



“Ideias para o fim do mundo”: a rhetorical and ecocritical postcolonial approach

Luciana Ferreira Leal

Professor, UNESPAR, Brazil
luciana.leal@unespar.edu.br

João Adalberto Campato Júnior

Professor, Universidade do Brasil, Brazil
campatojr@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Issues relating to the socio-environmental side of the world's reality are currently being discussed, with a certain apocalyptic aspect to this debate. This is the awareness of the increasingly concrete threats to the balance of the environment on planet Earth, the weaknesses and contradictions of the proposals for sustainable development and, finally, the pessimism regarding the possibility of the emergence of an alternative humanity to the consumerist, materialist, imperialist and anthropocentric values of capitalism, especially in its most economically aggressive form. In this context of gloomy threats, the aim is to show that the ecocritical discourse and post-colonial critique of the indigenous Brazilian Ailton Krenak, conveyed in *Ideias para o fim do mundo* (2019), rhetorically proposes to prove to his audience that humanity, although already neglected and distorted by the action of mystifying capitalism, still presents favorable conditions for a future renewal of paradigm shifts. The article has a qualitative and bibliographical design and concludes that Krenak, through the strategic use of rhetoric, enhanced the action of his propositional discourse.

KEYWORDS: Ailton Krenak. Rhetoric. Sustainable Development.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is an aspect of the global context that, for some time now, has been the subject of serious discussion and heated speculation among scientists, journalists, environmental activists, businesspeople, politicians and the general public. It's about the increasingly concrete threats to the planet's socio-environmental balance, sustainable development and what it can contribute - if anything - to the possibility of the emergence of a humanity that is more renewed, fraternal and sensitive to the most vulnerable populations and spaces. The debate is sometimes tinged with more optimistic colors, bordering on naivety, and sometimes with darker colors, bordering on the apocalyptic. Sometimes there is a desirable balance.

On the one hand, it is believed that the notion and practice of sustainable development and all that it entails has the possibility of correcting a path already distorted by the values that a certain type of savage capitalism has produced, in which nature is separated from man. From another angle, sustainable development and its culture are approached as the ideology of large corporations in industrialized countries whose purpose is not to correct, but to legitimize the action of capitalism, which will not stop being less aggressive, continuing to impose the culture of consumption and the creation of consumers; the culture of unbridled profit, of the creation of needs, in which nature is seen exclusively as a repository of raw materials at the service of human desires, which in turn become the wolf of man himself.

Within the deep and complex framework of this debate and through various personal and collective manifestations, the Brazilian indigenous intellectual Ailton Krenak takes sides, illuminating the impasses and contradictions of humanity, accentuating its difficulties, but also proposing original alternatives for the world to become healthier, uniting man and nature in a common complex of well-being and mutual respect. From Krenak's vast output, the text “*Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo*”, was chosen for analysis, illustrating how this conceptual complexity receives a reflective and inspiring treatment, which articulates the concept of humanity, the pleasure of living, the environment, colonialism and post-colonialism, seen from the analytical and revealing angles of ecocriticism and rhetoric.

2. OBJECTIVES

As a result of the above considerations, the aim of this article is to show that Ailton Krenak's ecocritical discourse and post-colonial critique, in “Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo”, uses rhetorical strategies to persuade his audience that humanity, although collapsed by the action of mystifying capitalism, still has conditions conducive to future renewal.

3. METHODOLOGY

The research that gave rise to this article followed a bibliographical approach. This is because it was carried out by reading, analyzing and categorizing bibliographic material, such as books and scientific articles. It also follows the broader guidelines of the qualitative approach, which seeks more in-depth analysis of the meanings derived from the material consulted, giving up interpretations by means of numbers and statistics.

4. ECOCRITICS

Ecocriticism is a field of study that focuses on the relationship between literature and the environment. In this context, researchers explore how nature is represented in literature and how the environmental crisis and the interdependence of human beings with the planet are articulated. For Mendes (2020, p. 93, *translated by the translator*), the premise of ecocritical studies is “reflection on the mutual interference between the human and physical universes”.¹

Ecocritical analysis seeks to give voice to what is often silenced: nature and the outside world. Unlike homocentric approaches, ecocriticism is ecocentric, privileging the place and context of writing. Peter Barry (2009) states that nature exists beyond us, affecting us and being affected by us. It is not just a cultural concept.

Originating above all in the United States and England, ecocriticism is an interdisciplinary critical movement focused on literary representations and recreations of the multiple relationships between man, nature and the environment. It is a relatively new research method that seeks to establish, in fundamental terms, the meanings of the relationships between cultural manifestations and the environment (GLOTFELTY, 1996).

Its growing importance is related to the fact that it appears in a historical reality marked by a capitalist, imperialist and anthropocentric environmental crisis whose proportions are putting humanity's existence at risk of either partial collapse or even total extinction.

The questions asked by literary or cultural critics affiliated with this trend are the following: “How is nature represented in the literary work?”, “What role does the physical setting play in the plot of a novel?”, “Are the values expressed in this work consistent with ecological wisdom?”, “Do men write about nature differently from women?”; “How has the

¹ Para Mendes (2020, p. 93), a premissa dos estudos ecocríticos é a “reflexão sobre a mútua interferência entre os universos humanos e físicos”.

environmental crisis been inserted into modern novels?”, among many others (COUTO, 2007, p. 438-439, *translated by the translator*).²

Garrad makes us understand the reason for such questions, clearly highlighting the aspect that underpins Ecocriticism:

Environmental problems require analysis in cultural and scientific terms because they are the result of the interaction between ecological knowledge of nature and its cultural inflection. This will involve interdisciplinary studies that draw on literary and cultural theories, philosophy, sociology, psychology and environmental history. (2006, p. 29, *translated by the translator*)³

Ecocritical criticism shares the premise that so-called human culture is linked to the physical world in such a way that both are modified in a constant process of transformation and that it is in search of environmental justice. It is precisely the interconnections between physical nature and human culture that are the subject of ecocritical examination, which is always proposing a negotiation between the human and the non-human. (GLOTFELTY; FROM 1996)

University disciplines such as ecocriticism, the scope of which is to examine the links between the environment and various textualities (literature, cinema, the arts, etc.), have already been established in American universities - such as the University of Nevada - since 1990, and are spreading to other parts of the world. Something similar can be said about the associations, research groups and congresses that deal with ecocriticism, such as the Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE) - which has an active branch in Brazil - and, more recently, the European Association for the Study of literature, Culture and Environment (EASLCE).

Ecocriticism is born problematizing, inserted in a tense world full of complexities. For this reason, some scholars prefer to refer to it using the plural "ecocriticism" (JUNQUEIRA, HENRIQUEZ, VIGAL, 2010, p. 15) in order to represent its various branches: ecofeminism, ecocriticism and national literatures, ecocriticism and children's literatures, the ecocriticism of matter, the study of oceanic humanities, toxic texts, urban nature, environmental justice, among others (JUNQUEIRA, HENRIQUEZ, VIGAL, 2010). The branch of ecocriticism of preferential interest in this article has not yet been mentioned, namely postcolonial ecocriticism.

