When it was warm, you finished sooner.

The idea is now to recover Guarani and Kaiowá knowledge—‘What we always knew but were unaware of,’ according to Petrus. The central idea is to plant consortiums of different plants that mutually support each other and protect the soil. Further, this diversity of seeds and plants seemed to be engendering small ‘cracks’ in the imaginary of monocultures promoted by the agribusiness hegemony. David, a non-indigenous missionary who was participating in the workshops, reflected:

For some time, I found the soybean fields aesthetically beautiful. I saw a lost tree in the middle of it. I found it pretty. But there is no beauty in that! Now I have taken deliberate steps away from understanding that monotony as pretty. But we are culturally educated to find beauty in monotony, practised on a large scale by the dominant system.

Participants noted the importance of including rituals and spiritual guidance from the Nhandesy and Nhanderu in combination with the kind of techniques mentioned above to cure not only the soil but also the people. Martin, a young assistant teacher in the practice of agroecology, referred what the local Nhanedsy had told him: ‘Mari explains that when you participate, you also need to dance Guaxiré, then you have a higher chance of cutting off that pain and the feelings related to the bad spirits, you scare it out of yourself.’

However, Genaro, nearly 100 years old at the time of our conversation, pointed to how the lack of land had forced individualist behaviour patterns upon people, and that reviving the reciprocity of earlier times might be difficult. Many practices seemed to be aimed at not making matters worse. All living entities or natural phenomena have, according to Guarani and Kaiowá cosmology, specific kinds of Jaras/Járys, or spirits/guardians (João, 2011; Mura, 2006). When humans cause destruction or stop following specific behaviour norms, these Jaras may abandon the Earth, causing the disequilibrium that in Western thought is understood as climate change. Lalo, a Nhanderu, held that the high winds and extreme drought announced the forest Jara’s abandonment. But according to him, the Jara of agriculture and the Jara of the Earth were still here, and so efforts are made to keep them around and prevent famine.
Imagining the Future

At one point during fieldwork, when reflecting on the position of memory in a context where agribusiness has penetrated ways of life so thoroughly, I found myself sitting around a fire late at night in a retomada. I had come there to attend a political meeting the next day, where the murder of a young health worker and his father’s incarceration 3 years earlier would be remembered. A Kaiowá friend in his early twenties asked me, with a big smile, ‘how do you imagine the future?’ Impressed by the fact that I had been asked one of the questions I was trying to deal with in my research, and where people often seemed reluctant or shy about answering, I replied as I best could; and was, unfortunately, hindered from asking him. A French anthropologist, doing an ethnography in the area, was sitting next to us and had picked up elements of the conversation. He asked me fascinated, ‘Did he tell you about his view on the future? You must hear his answer!’ Without knowing it, he was getting close to one of my research puzzles. The next day, we had gathered where the friend had been killed 3 years ago and was now buried. The Brazilian flag placed on the grave was flying; it had holes in it, and red paint, symbolising the shed blood. Around us there was high pasture, growing again after the land area had been recovered three years ago; then, some 500 m down a gentle slope, the rows of sugarcane commenced. At the community’s request, I was filming the event, where the community leaders, one by one, shared their words, meant to fly far, meant to make a difference in the hearts and minds of other peoples. The friend from the fireplace the previous night was leading the ceremony. Suddenly in a well-formulated and energetic political discourse, he said, ‘Our future is not there in front of us. Our future is behind us. When we return to our Tekoha, we are re-living our future.’

Discussion

‘Narratives’ can be people’s accounts of disruptions in the expected course of things, about meanings that are given to them, and about attempts to resolve the unexpected (Bruner, 2008). Narrative knowledge involves efforts to search for plausibility and coherence (Polkinghorne, 1988) and can set in motion human actions (Brockmeier, 2009). In my study I have found that through narratives built on different forms of memory, the participants constructed strong criticisms of the modernity/coloniality models of progress (in their words, Karaí ways of being) that are dependent on extractivism. Study participants did not decouple coloniality/modernity from climate change—neither in addressing causality nor in enacting resilience strategies. This is perhaps no surprise, given the collective memories of how initial contact with white colonisers concurred with the deforestation and destruction of their world system.

