# Going Viral: Public Attention and Environmental Action in the Amazon*

Rafael Araujo† Francisco Costa‡ Teevrat Garg §

April 25, 2024

**Abstract**

International agreements to reduce anthropogenic environmental disasters rely on public pressure to drive local action. We study whether focused media and increased public outcry can drive local environmental action, reducing environmental damage. Although an annual affair, forest fires in the Brazilian Amazon went viral in August 2019, receiving unprecedented public scrutiny. Comparing active fires in Brazil versus those in Peru and Bolivia in a difference-in-differences design, we find that increased public attention reduced fires by 22% avoiding 24.8 million tons of $CO_2$ in emissions. Our results highlight the power of public attention to compel local action on pressing environmental issues.

*JEL*: Q51, Q54, L82, F55

*Keywords*: Forest Fires, Media Attention, Carbon Emission, Amazon, Climate Change.

*We thank Chris Barrett, Prashant Bharadwaj, Jennifer Burney, Jonathan Colmer, Yuta Masuda, and Jeremy Tobacman for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this paper. We also thank Andrew Plantinga for excellent editorial advice and two anonymous referees. Financial support is gratefully acknowledged by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) and Conselho Nacional de Pesquisas - Brasil (CNPQ).

†São Paulo School of Economics Getulio Vargas Foundation FGV EESP. E-mail: rafael.araujo@fgv.br.

‡Department of Economics, University of Delaware; and FGV EPGE. E-mail: fcosta@udel.edu.

§School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California - San Diego. E-mail: teevrat@ucsd.edu.

# 1 Introduction

Environmental disasters can occasionally capture public attention, especially if these are of global importance and national governments are unable or unwilling to curtail damages. While Public awareness and media coverage play vital roles in holding governments accountable to society (Besley and Burgess, 2002; Besley and Prat, 2006; Snyder Jr and Strömberg, 2010), it remains unclear whether efforts to raise public awareness about pressing environmental challenges have any local abatement effects. The relevance of international environmental agreements is contingent at least partially on national and international attention compelling local conservation.

Empirically investigating the effects of public attention on conservation is challenging. Public attention often builds either around the media coverage of idiosyncratic one-off events (e.g., a nuclear power plant disaster) or slowly and continuously around repeated phenomena (e.g., air or water pollution). In both cases, it is rare to have a suitable comparison group to estimate the counterfactual conservation had the issue remained out of the public eye. When environmental events are unique, unobservables are likely underlying them. When events are repeated phenomena, the issue of selection in media coverage and global dissemination of information makes it unlikely to have such a comparison group.

In this paper, we study an episode of unprecedented public attention on forest fires in the Brazilian Amazon, one of the world's most biodiverse and carbon-rich tropical forests. Fires in tropical forests are a pressing concern globally, resulting in particulate emissions that harm human health (Jayachandran, 2009; Sheldon and Sankaran, 2017; Tan-Soo and Pattanayak, 2019; Barlow et al., 2020; Rocha and Sant'Anna, 2022) and contribute to global warming (Cochrane, 2003; Aragão et al., 2018; Araujo et al., 2020; Balboni et al., 2021a).

Seasonal forest fires occur every year in the Brazilian, Bolivian, and Peruvian Amazon biome burning thousands of square kilometers of land without receiving much media attention. In the second half of August 2019, however, forest fires *in Brazil* "went viral" causing a surge in domestic and international attention to the issue. The sudden rise of public attention had three features that make it an ideal episode to evaluate the effect of public attention on local conservation. First, the phenomenon going viral – seasonal forest fires – is an annual affair allowing us to study them over time. Second, while the fires were not unusual, the surge in media coverage and public attention was astronomically high. We show that searches for fires in the Brazilian Amazon increased many-fold during the second half of August 2019 as did stories in leading newspapers around the world. Finally, although these seasonal fires affected the Brazilian, Peruvian, and Bolivian Amazon similarly to previous years, the attention was uniquely focused on the Brazilian Amazon. Indeed, we show that

the searches and articles were focused on the Brazilian Amazon or the Brazilian President.

We first show that trends in bi-weekly fires per square kilometer in Brazil, Peru, and Bolivia largely followed each other in the previous years and the first half of 2019. This suggests that the historical fire seasonality in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon is similar to the Brazilian one. Second, we show that through much of this "pre-treatment period", public attention on fires in the Brazilian, Peruvian, and Bolivian Amazon were largely similar and two orders of magnitude smaller than the attention peak on the Brazilian Amazon in the second half of August 2019. We then estimate the effect of public attention on fires in Brazil by employing a difference-in-differences strategy comparing fires in Brazil against fires in Peru and Bolivia before and after the spike in attention.[1]

We estimate that the attention surge in 2019 reduced subsequent forest fires in the Brazilian Amazon by 22% in that year. A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests the fires averted account for 3.8% of the reductions in emissions needed for Brazil to meet its commitments to the Paris Agreement. Our results are robust to using fire count or fire intensity measures, a Poisson model, a synthetic control method, and a triple-differences strategy where we further exploit seasonal differences in fires within each country.

We discuss potential mechanisms underlying our results. A close examination of the timeline of events suggests that increased attention (peak on August 18, 2019) was followed by several speeches in the Brazilian Congress on fires beginning on August 21, 2019. The four speeches on August 21, 2019 containing references to fires in the Amazon were the first of their kind since 2008. The Brazilian Congress continued to devote unprecedented attention to the matter following the spike in public attention. In response to the accumulated pressure, the Brazilian government dispatched fire brigades to affected areas. We show that this action, although effective, cannot fully account for the reduction in fires. Our results suggest that other actions, including those from civil society, also contributed to controlling the fires in Brazil. We show that public awareness was particularly effective in reducing fires in forested areas, more so than in reducing field burning on agricultural land. We also show that these effects were not driven by the potential displacement of fire activity across national borders. We discuss how political and economic factors may have mediated these effects. Although the surge in attention was a global phenomenon, domestic and international media likely catalyzed each other, preventing us from disentangling their individual effects.

Our paper relates to a growing literature on the economic effects of media and public awareness. Prior work has shown that media coverage influences governments' response to

[1]We use Bolivia and Peru over other neighboring countries (e.g., Venezuela, Colombia, Suriname, Guyana, and French Guiana) because the fire seasonality in other neighbors is substantially different than those in Brazil, Bolivia, and Peru (Marcus and Sant'Anna, 2021).

disasters (Strömberg, 2007; Eisensee and Strömberg, 2007; Bossavie et al., 2023; Besley et al., 2023) and citizens' opinions about policy issues (DellaVigna and Kaplan, 2007; Gerber et al., 2009; Enikolopov et al., 2011; Chiang and Knight, 2011; Shapiro, 2016; Buntaine et al., 2021), affecting even individual environmental behavior. For example, Jacobsen (2011) shows that the documentary *An Inconvenient Truth* influenced people to buy carbon offsets. Beattie (2021) shows that the media's climate change coverage makes people choose more environmentally friendly driving options. Firms also tend to be responsive to public attention. For example, Campa (2018) shows that consumer goods producers reduce emissions when they are covered by local newspapers. Buntaine et al. (2022) shows that social media visibility increases regulatory efforts toward polluting firms in China. Our findings show that mass media coverage and public awareness can pressure civil society and governments – even those hostile to conservation – to act on large and pressing environmental emergencies.

The impact of viral attention on fires in the Amazon, however, is short-lived. Our analysis reveals that media coverage on the issue lasted no more than two weeks, with political and public attention waning after a couple of months. Consequently, the reduction in forest fires is also transient. However, we underscore that the brevity of this effect does not diminish its significance. Despite its ephemeral nature, the concentrated attention resulted in a substantial 22% decrease in fires. Apart from its direct impact on emissions, these avoided fires likely contributed positively to public health (Rocha and Sant'Anna, 2022). Moreover, fewer fires likely prevented indirect forest degradation (Araujo et al., 2023), which emphasizes a broader ecological implication of the short-lived decrease in fires.