Postcolonial ecocriticism is an interdisciplinary field that examines the intersections between literature, the environment and postcolonial issues. It looks at how narratives address environmental issues in postcolonial contexts, where historical power relations and the exploitation of nature play a seminal role.

This approach combines two areas: ecocriticism and postcolonial criticism. Ecocriticism investigates the relationship between literature and the environment, examining

²“Como a natureza está representada na obra literária?”, “Qual o papel do cenário físico no enredo de um romance?”, “Os valores expressos nessa obra são consistentes com a sabedoria ecológica?”, “Os homens escrevem sobre a natureza diferentemente das mulheres?”; “Como a crise ambiental vem se inserindo nos romances modernos?”, entre muitas outras possíveis (COUTO, 2007, p. 438-439).

³ Os problemas ambientais requerem uma análise em termos culturais e científicos porque são o resultado da interação entre o conhecimento ecológico da natureza e sua inflexão cultural. Isso implicará estudos interdisciplinares que recorram às teorias literárias e culturais, à filosofia, à sociologia, à psicologia e à história ambiental (2006, p. 29)

how literary texts represent nature, landscape and ecological issues. Postcolonial criticism focuses on the consequences of colonialism and marginalized voices, analyzing how literature reflects the experiences of the colonized and how writers respond to colonial power structures. Postcolonial ecocriticism invites the reader to examine how literature reflects and contests power relations, environmental exploitation and social issues in postcolonial contexts. It reminds us that environmental protection is intrinsically linked to justice and equity. Therefore, when ecocriticism is mentioned in the light of postcolonialism, it signals an examination of the links between colonialism, postcolonialism and neocolonialism and environmental degradation (BONNICI, 2012).

In this scenario, the devastating action of anthropocentrism and its preponderance over ecocentrism emerges. The meaning of everything that is not human is emptied, with only the human being the element that, as well as having meaning in itself, has the hierarchical power to confer meaning on nature. Man reveals himself to be the master, interpreter and center of nature, deciding what dies and what lives.

An ecocentric vision, on the other hand, presupposes the integration of all living beings in a context of equality and harmony in which there are no privileges for humans, for whom neither nature nor animals were voluntarily or involuntarily created.

Postcolonial ecocriticism - as Falconi (2022, p. 58, *translated by the translator*) makes clear - is centered on

[...] the critical analysis of the continuity of "imperial" forms of social and environmental domination; the inquiry into the ecological impacts of colonial, imperial and neo-colonial relations; as well as the full assumption of the complementarity between social justice and environmental problems.⁴

It follows that, in the neoliberal hegemonic scenario, the speculations and concerns of postcolonial ecocriticism account for a series of key problematic themes, such as human and non-human rights, animality and spirituality, the literary canon, the social and socio-environmental harms of extractivist capitalism, among others. (FALCONI, 2022).

Ecocriticism is part of a "confessedly political mode of analysis" (GARRARD, 2006, p. 14), in such a way that ecocritics, when they set out to examine discourses, do so on the basis of a militant project committed to persuading the recipients of the analyses of the seriousness of the environmental crisis in which men, with oppressive economic systems and harmful power relations, are to blame for socio-environmental tragedies.

From the above, one can better understand the reasons why it was chosen to show, in Aílton Krenak's speech, the links between imperialism, ecocriticism and rhetoric - militant discourse based on persuasion - in order to make the broad meanings produced by the text more evident.

⁴ [...] na análise crítica da continuidade de formas “imperiais” de dominação social e ambiental; na indagação dos impactos ecológicos das relações coloniais, imperiais e neocoloniais; bem como na plena assunção da complementaridade entre justiça social e problemáticas ambientais.

5. RHETORIC AND THE RHETORICAL METHOD

Rhetoric is about persuasion through verbal discourse. Persuasion can convince, move and please. As you can see, convincing is connected to logical persuasion; moving is an affective persuasion, which acts on the "heart" of individuals. Pleasing, on the other hand, refers to aesthetic persuasion (TRINGALI, 2014). From the point of view of ancient rhetoric, of the three ways of persuading, convincing the intellect is the most indispensable and decisive, with the others being placed in the field of accessories.

Greco-Latin rhetoric is interested in all the parts of persuasive discourse, which are invention, disposition, elocution, action and memory. Invention is characterized as the activity of finding evidence for a debate. The evidence is either logical or psychological. If logical, they are divided into syllogisms and examples; if psychological, into ethical and pathetic. Persuasion has both a rational and an emotional component. Psychological arguments fall into two categories: ethical (positive image of the speaker) and pathetic (emotions provoked in the recipient).

The layout is a "standard plan that is used to construct the speech" (REBOUL, 2004, p. 55, *translated by the translator*)⁵. It is customary to divide a speech into an exordium (beginning of the speech), proposition (thesis), partition (plan to be followed by the speaker), narration (the events), argumentation (presentation of evidence) and peroration (conclusion of the speech). Elocution, the third stage in the preparation of the rhetorical piece, consists of the linguistic and stylistic expression of the speech, in which the material found in the invention and ordered by the disposition is clothed in language. The next stage is memory, which refers to the exercise of memorizing the text to be presented, since speeches were memorized and expressed orally. The final stage of speech formulation is action, the activity of pronouncing the text.

Having learned about certain aspects of rhetoric, it remains to make use of a textual analysis model anchored in it (TRINGALI, 2014), with the help of which we will interpret Ailton Krenak's text, bringing out its persuasive dimension in the larger context of a socio-environmental vision of the planet. The method is made up of several stages, which, in this work, have been reduced to a considerably smaller number.

Figure 1 - Rhetoric as a textual approach method

THEME and QUESTION	Evaluate the theme of the speech and what is being discussed
PROPOSITION	Indicate what the speaker intends to prove
SPEAKER/AUDITOR	The speaker and the audience of the speech are determined.
GENRE OF THE SPEECH	Whether the speech is part of the judicial, demonstrative or deliberative genre.
INVENTION	The logical, pathetic and ethical proofs are examined.
ELOCUTION	Stylistic analysis
IDEOLOGY	The ideology contained in the rhetorical text is considered.

Source: Adapted from Tringali (2014) by the authors.

⁵ “plano-tipo ao qual se recorre para construir o discurso” (REBOUL, 2004, p. 55)

6. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo is a lecture given on March 12, 2019 by Ailton Krenak at the Institute of Social Sciences in Lisbon, in the context of Mostra Ameríndia: Percursos do Cinema Indígena do Brasil. In 2019, the lecture was transcribed into a book of the same name, which included two other speeches by Krenak: *Do sonho e da terra*, from 2017, and *A humanidade que pensamos ter*, both from 2017. The edition used for quotations in this article is the second one, published in 2020.