In light of these findings, the United Nations’ recent calls to include Indigenous knowledge (IK) in climate agendas have become a thought-provoking and complex matter. As this study has shown, Indigenous knowledges can entail profound breaks with central logics of the current climate agenda that promotes models of green growth, with agrofuel-production (not least in this specific research setting) expanding despite the increasing global focus on land-use change as a significant cause of harmful emissions (IPBES, 2019).

Grosfoguel warns how Western systems can extract, de-politicise, and decontextualise artefacts, objects, and knowledges—re-signifying and assimilating them into Western-hegemonic
ways of being (Grosfoguel, 2016). An example of this, relevant in the research setting, is how some companies in the agribusiness sector in the region now frame parts of their endeavours as ‘agroecology’, through limited technical fixes, all the while ignoring the sociocultural, political, and in this research setting deeply spiritual meanings of agroecology. Such ‘greenwashing’ or ‘co-opting’ practices (Giraldo & Rosset, 2018) may indicate that underlying the de-politicisation of IK identified by Grosfoguel, there can be disputes concerning people’s ability to imagine other futures. This draws our attention to political imagination. My findings are in line with research that has explored the function of collective memory to processes of political imagination (de Saint-Laurent, 2018b). Through narratives by spiritual guides and other elderly individuals, the constant practice of remembrance ‘speak to’ youth and children who grew up in colonial and adverse situations. The narratives of how things were before seemed to indicate conscious efforts to open the ability of children (and adults) to imagine other possible futures—but also to connect their experience with a different past, one without ‘disease’, and thus to contest stereotyped accounts of them. I found that, rather than implying nostalgic mourning of any kind of glorious past, remembrance enabled critical engagement with the past (de Luna, 2018): demystifying agribusiness hegemony, defining causations, and constructing imaginations of possible collective futures (Melã, 2015) that became a central tool in collective enactments. Kaiowá anthropologist Benites (2020, p. 20) describes the search for a future in the past as to follow existing elements (rivers, prayers, forests, practices) as ‘conductive lines to the past and spiritual dimensions, and when returning, bringing back the living memory to fundament new relations in a constantly transforming reality.’

In a way, the Guarani and Kaiowá participants’ efforts to re-member their communities (and by extension, the cosmos) have the dual purpose of casa adentro and casa afuera, as expressed by Juan García Salazar (In Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Casa adentro (in house) is the re-memberment through re-connecting young people with the collective memory, and casa afuera (out of house) may denote the dialogues with ‘others.’ Among Guarani and Kaiowá communities there are ongoing efforts at undertaking such dialogues, with other Indigenous peoples, but also with possible allied individuals in the Karai system, through invitations to register (and spread the word) of ceremonies, to contribute in processes of agroecology, or to receive researchers like myself. These dialogues may move us closer to the Guarani and Kaiowá notion of nhe’e, meaning simultaneously word, language, and soul. Nhe’e, is sacred (Cariaga, 2019), both during dialogues and during when stories are shared (João, 2011). Gonzalez and Silva Guimarães (2020), working in the Mbya Guarani context, propose that nhe’e might be an equivalent to the western word psyche. This is not to say that the worldviews are similar, but to underline how psychologists, in order to overcome epistemic violence, may seek to engage dialogically with the conceptions in the communities in which they study, instead of homogenising translation efforts. In this way, narratives, or nhe’e, can present us with possibilities of imagining the world (and ourselves) from another’s viewpoint, gaining new senses about what things are about (Bradbury, 2019). They open for the possibility of imaginatively moving forward into ‘what if’ futures (Andrews, 2014 as cited in Bradbury, 2019 p. 100). Against this backdrop, the dialogic engagement with the meaning system of the Guarani and Kaiowá during this research project also opened a critical bifocality (Weis & Fine, 2012), redirecting the gaze away from victimisation narratives towards a critique of both the shortcomings of psychological science in this study setting, but even further, towards imagining other ways of being in Western settings.