These findings contribute to the literature on salience regarding environmental issues. Egan and Mullin (2012) and Zaval et al. (2014) demonstrate that local short-term weather variations affect people's beliefs in global warming, while Hazlett and Mildenberger (2020) finds that exposure to wildfires in California increases support for climate measures. Pianta and Sisco (2020) shows how media coverage of climate change is affected by contemporaneous weather anomalies. Additionally, Li et al. (2014) suggests that consumers respond more strongly to salient changes in fuel taxes. There is also evidence that the salience of disasters increases pro-social behavior (Calo-Blanco et al., 2017; Cassar et al., 2017; Méon and Verwimp, 2022) and that media coverage matters and has a short attention span (Olsen et al., 2003; Brown and Minty, 2008). For example, Eisensee and Strömberg (2007) shows that US relief to natural disasters is smaller when disasters happen at the same time as large sports events, such as the Olympics, which crowded out coverage and peoples' attention span. Our paper provides evidence, focusing on a middle-income, that a temporary increase in the visibility of an environmental issue can spur national governments into action, albeit only temporarily. This short-lived response aligns with the ephemeral nature of the pub-

lic's reaction to disasters (Eisensee and Strömberg, 2007). Unlike personal experiences with natural disasters or weather shocks, which may permanently influence individual preferences toward environmental policy (e.g. Egan and Mullin, 2012; Zaval et al., 2014), our results suggest that a surge in public attention from afar is unlikely to result in lasting changes or sustained advocacy for policy reforms (e.g. Wibbenmeyer et al., 2019; Anderson et al., 2023).

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss data on public attention and fires. In Section 3 we provide background on our natural experiment and describe our empirical setting and research design and in Section 4 we present our results. In Section 5 we offer concluding remarks.

# 2 Data

In this section, we describe the various data sources used in our analysis. The two main variables we examine are changes in public attention (measured by the number of Google searches and newspaper articles) and satellite-based measures of active fires.

**Public attention.** We measure global attention to specific issues using data on Google searches (see, e.g., Preis et al., 2013; Sheshadri and Singh, 2019).[2] We consider searches in the whole world in English, Portuguese, and Spanish. This data captures the relative size of searches for specific terms normalized by the peak of searches in the period.[3] As Google does not share the actual number of searches, we complement these measures with trends in newspaper articles mentioning forest fires in Brazil appearing in leading English daily newspapers: The New York Times and The Guardian.[4] Figure A1 also shows a marked increase in the number of articles occurring just before the spike in related Google searches. At the Guardian, the number of articles mentioning Amazon fires increased from 0 by month to 36 in August 2019. At the New York Times, it jumps from 4 to 51.

**Active fires.** We obtain remote sensing data on the count of pixel-days of active fires at 1km resolution from Fire Information for Resource Management System (FIRMS).[5] Using the standard MODIS Fire and Thermal Anomalies product, this data provides global coverage every 1-2 days, which we aggregate to a panel of pixel-weekly data between June and November for 2016 to 2019. Weeks are set starting on the first Monday of June of each year. Each pixel-week is flagged with a fire occurrence if it contains an active fire in that

[2]Data available at: trends.google.com/trends.

[3]That is, a search index equal to 100 denotes the maximum number of searches on a given subject between 2016 and 2020.

[4]We use data on these two newspapers because they have an open and searchable database that goes back to 2016.

[5]Available at www.earthdata.nasa.gov/firms. Accessed through Gorelick et al. (2017).

week. Under good conditions, FIRMS can identify fires as small as 100 $m^2$. In our sample period, 9% of pixels had a fire. In the whole period of 2016-2019, 19% of pixels had a fire. On average, in 2019, a pixel with fire had 1.9 fires (standard deviation of 1.7). Appendix Figure A6 shows the spatial configuration of fires throughout the Amazon.

For robustness checks, we also work with a measure of fire intensity (brightness per $km^2$) from FIRMS and burned area. Data on area burned are from MODIS Burned Area Monthly Global available at the 1km spatial resolution (similar to data on fires) but only at the monthly temporal resolution.

**Other data sources.** Country borders and the limits of the Brazilian Amazon biome are available from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE)[6]. The limits of the Peruvian and Bolivian Amazon biome are available from the Amazon Geo-Referenced Socio-Environmental Information Network (RAISG)[7]. Data on land cover is from the Mapbiomas project[8]. Weekly precipitation data is obtained from ERA5 produced by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts.

We gather different data sets to investigate possible mechanisms through which the government responded during the fire crisis. We collect daily data on congressional speeches in Brazil since 2001 related to the fires in the Amazon.[9] We also gather data on fire brigades at the municipal level for the year 2019 from the Registry of Fire Incidents from the Environmental Agency (ROI/IBAMA). These are the records of the agency inside the Ministry of the Environment responsible for the policy of preventing and fighting forest fires throughout the national territory. This data set does not paint a complete picture of fire brigades, since we do not have access to data on military operations, which happens outside the scope of the Ministry of the Environment. We also collect data on votes for the former Brazilian president, Jair Bolsonaro, in the 2018 presidential election. The voting data is from the Brazilian Superior Electoral Court.

# 3 Background and Research Design

In this section, we describe the study context and provide details on the natural experiment and the research design.

[6]Available at www.ibge.gov.br/en/home-eng.html

[7]Available at www.amazoniasocioambiental.org/en

[8]Available at: www.mapbiomas.org

[9]We searched for "Amazônia" and "fogo" (Amazon and fire in Portuguese) in all speeches available at camara.leg.br/atividade-legislativa/discursos-e-notas-taquigraficas.

## 3.1 A Natural Experiment in Public Attention

Forest fires are an annual phenomenon in much of the Amazon in the second half of each calendar year. Although these seasonal forest fires occur every year in the Brazilian, Bolivian, and Peruvian Amazon biome (Figure 1a), there was a dramatic surge in public attention on forest fires in Brazil in the second half of August 2019. Using data on Google searches in the whole world, we see that searches on fires in the Amazon increased sharply in August 2019 in English, Portuguese, and Spanish (Figure 1b). At the same time, articles on fires in the Amazon in leading newspapers such as the Guardian and the New York Times also increased manyfold (Appendix Figure A1). This unusual, unprecedented increase in attention provides the basis for our empirical analysis.

Three features make this episode ideal for studying the effect of public attention on environmental outcomes. First, the surge in attention was unprecedented but around a routine annual affair. Appendix Figure A2 plots the accumulated number of fire outbreaks for the Brazilian Amazon for different years as evidence that 2019 was an average year of fire activity. It shows there were higher cumulative fires as of August 2019 than in August 2018 but similar to those in 2017, and is similar to the trajectories of the 2000's.[10]

Second, even though fires per unit area were as much an issue in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon as they were in the Brazilian Amazon, only the Brazilian Amazon received this unusually high attention. Data show that the Google searches were specific to Brazil – a pattern evident either using the country's name (Figure 1c) or using the respective President's name (Figure 1d) in the search.[11] Third, the outcome of interest can be tracked using the same data source (satellite imagery) before and after the surge in attention.

**Why did the issue of fires in the Amazon go "viral"?** Figure 1 makes it clear that in August 2019, the issue of forest fires in the Amazon captured public attention and went "viral". Determining how an event "goes viral" in media and public discussion forums is often a puzzle (Shiller, 2020) and this episode is no different. We cannot point to a single factor that led the world to pay such close attention to fires in the Brazilian Amazon in 2019 as opposed to previous and following years or neighboring countries. While we focus

[10] It also shows that cumulative fires in 2020 were similar to 2019 but accompanied by no surge in public attention (potentially because of COVID-19).