Born in 1953 in the Rio Doce Valley, a geographic space typical of mining, Ailton Krenak became one of the most respected environmental and indigenous rights activists in Brazil, achieving national and international visibility. He was the organizer of the Alliance of Forest Peoples, bringing together riverside and indigenous communities in the Amazon. Academia recognized his work and, in 2016, he was awarded the title of Doctor Honoris Causa by the University of Juiz de Fora (MG). In 2024, he was elected the first indigenous member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters (ABL).

There is a clear rhetorical situation in Krenak's 2017 lecture. This is because there is a speaker, Ailton Krenak, who addresses an audience, which is initially stipulated as the Portuguese who attended the event in Lisbon. Then, as a book, the conference's message spreads to a larger audience, those interested in environmental causes. The speaker has a name and a very positive reputation: he is the indigenous Ailton Krenak, who, faced with a controversial subject, addresses the audience with authority in order to persuade them on an issue that was and remains on the agenda. Krenak will speak about something of which he has irrefutable knowledge and whose authority is apparent in the very discourse he enunciates (prior ethos plus discursive ethos).

Since ancient times, the socio-environmental issue has been at the center of a series of opinions that debate whether or not humanity is at risk of environmental collapse due to overly anthropocentric and capitalist human action. Along these lines, there is inevitable ideological debate as to whether the alternative of sustainable development based on a harmonious relationship between economic development along capitalist lines and the idea of sustainability is feasible. This environmental issue gives rise to opposing opinions, more or less rational, more or less passionate, on which scientists, politicians, businesspeople and environmentalists have often taken a stand, striving to persuade the opposing side.

Ailton Krenak's lecture (2019, *translated by the translator*) consists of taking a position - and the adoption of the term "invasion of my corner of the world" is already a first explicit ideological choice - in this discursive universe, populated by discourses, discursive and ideological formations that fight each other, always in the light of antilogy, which advocates that, in the rhetorical act, every discourse opposes other acts, albeit virtually in an eternal right of reply (TRINGALI, 2014). Krenak therefore emphasizes invasion over discovery.

By cutting out a position in this cunning web of meanings, Ailton Krenak enunciates his thesis, wishing to prove that the current socio-environmental situation is explained by the construction of a distorted and unjust idea of humanity, coming from the invading Europeans. Considered superior, the colonialist ideology legitimized their supposed right to bring the lights of civilization to the inferior people, in a messianic process of colonization and, in its wake,

sustainable development and globalization, in order to lead non-whites to behave as they should in the past, present and future, as if there were an essentialist vision of behaviour, a correct standard of being, regardless of time, space and any other circumstances.

In the terms postulated by Ailton Krenak himself, the rhetorical question that drives his discourse is as follows: "How, over the last 2,000 or 3,000 years, have we constructed the idea of humanity? Is it not at the root of many of the wrong choices we have made, justifying the use of violence?" (2020, p. 10-11, *translated by the translator*)⁶. This supposed humanity, moreover, would reject the "capacity for invention, creation, existence and freedom" (2020, p. 13, *translated by the translator*)⁷ of the original peoples, engulfing them in servitude.

In a roundabout way, it is appropriate to state that Krenak's thesis shows that such a socio-environmental and existential situation is a consequence of the disastrous creation of an idea of humanity by Europeans and strengthened by capitalist organizations, which assume and shape a man who is increasingly alienated from the earth, homogeneous, an inveterate consumer, distanced from the sacred, dominated by capitalist corporations, in which native peoples have the status of "sub-humanity". It is therefore urgent to overcome this state by broadening the horizon, experiencing freedom, diversity and joy.

One of the speaker's most powerful tests is his ethics, the image he builds of himself throughout his speech. This is the discursive ethos. However, for the study of persuasion, it is also possible to take into account the pre-discursive ethos, which concerns the reputation that the speaker has before taking the floor.

Krenak's reputation is shrouded in almost universal respect, with nothing known to disgrace him in terms of disrespect for laws and customs, as well as the protection of forests, indigenous people and humanity. There is therefore a link between the arguments Krenak presents and his image. His ethical evidence is already evident at the beginning of the speech, when he makes a point of emphasizing his authority when he claims to have knowledge of what his travels have given him.

Ailton Krenak's audience was presumed and constructed by him in advance, and it was possible to adapt the general lines of the speech to him. The need for such adaptation is one of the core postulates of rhetorical persuasion. It shouldn't go unnoticed that Krenak gave his speech in the context of the "Amerindian exhibition: paths of indigenous cinema in Brazil", an environment unquestionably favorable to him and the ideas he disseminates. Thus, Krenak knew in advance that the mood of those who would hear his speech would be favorable to his thesis criticizing the conception of humanity dominated by capitalist ways of acting. A community was established between speaker and audience and a prior agreement between them (FIORIN, 2015), based on common values, such as respect for the environment, for the original peoples, a reaction to the reification of man by capitalism, criticism of exaggerated consumerism, belief in a planet Earth that urgently needs help. Once prior agreement has been established, argumentation can take place in a more effective and productive way.

⁶ “como é que, ao longo dos últimos 2 mil ou 3 mil anos, nós construímos a ideia de humanidade? Será que ela não está na base de muitas das escolhas erradas que fizemos, justificando o uso da violência?” (2020, p. 10-11).

⁷ “capacidade de invenção, criação, existência e liberdade” (2020, p. 13)

6.1 Argumentation

One of the initial arguments that Ailton Krenak uses to support his thesis is that there is no such thing as “The Truth”⁸, in other words, there is no universal essence of “truth” that applies to humanity regardless of existing spatial, temporal or cultural particularities (2020, p. 11, *translated by the translator*).

In doing so, Krenak challenges those who believe that there is a manifestation of a standard of “enlightened humanity”⁹, superior to everything else (PERELMAN; ALBRECHTYS-TYTECA, 1996, *translated by the translator*). On this basis, the speaker nullifies the possibility of the colonizers being superior to the colonized. This is a rational argument aimed at the audience, who, by then, should have known that Krenak was relying on anthropological assumptions about culture. So, if the colonizers are not superior, the idea that they contributed greatly to the destruction of the Earth becomes more believable.

The next argument focuses on the slumization to which some rural and forest dwellers were subjected. Through this reasoning, the speaker points out that capitalism is a process that degrades the weakest, marginalizing them and excluding them from humanity. If the previous argument was painted in logical colors, in this one, in addition to the rational content, the pathetic and affective aspect comes to the fore, since the speaker persuades the listeners by touching their hearts (check out the verbs “throw”, “pluck”, for example). A linguistic resource that contributed to the text's expressive potential was the use of the rhetorical question: “How can we justify that we are one humanity if more than 70% are alienated from the minimum exercise of being?” (2020, p. 14, *translated by the translator*)¹⁰. The value of this type of question is to lead the public to a single answer: “there is no justification”, producing the meaning effect of evidence, of what is not questioned, of what is no longer in the realm of opinion and, therefore, of what must be accepted. From opinion to fact. Note that the argument receives the persuasive contribution of the place of quantity, which highlights the revealing power of numbers, in this case, the percentage used in favor of the thesis.