In a time when the re-prefix finds its way into research and public discourses concerning climate change, the Guarani and Kaiowá strategies may not be read as static or essentialised cultural features. Minds and cultures are in constant movement, and sociocultural history provides communities with a material and a symbolic basis for possible epistemological locations (de Sousa Santos, 2014 see also; Zittoun, 2019) that allow participants to develop profound
critiques of coloniality. Their method for theorisation has resemblance with the anticolonial work of Frantz Fanon, who, through the embodied experience and phenomenological writing about being a black man in colonial Martinique, developed his ideas of the sociogenesis of racism (Fanon, 2017; Bulhan, 1985). Similarly, the study participants developed decolonial ecological theory, generated from their experiences of deforestation and dismemberment and projected to today’s global challenges. Through this, they could target various strategies of re-membering and resilience—on the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels—interconnected with their cosmology. One example is agroecology; it had healing effects on individual and community traumas. It was directed at increasing resilience in the retomadas. It enabled the elderly to strengthen spiritual work—and it meant dialogues with other communities and questioning agribusiness hegemonies at the macro-level.

Such models of personhood and social relations can be critically important not only for Indigenous communities but also as models that better suit humanity’s interests in Western settings (Adams et al., 2018b). Indeed, some communities may now be figuring as laboratories as they resist and generate resilience under extremely adverse conditions (EGSVL, 2019): here, the case of the Guarani and Kaioiwa can be seen as one such place. In the broadest sense, the toxic environment in which they live is a dystopic image of some of the unsolved problems in models of green economies. In another sense, their persistent efforts at defending a collective memory can pave the way for re-thinking also in Western academic institutions. In these institutions, contemporary aspirations to re-think, remake and recover, as well as sociocultural psychology’s search to understand possibilities and limitations of human imagination, can perhaps partially be explained by increasing exhaustion (de Luna, 2018), and the paradigm shift in how we think about the future that Mbembe (2019a, b) observes. Western future-oriented optimism is becoming replaced with dissonance and social retreat (Morselli, 2013), as fires and floods with planetary consequences force us to recognise our strategies’ failure. One contribution from sociocultural and decolonial researchers might be to engage more deeply in accompanying individuals and communities to enact collective re-memberment and imagination processes.

**Conclusions**

This study has drawn on a loose conceptual framework, combining sociocultural psychological work on collective memory, political imagination, and human action with the concept of re-membering in decolonial thought. This framework, taken together with the narratives shared in this dialogically oriented study, enabled exploration of how the Guaraní and Kaiowá participants’ collective memory became a fundamental tool for imagining and enacting on the future. Collective memory further allowed study participants to articulate profound criticisms of the toxic environment that prioritised agrofuels and green growth—paradoxically, among Brazil’s commitments to the Paris Agreements.

However, the study is not exhaustive. Language limitations and colonial entanglements continue to mark academic practices and knowledge production. Therefore, the concept of dialogue is less about promoting a kind of normative or resolved ‘positive practice’, and more about being transparent about research as a social practice where new meanings are constructed—also when a researcher from ‘the outside’ may misinterpret complex meaning systems (Rogoff, 2003). In colonial systems, this practice has already produced much epistemological violence (Teo, 2010). However—and following Bradbury (2019)—in order to imagine new worlds, we all, including scholars, need to engage in dialogues with each other, with caution, respect and openness. Mignolo and Walsh (2018) pose this as ‘thinking with’, instead of
researching about'. The profound criticisms of the Karaí system voiced by the participants in this study have led to think that, even given these unsolved tensions, this admittedly modest and limited study makes a valid contribution to re-thinking hegemonic practices regarding climate change mitigation.

This is not to romanticise the adverse situation of the Guarani and Kaiowá. In 2019, during my last fieldwork, climate change was evident through extreme heat, and low rainfall. The Nhanderu and Nhandesy were praying for rain; I was told they were engaging in communicating with God to understand climate change better. Many agroecology fields dried up in this period, and soybean producers pressured communities to surrender their land for small fees. Some leaders accepted, generating turmoil in the local communities. A year later, the last forests in MS in the Pantanal wetlands some hours’ drive north of the Guarani and Kaiowá ancestral lands were in flames, with footage of burned pumas broadcast worldwide. Indeed, such sceneries will multiply around the planet in the coming years, underscoring the urgency for scholars to work on many levels to support healing processes of re-memberment and re-humanisation.
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