[11] It is worth noting that the total count of fires was higher in the Brazilian Amazon than in the Peruvian or Bolivian Amazon since the Brazilian Amazon is significantly larger. It is also possible that media reports may have used "Amazon" as an umbrella term for all of the Amazon and not just the Brazilian Amazon. Nonetheless, it remains true that searches and newspaper articles mentioned mostly the Brazilian Amazon and that this spike in attention was noteworthy in both a temporal (second half of August 2019 versus other years and other periods of the year) and cross-sectional (Brazil versus Peru and Bolivia) sense.

on understanding the effects of viral attention on environmental action and not what makes an environmental disaster go viral, we nonetheless conjecture and discount some possible explanations.[12]

Although the fire season arrived earlier in 2019 than it did in 2016-2018 (Caetano, 2021), the peak in 2019 was similar to that in 2018 and lower than that in 2017 (Figure 2a). Moreover, the accumulated number of fire outbreaks in August 2019 is about average for the same month in the last two decades and very similar to 2020 (Appendix Figure A2). For our empirical design, this suggests that fire intensity was unlikely to be a major driver of attention.

A more plausible explanation is that the newly elected Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro had previously faced criticism for his anti-environmental agenda, prompting increased scrutiny of environmental incidents in Brazil (Escobar, 2019; Burgess et al., 2023). Most newspaper articles indeed highlighted his stance against environmental protection. Appendix C presents a timeline of relevant events during Bolsonaro's presidency that weakened environmental institutions in Brazil.[13] Crucially, we did not find any regulatory changes initiated by the Brazilian government in mid-August 2019 that could have triggered the increase in media and public attention. Moreover, wildfires were even more prevalent in the subsequent three years of Bolsonaro's presidency compared to 2019, the year of the natural experiment. However, fires in the following years did not attract nearly as much public attention.

A unique episode may have contributed to the heightened media coverage. On August 19, 2019, suspended particulates from the fires in the Amazon, brought by a cold front, reached São Paulo creating a black sky during the day.[14] Such "black sky days" are a recurrent phenomenon in cities closer to the Amazon, but it was a one-off event in São Paulo. Such an event was covered in all national and some international news outlets, with some initial speculation that such an unprecedented event was caused by fires in the Amazon. This may have caught the media and public attention to the Amazon fires, as the population of the largest city in South America could see the smoke of the Amazon fires clearly for the first

[12]We cannot rule out that Bolivia and Peru acted to reduce fires to avoid the bad press coverage faced by Brazil. While we found no evidence supporting this scenario, it would mean that our estimates identify a lower bound on the effect of public attention on fires.

[13]To name a few institutional developments under Bolsonaro: the National Forest Service was placed under the Ministry of Agriculture, the Secretariat for Climate Change and Forestry was dissolved, the Amazon Fund was closed, significant cuts were made to the Ministry of Environment's budget, the president of INPE was dismissed, 21 out of 27 IBAMA's superintendents were dismissed, and ICMBio Regional Managers were dismissed, with military personnel taking over many of these positions and positions previously held by technical experts.

[14]It is worth noting that this "black sky" day in São Paulo cannot be the source of initial media coverage given that it occurred one day after the peak in global public attention.

time.[15] While the dark sky incident likely fuelled and sustained media attention, the focus of both national and international attention (as measured by Google searches) was on the Amazon fires and not on São Paulo (Appendix Figure A4 and Appendix B).

This leads us to an important caveat: we are not able to disentangle the relative roles of *domestic* versus *international* public attention. First, São Paulo, Brazil's largest city, hosts a sizable part of the domestic and international media outlets. Second, domestic and international media likely catalyze each other. International correspondents often cover the most visible domestic topics, and Brazilian news outlets amplify national topics covered by the most influential international media outlets. Third, the topic went viral within a couple of days (Figure 2a), leaving no temporal variation that would allow us to investigate differential responses under domestic and international outcry.

## 3.2 Research Design

To estimate the effect of public attention on fires in the Brazilian Amazon, we employ a difference-in-differences strategy using fires in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon as a control group for the fires in the Brazilian Amazon (Armenteras et al., 2017). As shown in Figure 1c-d, the public attention on forest fires was entirely focused on Brazil with very little interest in the similar magnitude of fires taking place in Peru and Bolivia.

We estimate the differential Amazon fires in Brazil relative to Bolivia and Peru over 2019 as captured by $\gamma_t$ from the equation below:

$$fire_{i,r,w} = \alpha_i + \delta_w + \sum_{t=Jun3}^{Nov5} \gamma_t BrAm_i 1\{w = t\} + \eta_r X_{i,w} + \varepsilon_{i,r,w} \quad (1)$$

where $fire_{i,r,w}$ is the number of fires in pixel $i$ in country $r$ in week $w$, $BrAm_i$ is a dummy for the Brazilian Amazon region, $\delta_w$ are week fixed effects (weeks starting in the date indicated), and $\alpha_i$ are pixel fixed effects that control for time-invariant factors that are specific to each pixel – such as geography and regulatory context. $X_{i,w}$ is a vector of pixel-week controls – contemporary precipitation and average fire outbreaks between 2016–2018. We allow $\eta_r$ to differ across countries $r$. $\varepsilon_{i,r,w}$ is the idiosyncratic error, which we cluster at 25km $\times$ 25km grids to account for serial and spatial correlation.

Under the assumption that forest fires in the Brazilian Amazon, absent media and public attention, would have followed a similar trend as the fires in Bolivia and Peru, $\gamma_t$ estimates

[15] Concerns about local air pollution in São Paulo are unlikely to be the dominant factor driving the public outcry. For example, air pollution levels in São Paulo were similar (if anything lower) in 2019 to the same period in previous years (Appendix Figure A3).

the average treatment effect of public attention on fires over the remainder of the 2019 fire season. Figure 2a shows that the number of fire outbreaks per unit area from 2016-2018 followed similar trends within the year in Brazil and Peru and Bolivia. Figure 2b shows that the number of fire outbreaks in 2019 across Brazil, Peru, and Bolivia followed a common trend until mid-August. We observe a synchronized drop in the count of fires in the transition from August to September in all three countries. In 2019 this was the period of the onset of the rainy season (Appendix Figure A8), which reduced fires everywhere. The beginning of the rainy season may have reduced the intensity of large-scale fires that had been burning without much control throughout the dry season.

We also estimate the average effect of public pressure on fires in the Brazilian Amazon between September and mid-November, captured by $\gamma$, in the following equation:

$$fire_{i,r,w} = \alpha_i + \delta_w + \gamma BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} + X_{i,r,w}\eta_r + \varepsilon_{i,r,w} \quad (2)$$

following a similar notation as in equation 1.

As a robustness check, we estimate a triple-differences strategy where we compare Brazil with its neighbors before and after August 2019 versus 2016-2018. We estimate the following equation:

$$fire_{i,r,w,2019} - fire_{i,r,w,2016-2018} = \alpha_i + \delta_w + \gamma BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} + X_{i,r,w}\eta_r + \varepsilon_{i,r,w} \quad (3)$$

where $fire_{i,r,w,2016-2018}$ is the average fire outbreak in pixel $i$ in fire week $w$ between 2016 and 2018. The coefficient $\gamma$ in this equation captures the triple-difference estimate.

# 4 Results

## 4.1 Main Results

Figure 3a shows the differential number of fire outbreaks per km$^2$ in the Brazilian Amazon every two weeks relative to the Peruvian and Bolivian Amazon – as captured by $\hat{\gamma}_t$ from equation (1). We observe no differential fires in Brazil before the spike in public attention, supporting the common trends assumption that underlies a causal interpretation of difference-in-differences estimates. We estimate that the surge in public attention reduced fires in the second half of September 2019 by 60% (0.013 days of fire per km$^2$) relative to the average fires during the same period in the Peruvian and Bolivian Amazon. While the effect is most prominent in September, it persists through early November as the fire season comes

to an end in the region.[16] We estimate that public awareness reduced fires by 40% (0.003 days of fire per km$^2$) in the Brazilian Amazon from October to early November relative to its neighbors in the same period.