By increasing the audience's emotional support for the most vulnerable section of society, the speaker makes them virtually distance themselves from the opposing party, i.e. people who share the capitalist, anthropocentric, non-sustainable, consumerist worldview, based on the exploitation of cheap labor. The opposing party is portrayed in a heavy light by the speaker, who pathetically approximates them to inhuman figures interested in the malaise of the vulnerable, who, in the end, will become “mad”, as the passage below attests:

How can we justify that we are one humanity if more than 70% are totally alienated from the minimum exercise of being? Modernization has thrown these people from the countryside and the forest to live in slums and on the outskirts, to become labour in urban centers. These people have been torn from their collectives, from their places of origin, and thrown into this blender called humanity. If people don't have deep links with their ancestral memory, with the references that support an identity, they're

⁸ “A verdade”

⁹ “humanidade esclarecida”

¹⁰ “Como justificar que somos uma humanidade se mais de 70% estão alienados do mínimo exercício de ser?” (2020, p. 14).

going to go mad in this crazy world we share. (2020, p. 14, translated by the translator)¹¹

The speaker offers a critical perspective on the relationship between humanity, nature and the Earth. He challenges the conception of humanity and invites reflection on the intrinsic connection with the natural world, questioning the myth of sustainability (2020, p. 14), which, invented, is used by corporations as a justification for deleterious actions. He suggests that such a myth obscures understanding of the true articulation between human beings and nature. The idea that humanity is separate from the rest of the natural world has alienated the Earth's inhabitants. The core of the speaker's rhetorical strategy recalls what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1996) called the dissociation of notions, a kind of rupture in relation to things that seem naturally connected, but are not. On this basis, it is clear that sustainability is not an absolute truth for the disinterested benefit of humanity, but a multifaceted notion which, when dissociated from some of its traditional assumptions, can reveal its mystifying and ideological facet. With this technique, Krenak problematizes the situation that they want to pass off as simple.

By asserting that "I don't understand where there is anything that isn't nature" (2020, p. 16-17, *translated by the translator*)¹², Krenak uses the argument of causal link, reminding the audience that everything is part of this interconnected system, the Earth. This holistic view contrasts with the Eurocentric perspective that has separated humanity from nature, resulting in exploitation and self-destruction. In terms of the environment, Krenak unites what many people separate. He adopts a socio-environmental view of the environment and not a naturalistic or biological one (CARVALHO, 2012). Up to this point, it should be noted that Krenak's arguments are rational and maintain unity. Some arguments are more frequent: what is natural is better than what is artificial; in some circumstances, man is the wolf of man; humanity as we know it is something constructed and does not aim for social justice in general; there are human beings in more vulnerable conditions than others; diversity is better than uniformity; ecocentrism/biocentrism is better than anthropocentrism, etc.

Striving to maintain factual contact with the audience, the speaker invites them to rethink the idea of humanity, considering the wisdom of traditional communities that live in harmony with the Earth. It's interesting to note the use of pronouns that act to create communion between speaker and audience. In the speaker's view, preserving these perspectives is crucial in order to avoid the end of the world that humanity is accelerating. Krenak's rhetoric challenges the audience to reconnect with nature and to recognize their responsibility as an integral part of this whole: "Why don't these narratives excite us? Why are

¹¹ Como justificar que somos uma humanidade se mais de 70% estão totalmente alienados do mínimo exercício de ser? A modernização jogou essa gente do campo e da floresta para viver em favelas e em periferias, para virar mão de obra em centros urbanos. Essas pessoas foram arrancadas de seus coletivos, de seus lugares de origem, e jogadas nesse liquidificador chamado humanidade. Se as pessoas não tiverem vínculos profundos com sua memória ancestral, com as referências que dão sustentação a uma identidade, vão ficar loucas neste mundo maluco que compartilhamos. (2020, p. 14)

¹² "não percebo onde tem alguma coisa que não seja natureza" (2020, p. 16-17)

they being forgotten and erased in favour of a globalizing, superficial narrative that wants to tell us the same story?” (2020, p. 19, *translated by the translator*)¹³

The speaker invites listeners to reflect on the relationship between humanity and nature, offering the example of the Hopi people in the United States as proof. The Hopi talk to nature, such as the stones, which they consider to be their sisters. He quotes a Hopi elder - who serves as a role model for those who want to see an integration of man and nature - who understood the rock as part of her family. The speaker amplifies this perspective through an oratorical induction, presenting new evidence that in various regions of the Andes mountains are considered living beings, forming emotional families. All of this is intensified by places of quantity (“lots of people”, 2020, p. 18, *our translated by the translator*)¹⁴ and personifications and animations of nature. This evidence, however, is possibly disregarded by the opposing party in favour of the globalizing and superficial thesis, which neglects the deep connection between human beings and the natural environment.

In these terms, the pathetic question that the speaker poses to the audience is central: “Why don't these narratives excite us? Why are they being forgotten and erased in favour of a globalizing, superficial narrative that wants to tell us the same story?” (2020, p. 19, *translated by the translator*)¹⁵. A question like this works to rekindle the auditorium's anger, intensifying their desire to confirm the position in favor of the speaker's thesis, spread it and fight the opposing party's proposition, which has proven to be harmful to the planet.

The speaker seeks to increase the audience's emotional involvement. This interaction between the speaker and the audience is essential for the development and maintenance of argumentative discourse. Every speech must be thought of in a co-authored way, with the profile of the audience providing the speaker with the guidelines for the rhetorical piece. Argumentation aims to gain the support of those to whom it is addressed, making it relative to the audience it seeks to influence. Krenak - both rationally and emotionally - leads the audience to reconsider the idea of humanity, recognizing that self-destruction and the excessive exploitation of nature are rooted in the modern construction of this notion, used ideologically by the opposing party, whose intention is to persuade that humanity is naturally like this and that it is up to us to passively accept it.

Following on from the speech, note the criticism of humanity's relationship with the environment and the advance of corporations. In order to denounce this state of affairs, Krenak dissociates a natural and an artificial aspect from the misleading idea of a single humanity. In effect, he denounces an ongoing ideological process, the aim of which is to make the domination of the big capitalist corporations and their projects, which have their seed in the process of colonization, more peaceful. The speaker's lexical choice should not go unnoticed, as he seeks to ensure that the speech translates the financial greed of the opponents of a more sustainable humanity (“smart corporations”, “take over”, “devour”, “super-interesting kits”, “invent”, “medicine”, “garbage”, “paraphernalia”):

¹³ “Por que essas narrativas não nos entusiasma? Porque elas vão sendo esquecidas e apagadas em favor de uma narrativa globalizante, superficial, que quer contar a mesma história para a gente?” (2020, p. 19)

¹⁴ (“monte de gente”, 2020, p. 18)

¹⁵ “Por que essas narrativas não nos entusiasma? Porque elas vão sendo esquecidas e apagadas em favor de uma narrativa globalizante, superficial, que quer contar a mesma história para a gente?” (2020, p. 19).