Figure 3b shows the results of the difference-in-differences estimation using fire intensity (brightness per km$^2$) as the dependent variable. This measure of fire activity produces remarkably similar effects to those using fire counts data – a 60% reduction in the second half of September and a 37% reduction in October and early November. We also obtain similar results if we use monthly area burned as the dependent variable (Appendix Figure A5a) or estimate the model with week-specific coefficients (Appendix Figure A5b).

Table 1 columns 1-4 show the results for the average effect of public pressure on fires, as described in equation 2. Our estimates are robust to controlling for precipitation and average fires from 2016-2018 at the pixel level. In our preferred specification (column 4), we observe that fires decline by 0.004 days of fire per km$^2$ after the spike in attention until the end of the 2019 fire season. Altogether, our estimates indicate that the surge in public attention resulted in 187,215 fewer pixels-days of active fires than would have occurred in the absence of the same attention. This corresponds to a reduction of 22% of the total pixel-days of fires in the Brazilian Amazon relative to the counterfactual scenario where public attention is absent. We use average fire data from 2016 to 2018 as a control to address potential seasonal variations in each pixel. Incorporating this control increases the estimated coefficient and its precision.

Nonetheless, it could be that historically average fires in these countries diverge after August. To account for it, the triple difference specification compares Brazil and Bolivia/Peru before and after August using 2019 data, while adjusting for differences between 2016 and 2018. The result of the triple-difference specification (accounting for additional within-year differences in fire activity), described in equation 3, is shown in Table 1 column 5. The triple difference produces larger and more precise estimates than the difference-in-differences estimate in column 4 – fires decline by 0.005 days of fire per km$^2$ (as opposed to 0.004 days of fire per km$^2$) – suggesting that the divergence in fire patterns in August 2019 was not merely due to seasonal trends.

To further explore the structure of our count data on fire activity we estimate a Poisson model as in Balboni et al. (2021a). The Poisson model is estimated with a substantially

[16]It is reasonable to see stronger short-run effects. First, as we discuss in the next section, efforts from the government and civil society were concentrated on controlling the spread of fires, creating a large impact in the short run. Second, the fire season slows down in October and November with fewer occurrences of fires. Consequently, the effects of fire control efforts are also likely to be smaller. Third, as described by the Google searches and newspaper articles data, the media interest was short-lived, quickly releasing pressure on the Brazilian government.

smaller sample because a Poisson model with unit fixed effects limits the sample to units with variation in the dependent variable (Correia et al., 2019). Thus, the Poisson model is capturing an intensive margin of the use of fire (pixels with multiple occurrences of fires over the season) rather than an extensive margin. Table 1 column 6 consequently shows that the Poisson model recovers noisier and smaller effects, as it estimates a 6% reduction in the intensive margin of fire activity.

One potential episode that could pose a threat to our identification strategy is the enactment of Supreme Decree 3973 in Bolivia. This decree, passed in July, authorized controlled burning in the Bolivian provinces of Beni and Santa Cruz, which collectively constitute 62% of the Bolivian Amazon territory. Consequently, there is a possibility that this decree may have led to an increase in fires in these Bolivian provinces post-July 2019. To account for this potential confounding mechanism, we conducted a robustness exercise wherein we excluded pixels within the region affected by Decree 3973.

Columns 7 and 8 in Table 1 present the results of this exercise. Importantly, despite the exclusion of pixels in the affected region, the statistical significance remains consistent with our other specifications. While there is a reduction in the magnitude of the effect in the difference-in-differences specification, the magnitude remains virtually unchanged in our (more demanding) triple-differences specification. Furthermore, the event study depicted in Figure 3 and the time series in Figure 2 reveals no differential fires between Brazil and Peru-Bolivia before our defined treatment of media attention. This additional evidence reinforces the robustness of our findings and indicates that the results are not driven by the occurrences associated with Supreme Decree 3973.

In all specifications, we cluster standard errors at $625km^2$ grids. To minimize additional concerns over spatial correlation, we implement the Synthetic Control method by averaging weekly fire at the country level (i.e., Brazilian Amazon, Bolivian Amazon, and Peruvian Amazon). Appendix Figure A5c shows the results of the synthetic control using Bolivia and Peru as the donor pool. The synthetic control method estimates an average reduction of 0.0037 days of fire per $km^2$ in the period, similar to the effect size 0.0040 days of fire per $km^2$ estimated using the conventional difference-in-differences method.

## 4.2 Were fires displaced across national borders?

One potential concern could be that at least part of the reduction in fires in Brazil was driven by the displacement of illegal fires across the border. We find no evidence to support this concern. First, the map of fire intensity shows that the main locations of active fires in August 2019 were not close to the border (Appendix Figure A6). If anything, we can

observe an increase in fires in Brazil near the border around Rio Branco and at the Chico Mendes Extractive Reserve in the state of Acre.

Second, we compare occurrences of fires around the Brazilian border with Bolivia and Peru using a border regression discontinuity design as in Burgess et al. (2023). Appendix Figure A7 shows the average number of fire outbreaks within 27km from the border in August and September.[17] We see that the reduction of fires between August and September on the Brazilian side of the border was not followed by an equivalent increase in fires in the neighboring countries close to the border. The regression discontinuity estimates show no discontinuous fire outbreaks at the border neither before nor after the surge in public attention.

## 4.3 Where was public attention most effective?

To quantify the impact of public attention on the amount of carbon released by the fires, we investigate whether the public pressure was more effective in preventing fires in areas with denser forest cover than in other areas, such as pastureland. We assess this issue by estimating the heterogeneous effects of the public pressure on fires in areas with greater forest cover, as captured by $\gamma_2$ in the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned} fire_{i,r,w} = \alpha_i + \delta_w + \gamma_1 BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} \\ + \gamma_2 BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} \times Forest_i + X_{i,r,w}\eta_r + \epsilon_{i,r,w} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $Forest_i$ is the share of forest cover in each pixel in 2015 or an index equal to one for pixels with forest cover above a certain threshold.

We present results in Table 2 columns 1-4. We find that public attention was about three times more effective in reducing fires in forested pixels than in non-forest pixels. For example, we estimate in column 2 that while attention reduced the number of fire outbreaks by 0.0016 days of fire per km$^2$ in pixels with less than 50% of forest cover, it reduced an additional 0.0029 days of fires in pixels with more than 50% of forest cover. This suggests that agents refrained from setting fires on or near forested areas more so than in non-forested areas. This is consistent with Balboni et al. (2021b) who show that agents act strategically when setting fires, internalizing the risk of government punishment.

[17] We follow (Calonico et al., 2014) to obtain the optimal bandwidth.

## 4.4 How did government actions curtail fires?

Forest fires in the Amazon are an annual phenomenon, but a marked increase in public attention resulted in nearly 22% fewer pixel-days of active fire in 2019. The most likely mechanism that underlies this result is that public attention pressured the government to act. Descriptive evidence from speeches by members of the Brazilian Congress suggests that this is the case. All speeches in the Brazilian Congress are transcribed and cataloged. Figure 4 shows the number of speeches in Congress that mentioned Amazon and fires. Between 2001 and 2018, the subject was discussed in Congress in a total of 5 speeches. In 2019, no member of Congress discussed the subject up until August 20 (the first working day after August 18 when we observed a sharp and dramatic increase in public attention). Figure 4c shows that between August 21 and August 29, 2019, after the height in public attention to the matter, 16 speeches in Congress raised the issue of the Amazon fires. The subject continued to be relevant in September but lost momentum subsequently when the government stopped denying the issue and proposed actions.

The federal government took two main actions after over a week of public outcry: (i) fire control actions by recruiting and dispatching fire brigades to specific areas – some under the military "Green Brazil Operation"; and (ii) a 60-day ban on the use of agriculture fires inside the Legal Amazon. As the timeline of events shows (see Appendix C), both actions were initiated after the marked increase in public attention. Of course, it is not possible to demonstrate using gold standard causal methods that attention led to speeches which led to action but an examination of the timeline (Appendix C) suggests that it is likely this could be an important mechanism.

Although we cannot test for the extent to which each civil or government action in the aftermath of public outcry affected subsequent fires, we assess whether the fire brigades dispatched or recruited to control the forest can fully explain the effects we estimate. We use government records to identify the municipalities that received external fire brigades or that received funds to recruit firefighters (from the Ministerial Ordinance # 3020/2019). We estimate the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} fire_{i,r,w} = \alpha_i + \delta_w + \gamma_1 BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} \\ + \gamma_2 BrAm_i 1\{w \geq Aug18\} \times Brigade_i + X_{i,r,w}\eta_r + \epsilon_{i,r,w} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $Brigade_i$ is a dummy for the municipalities that received fire brigades.

Table 2 column 5 presents our estimates of $\gamma_2$ from equation 5. We observe a differential reduction of fires in areas that received fire brigades. However, we also see that the public

outcry reduced fires in the regions that did not receive federal assistance with fire brigades. Our estimates imply that fire brigades only partially contributed to reducing fires following the public outcry, suggesting that actions mediated by civil society and local governments also contributed to fire control.

It is worth noting that the "Green Brazil Operation" launched in 2019 was a military operation that included additional fire brigades over and above those sent by non-military agencies, such as IBAMA. Unfortunately, data from military operations (even in aggregate terms) are not available and therefore excluded from our analysis. As such, our result is an existence result in that we show that increased public attention reduced fires in the Brazilian Amazon through a combination of various actions from the government and civil society. However, disentangling the relative magnitude of each government action in reducing fires is beyond the scope of this paper.

As noted before, a cornerstone of Bolsonaro's campaign was hostility towards environmental initiatives. We consequently explore heterogeneity by local political alignment with and support for Bolsonaro as measured by the municipal vote shares for Bolsonaro during the 2018 election. In Table 2 column 6 we show the result of estimating equation 5 by substituting the fire brigade variable with Bolsonaro's vote shares. We find that fires decreased more in municipalities that had a higher share of votes for Bolsonaro. Taken together, the three heterogeneities that we explore – fire brigades, forest cover, and vote shares – show evidence that the government did act by dispatching fire brigades, targeting areas with more forest cover, potentially using its local political alignment as a means to bring action to the local level.

**Why did public attention work?** As we discussed in Section 3, one limitation of the paper is that it is difficult to empirically disentangle why the increase in public attention led to domestic action. We include a timeline of key events in Appendix C. Economic and reputational reasons might have encouraged the government to curtail the fires. In particular, after the news of the fires reached the international media, France threatened to block the Mercosur-European Union trade agreement on August 23. Foreign investors representing $16.2 trillion in assets following these events signed a letter calling on firms to protect the world's rainforest. As shown in Hsiao (2021), when domestic action faces resistance from the government, trade policy offers an intervention strategy for the international community.

Another caveat, we cannot conclude whether the short-lived nature of the observed reduction in fires is evidence of a lack of public learning regarding the environmental consequences of forest fires. Individuals may assimilate information on the environmental damages of forest fires and yet behave as private agents, neglecting externalities in their decisions to engage

in forest fires.

### 4.5 Quantifying the effects in $CO_2$

The Amazon remains one of the major strands of tropical forests in the world and preserving its integrity is crucial to meeting targets under the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. We perform a back-of-the-envelope calculation to quantify the avoided forest fires in terms of avoided $CO_2$ emissions.

To do so, we use Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED) which has compiled and revised data on fire count and emissions 2003-2015 (Randerson et al., 2012; Giglio et al., 2013; Van Der Werf et al., 2017).[18] This data is not available for 2019, so we predict emissions based on GFED data in two steps. First, we run a linear regression of fire counts on emissions between 2003 and 2015.[19] Second, we predict emissions between September and mid-November 2019 using these estimates and the fire count in this period.

We predict that the total emissions in the Brazilian Amazon between September and November 2019 were 112 million tons of $CO_2$. Thus, we calculate the reduction of 22% of fire days caused by public attention (Table 2 column 2) helped prevent the release of 24.81 million tons of $CO_2$ to the atmosphere. This avoided emission is comparable with the annual emission of the largest coal-fired power station in the United States (Filonchyk and Peterson, 2023).

We benchmark this number with the difference between Brazil's current emissions (De Azevedo et al., 2018) and the Brazilian goal of emission reductions under the Paris Agreement. Our back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that the effect of public pressure corresponds to 3.86% of $CO_2$ emissions that Brazil should have cut down in 2018 to reach the Paris Agreement goal.

## 5 Conclusion

The Amazon remains one of the major strands of tropical forests in the world and preserving its integrity is crucial to meeting targets under the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. In this paper, we examine the effect of a dramatic spike in public attention on the Brazilian Amazon on fires. By exploiting the unusual attention on a seasonal affair, we estimate the effects of public attention on local environmental outcomes.

[18] Data available at http://www.globalfiredata.org/

[19] The predictive power of using fire counts to predict emissions is high in our setting – the R-squared of the regression is 0.746, larger than some regressions presented in GFED's regional estimates.

We show that the surge in media and public attention to the Brazilian Amazon fires in August 2019 reduced the number of fires in Brazil by 22% (187,215 avoided pixel-days of active fire) relative to those in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon in the same period. We estimate that public attention was at least twice more effective in areas with denser forest cover. Back-of-the-envelope calculations reveal that the fires averted in 2019 in the wake of public awareness account for 3.8% of the reductions in emissions needed for Brazil to meet its commitments to the Paris Agreement. Our findings imply that even under administrations openly hostile to conservation, public attention can lead to positive responses to urgent environmental catastrophes.

More work is needed to understand what captures media and public attention to a specific issue. Although fire activity remains very high in Brazil since the 2019 episode, the marked attention that led to a decline in forest fires in 2019 has been largely absent. That fires resume strongly in the subsequent seasons suggests the effects of public awareness are short-lived, and that attention needs to remain high to keep local governments under pressure to act. It remains an open question whether the effects of continued public attention persist or fade over time. Future work should also shed light on whether public outcry can lead the government to act on issues other than environmental disasters.

# References


Anderson, S. E., Plantinga, A. J., and Wibbenmeyer, M. (2023). Inequality in agency response: evidence from salient wildfire events. *The Journal of Politics*, 85(2):625–639.

Aragão, L. E., Anderson, L. O., Fonseca, M. G., Rosan, T. M., Vedovato, L. B., Wagner, F. H., Silva, C. V., Junior, C. H. S., Arai, E., Aguiar, A. P., et al. (2018). 21st Century Drought-Related Fires Counteract the Decline of Amazon Deforestation Carbon Emissions. *Nature Communications*, 9(1):1–12.

Araujo, R., Assunção, J., Hirota, M., and Scheinkman, J. A. (2023). Estimating the spatial amplification of damage caused by degradation in the amazon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(46):e2312451120.

Araujo, R., Costa, F., and Sant'Anna, M. (2020). Efficient Forestation in the Brazilian Amazon: Evidence from a Dynamic Model.

Armenteras, D., Espelta, J. M., Rodríguez, N., and Retana, J. (2017). Deforestation Dynamics and Drivers in Different Forest Types in Latin America: Three Decades of Studies (1980–2010). *Global Environmental Change*, 46:139–147.

Balboni, C., Burgess, R., Heil, A., Old, J., and Olken, B. A. (2021a). Cycles of Fire? Politics and Forest Burning in Indonesia. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, volume 111, pages 415–19.

Balboni, C., Burgess, R., and Olken, B. A. (2021b). The Origins and Control of Forest Fires in the Tropics.

Barlow, J., Berenguer, E., Carmenta, R., and França, F. (2020). Clarifying Amazonia's Burning Crisis. *Global Change Biology*, 26(2):319–321.

Beattie, G. (2021). Measuring Social Benefits of Media Coverage: How Coverage of Climate Change Affects Behavior.

Besley, T. and Burgess, R. (2002). The Political Economy of Government Responsiveness: Theory and Evidence from India. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(4):1415–1451.