While humanity is moving away from its place, a bunch of smart corporations are taking over the Earth. We, humanity, are going to live in artificial environments produced by the same corporations that devour forests, mountains and rivers. They invent super interesting kits to keep us there, alienated from everything, and if possible taking lots of drugs. Because, after all, you have to do something with what's left of the waste they produce, and they're going to make medicine and a lot of paraphernalia to entertain us. (2020, p. 19-20, *translated by the translator*)¹⁶

It is clear that Krenak is committed to creating a polarized opposition between his group and the group of large corporations, to whom, by the way, he concedes nothing positive. The values of the corporations are villainy, threat, greed, deceit, capital, disrespect for ancestry and the environment; the other group is represented by the oppressed, the alienated who are bearing the consequences of irrational consumption and the supreme desire for profit. The polarized portrait of the actors in question has a clear rhetorical function in that it makes it easier for the audience to recognize who is who in this process of high tension.

In the continuation of his persuasive argument, the speaker puts it this way:

Lest you think I'm inventing yet another myth, that of the corporate monster, it has a name, an address and even a bank account. And what an account! They're the owners of the planet's money, and they're earning more every minute, spreading malls around the world. They spread almost the same model of progress that we are encouraged to understand as well-being all over the world. The great centers, the great metropolises of the world are a reproduction of each other. If you go to Tokyo, Berlin, New York, Lisbon or São Paulo, you'll see the same enthusiasm for building incredible towers, spirochete elevators, space vehicles... It's like you're on a trip with Flash Gordon (2020, p. 20-21, *translated by the translator*).¹⁷

Right away, the speaker uses a rebuttal, presenting an argument that counters any criticism that he is inventing a "myth". This refutation gives him the opportunity, through an ethical argument, to reinforce his positive image as someone who only tells the truth. Linguistically, this ethical strategy is strengthened by the enumeration of the nouns "names", "address" and "bank account". The speaker does not hesitate to characterize these corporations as "corporate monsters" (2020, p. 20, *translated by the translator*)¹⁸, of obvious pathetic force. The disgust that the speaker feels for these institutions he wants the audience to feel. The elaboration of this evil environment creates in the audience a feeling of presence for the speaker's thesis. Presence is a key element in argumentation, as it acts on the consciousness of the audience (PERELAMN; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, 1996), which becomes more alive and attentive. The comparison with science fiction, for example with "Flash Gordon", emphasizes the surreal

¹⁶ Enquanto a humanidade está se distanciando do seu lugar, um monte de corporações espertalhonas vai tomando conta da Terra. Nós, a humanidade, vamos viver em ambientes artificiais produzidos pelas mesmas corporações que devoram florestas, montanhas e rios. Eles inventam kits superinteressantes para nos manter nesse local, alienados de tudo, e se possível tomando muito remédio. Porque, afinal, é preciso fazer alguma coisa com o que sobra do lixo que produzem, e eles vão fazer remédio e um monte de parafernalias para nos entreter. (2020, p. 19-20)

¹⁷ Para que não fiquem pensando que estou inventando mais um mito, o do monstro corporativo, ele tem nome, endereço e até conta bancária. E que conta! São os donos da grana do planeta, e ganham mais a cada minuto, espalhando shoppings pelo mundo. Espalham quase que o mesmo modelo de progresso que somos incentivados a entender como bem-estar no mundo todo. Os grandes centros, as grandes metrópoles do mundo são uma reprodução uns dos outros. Se você for para Tóquio, Berlim, Nova York, Lisboa ou São Paulo, verá o mesmo entusiasmo em fazer torres incríveis, elevadores espiroquetas, veículos espaciais... Parece que você está numa viagem com o Flash Gordon. (2020, p. 20-21)

¹⁸ substantivos “nomes”, “endereço” e “conta bancária”. O orador não hesita em caracterizar essas corporações como “monstros corporativos” (2020, p. 20)

nature of this reality. The persuasive value of the comparison consists in the fact that the compared terms come to share the same elements. Thus, a reality comparable to a comic book language is not exactly a compliment.

However, the speaker highlights the existence of telluric nuclei resistant to this neoliberal model, which remain "attached" to the land, even though they are on the margins of globalized society. The caíças, indigenous people, quilombolas and aborigines represent this "sub-humanity", which still values its connection with the planet. This characterization of sub-humanity is revealed by the language of spatial location, which is never central: "they are those who have been half-forgotten by the **edges** of the planet, on the **banks** of the rivers, on the **edges** of the oceans" (2020, p. 21, authors' emphasis, *translated by the translator*)¹⁹. These groups resist alienation, preserving a harmonious relationship with nature. He warns those who listen by arguing that it is urgent to rethink the development model, prioritizing environmental preservation and social justice. It is up to humanity to reconnect with the earth and value cultural diversity in order to postpone the inevitable end of the world it is building.

The speaker criticizes the view that human beings can detach themselves from the Earth, living in a civilizational abstraction. Krenak argues that this idea is absurd, since it suppresses diversity, denies the plurality of life forms and offers a uniform menu, standardized costumes and, if possible, a single language for everyone. Krenak adds: "The idea of us humans detaching ourselves from the earth, living in a civilizing abstraction, is absurd. It suppresses diversity, denies the plurality of ways of life, existence and habits. It offers the same menu, the same costume and, if possible, the same language to everyone" (2020, p. 22-23, translated by the translator)²⁰. The values that underpin Krenak's reasoning assume that diversity and plurality are presuppositions without which man does not exist. In a hierarchy of values, they are superior to uniformity, which leads human beings to absurdity.

The speaker points out that in 2019, UNESCO declared the international year of indigenous languages; however, many of these languages, belonging to small groups on the margins of humanity, continue to be deleted. The focus is on languages that are of interest to corporations in order to manage the notion of sustainable development.

For UNESCO, 2019 is the international year of indigenous languages. We all know that every year or every semester one of these mother tongues, one of these original languages of small groups on the periphery of humanity, is deleted. There are a few left, preferably those that interest corporations in managing the whole thing, sustainable development (2020, p. 23, *translated by the translator*).²¹

By using the phrase "We all know", the speaker rhetorically establishes a communion with the audience, in which the two are united in the belief that the future of a large proportion of indigenous languages is disappearance, as has been the case since the colonization process in the 16th century. The use of "delete" is ironic because it signals a modernity that, instead of understanding how cultural systems work, ignores them. All that remains of the original

¹⁹ “são aqueles que ficaram meio esquecidos pelas **bordas** do planeta, nas **margens** dos rios, nas **beiras** dos oceanos” (2020, p. 21, grifo dos autores).