Besley, T. and Prat, A. (2006). Handcuffs for the Grabbing Hand? Media Capture and Government Accountability. *American Economic Review*, 96(3):720–736.

Besley, T. J., Fetzer, T., and Mueller, H. F. (2023). How Big is the Media Multiplier? Evidence from Dyadic News Data.

Bossavie, L., Cho, Y., and Heath, R. (2023). The Effects of International Scrutiny on Manufacturing Workers: Evidence from the Rana Plaza Collapse in Bangladesh. *Journal of Development Economics*, 163:103107.

Brown, P. H. and Minty, J. H. (2008). Media coverage and charitable giving after the 2004 tsunami. *Southern Economic Journal*, 75(1):9–25.

Buntaine, M., Greenstone, M., He, G., Liu, M., Wang, S., and Zhang, B. (2022). Does the Squeaky Wheel Get More Grease? The Direct and Indirect Effects of Citizen Participation on Environmental Governance in China. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Buntaine, M. T., Zhang, B., and Hunnicutt, P. (2021). Citizen Monitoring of Waterways Decreases Pollution in China by Supporting Government Action and Oversight. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(29):e2015175118.

Burgess, R., Costa, F., and Olken, B. A. (2023). National Borders and the Conservation of Nature.

Caetano, M. A. L. (2021). Political Activity in Social Media Induces Forest Fires in the Brazilian Amazon. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 167:120676.

Calo-Blanco, A., Kovářík, J., Mengel, F., and Romero, J. G. (2017). Natural disasters and indicators of social cohesion. *PloS one*, 12(6):e0176885.

Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Titiunik, R. (2014). Robust Nonparametric Confidence Intervals for Regression-Discontinuity Designs. *Econometrica*, 82(6):2295–2326.

Campa, P. (2018). Press and Leaks: Do Newspapers Reduce Toxic Emissions? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 91:184–202.

Cassar, A., Healy, A., and Von Kessler, C. (2017). Trust, risk, and time preferences after a natural disaster: experimental evidence from thailand. *World Development*, 94:90–105.

Chiang, C.-F. and Knight, B. (2011). Media Bias and Influence: Evidence from Newspaper Endorsements. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 78(3):795–820.

Cochrane, M. A. (2003). Fire Science for Rainforests. *Nature*, 421(6926):913–919.

Correia, S., Guimaraes, P., and Zylkin, T. (2019). PPMLHDFE: Stata Module for Poisson Pseudo-Likelihood Regression with Multiple Levels of Fixed Effects.

De Azevedo, T. R., Junior, C. C., Junior, A. B., dos Santos Cremer, M., Piatto, M., Tsai, D. S., Barreto, P., Martins, H., Sales, M., Galuchi, T., et al. (2018). SEEG Initiative Estimates of Brazilian Greenhouse Gas Emissions from 1970 to 2015. *Scientific Data*, 5:180045.

DellaVigna, S. and Kaplan, E. (2007). The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3):1187–1234.

Egan, P. J. and Mullin, M. (2012). Turning personal experience into political attitudes: The effect of local weather on americans' perceptions about global warming. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3):796–809.

Eisensee, T. and Strömberg, D. (2007). News droughts, news floods, and us disaster relief. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(2):693–728.

Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M., and Zhuravskaya, E. (2011). Media and Political Persuasion: Evidence from Russia. *American Economic Review*, 101(7):3253–85.

Escobar, H. (2019). Brazilian president attacks deforestation data. *Science*, 365(6452):419–419.

Filonchyk, M. and Peterson, M. P. (2023). An integrated analysis of air pollution from us coal-fired power plants. *Geoscience Frontiers*, 14(2):101498.

Gerber, A. S., Karlan, D., and Bergan, D. (2009). Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Political Opinions. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(2):35–52.

Giglio, L., Randerson, J. T., and Van Der Werf, G. R. (2013). Analysis of Daily, Monthly, and Annual Burned Area Using the Fourth-Generation Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED4). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 118(1):317–328.

Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., and Moore, R. (2017). Google Earth Engine: Planetary-Scale Geospatial Analysis for Everyone. *Remote Sensing of Environment*.

Hazlett, C. and Mildenberger, M. (2020). Wildfire exposure increases pro-environment voting within democratic but not republican areas. *American Political Science Review*, 114(4):1359–1365.

Hsiao, A. (2021). Coordination and commitment in international climate action: evidence from palm oil. *Working paper*.

Jacobsen, G. D. (2011). The Al Gore Effect: An Inconvenient Truth and Voluntary Carbon Offsets. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 61(1):67–78.

Jayachandran, S. (2009). Air Quality and Early-life Mortality Evidence from Indonesia's Wildfires. *Journal of Human Resources*, 44(4):916–954.

Li, S., Linn, J., and Muehlegger, E. (2014). Gasoline taxes and consumer behavior. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 6(4):302–342.

Marcus, M. and Sant'Anna, P. H. (2021). The Role of Parallel Trends in Event Study Settings: An Application to Environmental Economics. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, 8(2):235–275.

Méon, P.-G. and Verwimp, P. (2022). Pro-social behavior after a disaster: Evidence from a storm hitting an open-air festival. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 198:493–510.

Olsen, G. R., Carstensen, N., and Høyen, K. (2003). Humanitarian crises: What determines the level of emergency assistance? media coverage, donor interests and the aid business. *Disasters*, 27(2):109–126.

Pianta, S. and Sisco, M. R. (2020). A hot topic in hot times: how media coverage of climate change is affected by temperature abnormalities. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15(11):114038.

Preis, T., Moat, H. S., and Stanley, H. E. (2013). Quantifying Trading Behavior in Financial Markets Using Google Trends. *Scientific Reports*, 3(1):1–6.

Randerson, J., Chen, Y., Van Der Werf, G., Rogers, B., and Morton, D. (2012). Global Burned Area and Biomass Burning Emissions from Small Fires. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 117(G4).

Rocha, R. and Sant'Anna, A. A. (2022). Winds of Fire and Smoke: Air Pollution and Health in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development*, 151:105722.

Shapiro, J. M. (2016). Special Interests and the Media: Theory and an Application to Climate Change. *Journal of Public Economics*, 144:91–108.

Sheldon, T. L. and Sankaran, C. (2017). The Impact of Indonesian Forest Fires on Singaporean Pollution and Health. *American Economic Review*, 107(5):526–29.

Sheshadri, K. and Singh, M. P. (2019). The Public and Legislative Impact of Hyperconcentrated Topic News. *Science Advances*, 5(8):eaat8296.

Shiller, R. J. (2020). *Narrative Economics: How Stories Go Viral and Drive Major Economic Events*. Princeton University Press.

Snyder Jr, J. M. and Strömberg, D. (2010). Press Coverage and Political Accountability. *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(2):355–408.

Strömberg, D. (2007). Natural disasters, economic development, and humanitarian aid. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 21(3):199–222.

Tan-Soo, J.-S. and Pattanayak, S. K. (2019). Seeking Natural Capital Projects: Forest Fires, Haze, and Early-life Exposure in Indonesia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(12):5239–5245.

Van Der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Van Leeuwen, T. T., Chen, Y., Rogers, B. M., Mu, M., Van Marle, M. J., Morton, D. C., Collatz, G. J., et al. (2017). Global Fire Emissions Estimates During 1997-2016. *Earth System Science Data*, 9(2):697–720.

Wibbenmeyer, M., Anderson, S. E., and Plantinga, A. J. (2019). Salience and the government provision of public goods. *Economic Inquiry*, 57(3):1547–1567.

Zaval, L., Keenan, E. A., Johnson, E. J., and Weber, E. U. (2014). How warm days increase belief in global warming. *Nature Climate Change*, 4(2):143–147.