²⁰ “A ideia de nós, os humanos, nos descolarmos da terra, vivendo numa abstração civilizatória, é absurda. Ela suprime a diversidade, nega a pluralidade das formas de vida, de existência e de hábitos. Oferece o mesmo cardápio, o mesmo figurino e, se possível, a mesma língua para todo mundo” (2020, p. 22-23).

²¹ Para a Unesco, 2019 é o ano internacional das línguas indígenas. Todos nós sabemos que a cada ano ou a cada semestre uma dessas línguas maternas, um desses idiomas originais de pequenos grupos que estão na periferia da humanidade, é deletada. Sobram algumas, de preferência aquelas que interessam às corporações para administrar a coisa toda, o desenvolvimento sustentável. (2020, p. 23)

peripheral peoples is the result of artificial charity from the center, which is forging a concept of sustainable development for the English to see.

Furthermore, Krenak questions what has happened to the rivers, forests and landscapes: "What has become of our rivers, our forests, our landscapes?" (2020, p. 23, *translated by the translator*)²². The speaker manages to establish a pathetic link with the audience (possessive "our"), creating a feeling of absence that unites them and leads them to fight for the same thesis. There is also an argument from authority, namely the mention of the Portuguese intellectual Boaventura de Souza Santos. The speaker, in a pragmatic argument, observes that humanity is so disturbed by regional disarray and the lack of political perspective that it can't see what really matters to people, collectives and communities in their ecologies. Krenak proposes that the "ecology of knowledge" (2020, p. 24, *translated by the translator*)²³ should integrate everyday human experience and inspire choices about where we want to live as a community.

The idea of a homogeneous humanity, in which consumption has replaced citizenship, is criticized. The speaker quotes the former president of Uruguay, José Mujica (2020, p. 24), an authoritative argument with which to condemn the transformation of people into consumers, not citizens. Children are taught to be customers, and the consumer is idolized to the point of imbecilization. The speaker uses language rich in sensory images to describe the intimate connection between people and nature, rhetorically indicating that the interaction is plausible and desirable. Words like "spirit of the forest", "living with the forest" and "being in the forest" evoke a sense of belonging. Furthermore, the mention of the speaker's knowledge of Yanomami territory acts as an ethical proof of credibility and authority.

The speaker goes on to criticize, through a mixture of *logos* and *pathos*, the modernization that has alienated people from their roots and thrown them into urban centers, disconnecting them from their ancestral memories. The denunciation of perverse corporations - which reflect the evils of post-colonialism, capitalism and globalization, and which threaten Yanomami territory through mining - highlights the urgency of preserving these cosmovisions, which the current ideological concept of humanity and sustainability is unable to do. In this sense, the term "zombie" is rhetorically expressive and precise beyond doubt.

The kind of zombie humanity we are being called upon to integrate cannot tolerate so much pleasure, so much enjoyment of life. So they preach the end of the world as a way of making us give up on our own dreams. And my provocation about postponing the end of the world is precisely that we can always tell one more story. If we can do that, we are postponing the end (2020, p. 26-27, *translated by the translator*).²⁴

"Zombie humanity" suggests a blunted society, insensitive to joy, which doesn't value the pleasure of being alive. Intolerance towards those who still have these experiences is pointed out as a symptom of this context. If, as Oswald de Andrade (1890-1954) says, joy is the

²² "O que é feito de nossos rios, nossas florestas, nossas paisagens?" (2020, p. 23).

²³ "ecologia dos saberes" (2020, p. 24)

²⁴ O tipo de humanidade zumbi que estamos sendo convocados a integrar não tolera tanto prazer, tanta fruição de vida. Então, pregam o fim do mundo como uma possibilidade de fazer a gente desistir dos nossos próprios sonhos. E a minha provocação sobre adiar o fim do mundo é exatamente sempre poder contar mais uma história. Se pudermos fazer isso, estaremos adiando o fim. (2020, p. 26-27)

litmus test, then a lack of joy is a serious counter-proof. The speaker's central provocation is the possibility of postponing the end of the world through storytelling.

The speaker experiences this moment in the speech as fundamental for testing the channel with the audience, capturing their attention and benevolence, addressing them explicitly in a tone of symmetrical conversation, which seeks the precious information of the audience's feedback and values it for the distinction of the desire for conversation.

It's important to experience our own movement through the world, not as a metaphor, but as friction, to be able to count on each other. To be able to have a meeting like this, here in Portugal, and to have such an essential audience as yourselves is a gift to me. You can be sure that this gives me the greatest gas to stretch the beginning of the end of the world a little further. And I encourage you to think about the possibility of doing the same exercise. It's a kind of tai chi chuan. When you feel that the sky is getting too low, just push it up and breathe (2020, p. 27-28, *translated by the translator*).²⁵

In each provocation, the speaker urges the audience to rethink their relationship with the planet, to value different forms of existence and to recognize the importance of preserving cultures that are connected to nature. Postponing the end of the world, literally and symbolically, is an act of resistance and hope, fueled by the stories that continue to be told: "And my provocation about postponing the end of the world is precisely that we can always tell one more story. If we can do that, we are postponing the end" (2020, p. 27, *translated by the translator*).²⁶

The speaker, with the authority of an original people, asks the audience to reflect on how similar communities faced colonization, an institution that wanted to exterminate the peoples of Brazil or place them in a second-class humanity. The speaker establishes an opposition between colonizers and colonized and asks the audience to take a stand on it. Within this framework, he highlights the "maneuvers", "creativity" and "poetry" that inspired his resistance. Resisting as barbarians, which was the name given to them by civilization, because the colonizers had the power to give names to the unknown and thus dominate them. However, the speaker insists on calling on his audience - in a process of redundancy - to rethink their relationship with nature, to recognize the wisdom of traditional communities and to seek alternatives to the self-destructive logic of modern civilization. The speaker uses anaphora to reiterate the word "take" to emphasize the imposition of civilization on traditional peoples. This repetition creates an effect of insistence, highlighting the continuous violence and oppression that these peoples have faced: "And the guys: 'No, take this stolen thing. Take the Bible, take the cross, take the college, take the university, take the road, take the railroad, take the mining

²⁵ É importante viver a experiência da nossa própria circulação pelo mundo, não como uma metáfora, mas como fricção, poder contar uns com os outros. Poder ter um encontro como este, aqui em Portugal, e ter uma audiência tão essencial como vocês é um presente para mim. Vocês podem ter certeza de que isso me dá o maior gás para esticar um pouco mais o início do fim do mundo que se me apresenta. E os provoco a pensar na possibilidade de fazer o mesmo exercício. É uma espécie de tai chi chuan. Quando você sentir que o céu está ficando muito baixo, é só empurrá-lo e respirar. (2020, p. 27-28)

²⁶ “E a minha provocação sobre adiar o fim do mundo é exatamente sempre poder contar mais uma história. Se pudermos fazer isso, estaremos adiando o fim” (2020, p. 27).

company, take the beating. To which the people replied: 'What is this? What a weird program! There isn't another one?' (2020, p. 29-30, *translated by the translator*)²⁷

In addition, irony permeates the text. The expression "There's no other, is there?" is used sarcastically, questioning the lack of alternatives offered by the civilization program. The speaker suggests that civilization has imposed a single vision of progress, ignoring other possibilities. This is called ideology. The metaphor of "space not as a confined place, but as the cosmos where we can plummet in colorful parachutes" (2020, p. 30, *translated by the translator*)²⁸ proves important. It represents the need to look beyond the limitations imposed by civilization and explore new perspectives. The "colourful parachutes" symbolize creativity, resistance and hope in the face of the imminent fall.

There is also the use of the rhetorical question: "Why does the sensation of falling make us uncomfortable?" (2020, p. 30, *translated by the translator*)²⁹, which aims to make the audience reflect on their own conditions. Falling is inevitable, but you can choose how to face it: with fear or with courage. Krenak proposes that listeners rethink their relationship with nature, question the paradigms of civilization and look for alternatives to postpone the end of the world. The construction of "colourful parachutes" symbolizes hope for a different future, based on harmony between humanity and nature and, above all, on joy. Ailton Krenak proposes a connection with the plurality of narratives present in different peoples, recalling the hundreds of stories sung and shared by the communities. This approach challenges viewers to recognize that they are not the only interesting beings in the world, but part of an interconnected whole.

There are hundreds of narratives of people who are alive, tell stories, sing, travel, talk and teach us more than we have learned in this humanity. We are not the only interesting people in the world, we are part of the whole. This perhaps takes away some of the vanity of this humanity that we think we are, as well as reducing the lack of reverence we have all the time for the other companies that make this cosmic journey with us. (2020, p. 30-31, *translated by the translator*)³⁰

The speaker also criticizes humanity's vanity. By mentioning the lack of reverence for other companies on this cosmic journey, he suggests that arrogance prevents us from seeing the richness and diversity of existing perspectives. The allusion to the situation in Brazil in 2018, when asked how indigenous people would face the challenges, reveals the resilience of these peoples. Krenak emphasizes, hitting the rhetorical key of resistance, that we are not all the same and that there are still hundreds of ethnic groups with different languages and dialects:

²⁷ “E os caras: ‘Não, toma essa roubada. Toma a Bíblia, toma a cruz, toma o colégio, toma a universidade, toma a estrada, toma a ferrovia, toma a mineradora, toma a porrada’. Ao que os povos responderam: ‘O que é isso? Que programa esquisito! Não tem outro, não?’”. (2020, p. 29-30)

²⁸ “espaço não como um lugar confinado, mas como o cosmos onde a gente pode despencar em paraquedas coloridos” (2020, p. 30)

²⁹ “Por que nos causa desconforto a sensação de estar caindo?” (2020, p. 30),

³⁰ Há centenas de narrativas de povos que estão vivos, contam histórias, cantam, viajam, conversam e nos ensinam mais do que aprendemos nessa humanidade. Nós não somos as únicas pessoas interessantes no mundo, somos parte do todo. Isso talvez tire um pouco da vaidade dessa humanidade que nós pensamos ser, além de diminuir a falta de reverência que temos o tempo todo com as outras companhias que fazem essa viagem cósmica com a gente. (2020, p. 30-31)

In 2018, when we were about to be assaulted by a new situation in Brazil, I was asked: "What are the Indians going to do in the face of all this?". I said: "The Indians have been resisting for five hundred years, I'm worried about the whites, how they're going to get out of this". We resisted by expanding our subjectivity, by not accepting this idea that we are all the same. There are still approximately 250 ethnic groups that want to be different from each other in Brazil, who speak more than 150 languages and dialects (2020, p. 31, translated by the translator).³¹

The speaker mentions, by way of an authoritative argument, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, who defends Amazonian perspectivism. This ecocentric stance points out that humans are not the only ones to hold a view on existence. Other beings also have perspectives, and it is fundamental to recognize them. Krenak argues for listeners to question the idea of humanity, persuading them to value the narratives of traditional peoples and to recognize that existence goes beyond a conventionally limited view. We are part of a complex, and reverence for diversity is essential to postpone the end of the world. This is the rhetoric of diversity that runs throughout Krenak's text. The proposal to "suspend the sky" is a rhetorical metaphor, representing the expansion of the existential horizon, not just the prospective one. This suspension invites us to enrich our subjectivities, to look beyond the obvious, to transcend limits and, finally, to pay due tribute to joy.

Singing, dancing and living the magical experience of suspending the sky is common in many traditions. To suspend the sky is to broaden our horizon; not a prospective horizon, but an existential one. It means enriching our subjectivities, which is the material that this time we live in wants to consume. If there is a desire to consume nature, there is also a desire to consume subjectivities - our subjectivities. So let's live them with the freedom we are capable of inventing, not put it on the market. Since nature is being assaulted in such an indefensible way, let's at least be able to maintain our subjectivities, our visions, our poetics of existence. We are definitely not the same, and it's wonderful to know that each of us here is different from the other, like constellations. The fact that we can share this space, that we're traveling together, doesn't mean that we're the same; it means that we're able to attract each other through our differences, which should guide our life script. To have diversity, not a humanity with the same protocol. Because up until now this has just been a way of homogenizing and taking away our joy of being alive (2020, p. 32-33, translated by the translator).³²

³¹ Em 2018, quando estávamos na iminência de ser assaltados por uma situação nova no Brasil, me perguntaram: “Como os índios vão fazer diante disso tudo?”. Eu falei: “Tem quinhentos anos que os índios estão resistindo, eu estou preocupado é com os brancos, como que vão fazer para escapar dessa”. A gente resistiu expandindo a nossa subjetividade, não aceitando essa ideia de que nós somos todos iguais. Ainda existem aproximadamente 250 etnias que querem ser diferentes umas das outras no Brasil, que falam mais de 150 línguas e dialetos. (2020, p. 31)

³² Cantar, dançar e viver a experiência mágica de suspender o céu é comum em muitas tradições. Suspender o céu é ampliar o nosso horizonte; não o horizonte prospectivo, mas um existencial. É enriquecer as nossas subjetividades, que é a matéria que este tempo que nós vivemos quer consumir. Se existe uma ânsia por consumir a natureza, existe também uma por consumir subjetividades — as nossas subjetividades. Então vamos vivê-las com a liberdade que formos capazes de inventar, não botar ela no mercado. Já que a natureza está sendo assaltada de uma maneira tão indefensável, vamos, pelo menos, ser capazes de manter nossas subjetividades, nossas visões, nossas poéticas sobre a existência. Definitivamente não somos iguais, e é maravilhoso saber que cada um de nós que está aqui é diferente do outro, como constelações. O fato de podermos compartilhar esse espaço, de estarmos juntos viajando não significa que somos iguais; significa exatamente que somos capazes de atrair uns aos outros pelas nossas diferenças, que deveriam guiar o nosso roteiro de vida. Ter diversidade, não isso de uma humanidade com o mesmo protocolo. Porque isso até agora foi só uma maneira de homogeneizar e tirar nossa alegria de estar vivos. (2020, p. 32-33)

The speaker suggests - almost allegorically - that just as nature is being consumed, we should also value subjectivity, the non-standardized and non-colonized way of experiencing the world. Nature is being "assaulted", and preserving visions and poetics proves to be a form of serious and playful resistance at the same time, without contradicting itself. It's about taking a stand for values and how some of them are more important than others. We mustn't forget that argumentation takes place in its entirety on the basis of values.