Figure 1: Fire Occurrences and Google Searches on Fires in Brazil




This figure shows that searches on fires in Brazil increase in August 2019 but fire patterns are similar to previous years. Figure (a) shows the number of days of active fire in each 1km$^2$ pixel in the Amazon biome in Brazil and Bolivia and Peru every two weeks from January 2016 through October 2020. Figure (b) shows Google searches about Amazon fire in English (amazon fires, amazon burning) and in Portuguese or Spanish since 2016 (incendio amazonia, fogo amazonia, fuego amazonia) . Figure (c) depicts searches mentioning rainforest and the country name (rainforest Brazil, rainforest Peru, rainforest Bolivia). Figure (d) shows searches on Amazon and the name of each country's president (Amazon Morales, Amazon Vizcarra, Amazon Bolsonaro, Amazon Temer, Amazon Rousseff).

Figure 2: Fire Occurrences over the season in the Brazilian, Peruvian, and Bolivian Amazon

(a) Average Fire Occurrences 2016–2018




(b) Fire Occurrences 2019




This figure shows fire outbreaks per km$^2$ in the Brazilian, Peruvian, and Bolivian Amazon. Figures (a) and (b) show the average number of fire outbreaks per km$^2$ for two-weeks intervals between 2016 and 2018, and in 2019, respectively.

Figure 3: Dynamic Difference-in-Differences Results




Figures (a) and (b) show difference-in-differences estimates of fire outbreaks and fire intensity per km$^2$ in the Brazilian Amazon relative to fires in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon as captured $\gamma_t$ in eq. (1), respectively. Each point indicates the point estimate for every two week period. Vertical bars present 95% confidence intervals. Shaded area marks the period before the rise of international attention. Standard errors clustered at 625km$^2$ grids. Number of observations (clusters): 127,758,905 (9,309). The results are also presented in Appendix Table A1.

Figure 4: Number of speeches about fires in the Amazon in the Brazilian Congress




Figures show the number of speeches made in the Brazilian Congress about fires in the Amazon in different time windows. Figure (a) shows the number of speeches by year between 2001 and 2022. Figure (b) shows the number of speeches by month in 2019. Figure (c) zooms in and shows the number of speeches by day in August 2019. The Congress holds sessions only from Tuesday to Thursday (days labeled in black) and is closed the rest of the week (days labeled in red).

Table 1: Results: Difference-in-Differences

| | Dep. var.: fire outbreaks per 1km$^2$ | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\beta$) | -.00319*** | -.00342*** | -.00378*** | -.00405*** | -.00505*** | -.05897 | -.00122*** | -.00333*** |
| | (.0005) | (.00052) | (.00048) | (.0005) | (.00041) | (.05736) | (.00038) | (.00031) |
| Precipitation | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Avg fire 2016–2018 | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Triple difference | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Decree 3973 | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Avg Fire Sep-Nov Bolivia & Peru | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0994 | .0064 | .0064 |
| Avg Fire Sep-Nov Brazil 2016-2018 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .0557 | .009 | .009 |
| # Observations | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 11,156,725 | 120,590,150 | 120,590,150 |
| # Clusters | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 5,072 | 8,846 | 8,846 |

[a] This table presents the results of our main difference-in-differences approach (columns 1-4) and additional robustness. The table shows the coefficient of the interaction term of a pixel belonging to the Brazilian Amazon with a dummy indicating the period after the week of the rise in international attention (coefficient $\gamma$ from expression (2)). All specifications include pixel fixed-effect and week fixed-effect. Units of observation are 1km$^2$ pixels in a week period. From columns (1) to (4) we vary the controls included. The results are robust to including precipitation at the pixel-week unit and the average fire count of each pixel in the equivalent week of the years 2016-2018. Column (4) presents our preferred estimates. Column (5) shows the estimates of a triple-difference estimate as represented in equation 3. Column (6) shows the estimates of the Poisson specification. Columns (7) and (8) show the estimates when we exclude pixels in Bolivia affected by Supreme Decree 3973. Standard errors clustered at 625km$^2$ grids in parentheses. Significance levels: *10%, **5%, ***1%.

Table 2: Results: Difference-in-Differences - Heterogeneous Effects

| | Dep. var.: fire outbreaks per 1km$^2$ | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_1$) | -.00076 | -.00163*** | -.00149** | -.00152** | -.00313*** | -.00231*** |
| | (.00066) | (.0006) | (.00061) | (.00061) | (.0005) | (.00061) |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | -.00407*** | | | | | |
| × Forest Cover | (.00044) | | | | | |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | | -.00298*** | | | | |
| × Forest Cover > 50% | | (.00034) | | | | |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | | | -.0034*** | | | |
| × Forest Cover > 75% | | | (.00035) | | | |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | | | | -.00359*** | | |
| × Forest Cover > 90% | | | | (.00036) | | |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | | | | | -.00504*** | |
| × Brigades Sent or Budgeted | | | | | (.00069) | |
| Brazilian Amazon × Sep-Nov ($\gamma_2$) | | | | | | -.00429*** |
| × Bolsonaro's Vote Share | | | | | | (.00119) |
| Precipitation | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Avg fire 2016–2018 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Avg Fire Sep-Nov Bolivia & Peru | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 | .0112 |
| Avg Fire Sep-Nov Brazil 2016-2018 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .009 | .009 |
| # Observations | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 | 127,758,905 |
| # Clusters | 9309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 | 9,309 |

[a] This table presents the results of the difference-in-differences approach with heterogeneous effects. Columns (1) to (4) show the coefficient of the interaction term of a pixel belonging to the Brazilian Amazon with the a dummy indicating periods after the bi-week of the rise in international attention interacted with a pixel's forest cover in 2015 (coefficient $\gamma_2$ from equation (4)). All specifications include pixel fixed-effect, week fixed-effect, and controls for precipitation and average fires from 2016-2018 at the pixel-week level. Units of observation are 1km$^2$ pixels in a week period. In column (1) the forest cover variable is the share of the forest cover in that pixel. From columns (2) to (4) we create dummy variables that equals to one when the forest cover of a pixel is above a threshold (50%. 75%, and 90% respectively). In these columns we see that the effect of the reduction on fires was stronger in areas with greater forest cover. In column (5) we consider the interaction term of a pixel belonging to the Brazilian Amazon with a dummy indicating the period after the bi-week of the fire ban with a dummy variable that indicates if a fire brigade or a special budget to combat fire was sent to the municipality that the pixel belongs, after the fire ban. We observe a stronger effect of fire reductions on municipalities that receive such help. Nonetheless, it does not explain all the reduction on fires. In column (6) we consider the interaction term of a pixel belonging to the Brazilian Amazon with the vote share of the Brazilian municipality for Bolsonaro in 2018. Standard errors clustered at 625km$^2$ grids in parentheses. Significance levels: *10%, **5%, ***1%.

# Appendix (for online publication)

- Section A presents additional figures and tables discussed in the paper.
- Section B discusses whether air pollution could have attracted domestic public attention.
- Sections C presents a detailed timeline of events.

# A Appendix Figures and Tables

Figure A1: Hits on The New York Times and The Guardian Newspapers




This figure presents the number of articles that mentioned the words "Amazon", "fires", and "Brazil" together. The data were built using The New York Times Developer Network (developer.nytimes.com) and The Guardian Open Platform (open-platform.theguardian.com)

Figure A2: Cumulative fires outbreaks in the Brazilian Amazon between 2001 and 2020




This figure shows the cumulative number of fires outbreaks in the Brazilian Amazon between 2001 and 2020. The red line marks 2019. The dashed line marks 2020.

Figure A3: Pollution in São Paulo, Brazil followed similar trends in 2019 as in previous years




This figure presents different measurements of pollution for the city of São Paulo Brazil from 2016-2020. Data is from the Environmental Company of the State of São Paulo. We used data from the Marginal Pinheiros' station, aggregated by month. Data is available at https://cetesb.sp.gov.br/.