The comparison between human beings and constellations is striking. Each of us is unique, like stars in a vast sky. Space is shared, but differences attract and should guide people along the way. In this context, the speaker rejects the idea of a homogeneous humanity with identical protocols. Such uniformity takes the joy out of life.

Therefore, the speaker Ailton Krenak, based on his authority on the subject, invites us, whether rationally or affectively, to suspend the sky, to value our subjectivities and to embrace diversity and ancestry as a necessary task of resistance against the standardization of views, against the mystifications of capitalism, against improbable environmental theories, against the destruction of nature and against the ever-renewed "colonization" that threatens our joy of being alive and hopeful.

7. CONCLUSION

In the lecture given in Lisbon and later published in *the Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo* (2020), the speaker Ailton Krenak meditates persuasively on the power relations between man and the environment that have put humanity at risk of collapse. Through rhetorical resources and ethical, logical and pathetic arguments (which combine the speaker's authority, rationality and ability to emotionally impact the audience), Krenak tries to convince the audience of the deleterious impacts of human actions guided by the view that we are separate from nature. He questions the idea of humanity constructed and distorted by Eurocentric modernity, which legitimizes self-destruction and the excessive exploitation of natural resources.

The indigenous leader stresses the urgency of rethinking the capitalist and pragmatic worldview of today, recognizing the importance of traditional communities. For him, these peoples, seen as subhuman, offer an alternative to the logic of self-destruction. This is because their narratives and perspectives, rooted in ancestry and connection with nature, are fundamental to preserving cultural diversity and the survival of the planet. Krenak questions - and wants the audience to do the same, that is, with rationality and emotion - the concept of humanity that has been erected over the centuries. The speaker points out that the idea of domination and unsustainable exploitation of nature has jeopardized not only the lives of traditional peoples, but also the future of humanity. In this way, he rhetorically inspires the reader and listener to support the thesis of postponing the end of the world, recognizing our interdependence with the Earth and exploring a more harmonious and conscious way of life.

At this point, it should be pointed out that Krenak has an undeniable chance of having his thesis accepted by the audience, which would also reject the thesis of the opposing party,

even if it wasn't presented concretely by an opponent-speaker. In addition to the fact that the proposition is unequivocally credible at a time when environmental thinking is growing in relevance and urgency, the audience who heard it or the readers who read it did so voluntarily, knowing beforehand that they were in the "presence" of one of the most renowned and celebrated thinkers on the environment and sustainability, and whose words should be given greater attention.

In addition, Krenak used accessible, clear and correct language that made references to current contexts, not to mention the "icebreakers" through the use of informal expressions, which created, within limits, a communion of camaraderie between speaker and audience. His arguments were fundamentally rational, but combined, in excellent measure, with his authority as an indigenous person talking about the environment (ethos) and with an inflection of concern that runs through the text and which concerned the environmental risk and the failure of humanity (pathos).

Since it is a discourse about the mistakes of the past, which are condemned, it can be classified in the judicial rhetorical genre, which defends and accuses, based on the just and the unjust. In other words, for Krenak, it is unjust to have treated the environment and humanity as they have been, and this destructive aspect needs to be condemned. Despite this, there is room for the demonstrative genre: as Krenak has pointed out that the problems persist in the present, he tries to censure them in current terms, educationally seeking to make the audience appreciate what they have heard and read, spreading ecocentric values. Finally, we can add another rhetorical genre to the discourse: the deliberative genre. This is a genre whose tense is the future. Deliberations are made about what will happen. Insofar as Krenak postulates a revitalizing alternative for humanity, his rhetoric points to the future, based on dialogue between the useful and the harmful and what might prevail.

Given the persuasive force that the combination of these three rhetorical genres gives to Krenak's discourse, it is to be hoped that his text can, to some extent, become a valid reference for efforts to combat the lack of true humanity and the excess of oppressions reminiscent of colonialism.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCE

BARRY, Peter. Ecocriticism. In **Beginning theory: an introduction to literary and cultural theory**. 3.ed. Manchester, 2009.

BONNICI, Thomas Ecocrítica e pós-colonialismo: o fitar de Bigg-Wither na Floresta Atlântica do Paraná. **INTERSEMIÓSE**, Jun/Dez 2012, p.171-p.184,

CARVALHO, Isabel Cristina de Moura, **Educação ambiental: a formação do sujeito ecológico**. 6.ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

COUTO, Hildo H. do. **Ecolinguística: estudo das relações entre língua e meio ambiente**. Brasília: Thesaurus, 2007.

FALCONI, Jéssica. Ecocrítica. In: GALLO, F. (org.). **Breve dicionário das literaturas africanas**. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2022. p.57-65.

FIORIN, José Luiz. **Argumentação**. São Paulo: contexto, 2015.

GARRAD, Greg. **Ecocrítica**. Brasília: UNB, 2006.

GLOTFELTY, Cheryll. Introduction. In: GLOTFELTY, Cheryll; FROM, Harold. **The ecocriticism reader: landmarks in literary ecology**. Athens and London: The university of Georgia, 2016. p.xvxxxvii.

JUNQUEIRA, C.F; HENRIQUEZ, J. M. M.; VIGAL, J.B. (orgs). **Ecocríticas: literature y medio ambiente**. Madrid: Iberoamericana. 2010.

KRENAK, Ailton. Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo. In: KRENAK, Ailton. **Ideias para adiar o fim do mundo**. 2 ed. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2020. p.7-33.

Mendes, Maria. do Carmo. No princípio era a Natureza: percursos da Ecocrítica. *Anthropocenica*. **Revista de estudos do antropoceno e ecocrítica**, 1. <https://doi.org/10.21814/anthropocenica.3100>, 2020.

PERELMAN, Chaim; OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, Lucie. **Tratado da argumentação** - a nova retórica. Trad. Maria E.G.G. Pereira. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1996

REBOUL, Olivier. **Introdução à retórica**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

TRINGALI, Dante. **A retórica antiga e as outras retóricas**: a retórica como crítica literária. São Paulo: Musa, 2014.