Figure A4: Searches on Amazon Fires in Brazil and Dark Sky Day in São Paulo

(a) Searches in English




(b) Searches in Portuguese




This figure shows searches on fires in Brazil compared with searches mentioning São Paulo. Figure (a) shows Google searches in English about Amazon fire compared with searches about Amazon fire and the dark sky day in São Paulo. For this we used the words "smoke", "fire", "sao paulo", or "amazon". Figrue (b) shows the same Google searches results in Portuguese. For this we used the words "fumaça", "fogo", "são paulo", or "amazônia".

Figure A5: Robustness Estimates

(a) Difference-in-Differences: Burned area (monthly)




(b) Difference-in-Differences: Fire outbreaks (weekly)




(c) Synthetic Control: (bi-weekly)




Figures in the top row show the difference-in-differences estimates of monthly burned area per km$^2$ (a) and of weekly fire outbreaks per km$^2$ (b) in the Brazilian Amazon relative to fires in the Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon as captured $\gamma_t$ in equation (1), respectively. Each point indicates the point estimate for every month (a) or week (b) period. Vertical bars present 95% confidence intervals. Shaded area marks the period before the rise of international attention. Standard errors clustered at 625km$^2$ grids. In (b), because we have over 120 million pixels, for computational reasons, we estimate equation 1 using a random sample (without replacement) of 50% of total pixels. (c) shows the synthetic control using Bolivia and Peru as donor pool.

Figure A6: Maps of Intensity of Fire Outbreaks




This figure shows maps of the intensity of fire outbreaks in August (a) and September 2019 (b).

Figure A7: Regression Discontinuity at the National Borders




This figure shows the regression discontinuity at the national borders. Figure (a) and (b) show average fire outbreaks in August 2019 and September-November 2019, respectively, within 27km from the Brazilian border with Bolivia and Peru. Each point shows the average number of fire outbreaks by 1km bins of distance to the border; positive distances represent pixels in Brazil and negative distances represent pixels in Bolivia or Peru. Black solid lines depict linear polynomials, whereas the shaded grey region depicts the 95% confidence interval.

Figure A8: Precipitation in the Amazon: Brazil and Per-Bolivia




This figure shows the weekly average precipitation levels for the Amazon in Brazil and Peru-Bolivia.

Table A1: Dynamic Difference-in-Differences Results

| parameter | Fire outbreaks | Fire intensity |
|---|---|---|
| jul.1 | -0.001116*** | -0.050611*** |
| | (0.000212) | (0.009726) |
| jul.2 | 0.000746*** | 0.035868*** |
| | (0.000246) | (0.011520) |
| aug.1 | -0.000256 | -0.000540 |
| | (0.000992) | (0.046963) |
| aug.2 | -0.000844 | -0.034168 |
| | (0.000671) | (0.031252) |
| sep.1 | -0.000942 | -0.042755 |
| | (0.000747) | (0.035305) |
| sep.2 | -0.012760*** | -0.602138*** |
| | (0.001125) | (0.053257) |
| oct.1 | -0.003671*** | -0.174153*** |
| | (0.000518) | (0.024324) |
| oct.2 | -0.002525*** | -0.119330*** |
| | (0.0004784) | (0.022333) |
| nov.1 | -0.002020** | -0.098926*** |
| | (0.000807) | (0.037993) |

This table shows the results of estimating Expression 1 with the dependent variable being number of fire outbreaks and fire intensity, respectively. These values are the same used to plot Figures 3 (a) and (b). Standard errors clustered at $625km^2$ grids. Number of observations (clusters): 127,758,905 (9,309).

Table A2: Descriptive Statistics

| Country | Statistic | Fire 2019 (1) | Average Fire 2016-2018 (2) | Precipitation (3) | Forest Cover (4) | Vote Share (5) | Fire Brigade |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brazil | mean | 0.0068 | 0.0058 | 0.35 | 0.80 | 0.42 | 0.09 |
| | std | 0.1040 | 0.0574 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.20 | 0.29 |
| | min | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0 |
| | max | 7.0000 | 6.3333 | 4.05 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 1 |
| Peru-Bolivia | mean | 0.0085 | 0.0065 | 0.44 | | | |
| | std | 0.1064 | 0.0546 | 0.41 | | | |
| | min | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.00 | | | |
| | max | 7.0000 | 2.6666 | 5.09 | | | |

# B Air Pollution and Domestic Public Attention

Figure A3 shows evidence that air pollution in major cities, for example, São Paulo was similar in August 2019 as it was in previous years. We take this as suggestive evidence that levels of air pollution in São Paulo were not driving domestic public attention and outcry towards forest fires. Although domestic public attention likely played some role in reducing forest fires, this evidence suggests that this effect was likely not driven by domestic air pollution concerns.

On August 19, São Paulo's sky became black during the day caused by suspended particles from the Amazon fires brought by a cold front. While this may have startled the local media, we show evidence that the focus of public attention remained in the Amazon fires, not in São Paulo's black sky. Figure A4 shows Google searches for "Amazon fires" (in English and in Portuguese) and searches for the combination of the words "São Paulo" and "fire", "smoke", or "Amazon". We can see that the focus of public attention was the Amazon fires, not São Paulo.

# C Timeline

**10/25/18** President-elect Bolsonaro pledges to quit Paris climate deal *(Reuters)*

**11/28/18** Brazil backs out of hosting the 2019 Climate Change Meeting *(New York Times)*

**12/10/18** Ricardo Salles is appointed as Minister of Environment, recommended by the Brazilian Rural Society. For him, the debate over Climate Change is "pointless" *(Guardian)*

**01/01/19** Jair Bolsonaro's inauguration *(Washington Post)*

**01/02/19** Competence over the National Forest Service is assigned to the Ministry of Agriculture *(Folha de São Paulo)*, effectively handing farming interests greater sway over Amazon lands *(Washington Post)*

**01/04/19** The Secretariat for Climate Change and Forestry is dissolved *(Folha de São Paulo)*

**02/28/19** Superintendents of Ibama are sacked *(Folha de São Paulo)*

**04/11/19** A new conciliation process for environmental fines is created, effectively stopping the application of fines *(Uol)*

**04/25/19** Technical experts are replaced with military personnel in the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation, an arm of the Ministry of Environment *(Valor)*

**05/07/19** Almost all funding to fight climate change is blocked and more than 1/5 of the non-discretionary budget of the Ministry of Environment is cut *(O Globo)*

**05/17/19** Minister of Environment says he will change rules for applications of the Amazon Fund, accusing NGO's of failing to account for the use of money. Norway responds: "Norway is satisfied with the robust governance structure of the Amazon Fund and the significant results that the entities supported by the Fund have achieved in the last 10 years" *(Reuters)*

**05/28/19** Minister of Environment suggests using Amazon Fund to compensate landowners in protected areas *(Observatório do Clima)*

**07/19/19** President Bolsonaro questions the satellite data on deforestation from the government's National Space Research Institute (INPE) after the data showed an increase in deforestation in May and June. "I am convinced the data is a lie. We are going to call the president of INPE here to talk about this." *(Guardian)*

**08/01/19** Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon hits the cover of The Economist *(Economist)*

**08/02/19** The president of INPE Ricardo Galvão, a well-respected scientist, is sacked and replaced by military personnel *(Guardian)*

**08/15/19** Following Germany, Norway halts Amazon Fund's donations *(Guardian)*

**08/18/19 Peak of attention as measured by Google Trends.**

**08/19/19** Suspended particulates from the Amazon reach São Paulo city *(Estadão)*

**08/21/19** Amazon fires in the New York Times and main media outlets *(New York Times) (Fox News) (CNN)*

**08/22/19** President of France, on Twitter, calls the fires an "international crisis". He calls members of G7 Summit to discuss it.
*(Twitter post. 08/22/19, 4:15 PM.*
*https://twitter.com/emmanuelmacron/status/1164617008962527232)*

**08/22/19** President Bolsonaro answers "The French president's suggestion that Amazonian matters be discussed at the G7 without the involvement of countries of the region recalls the colonialist mindset that is unacceptable in the 21st century." *(Twitter post)*

**08/23/19** President Macron says France would oppose an EU trade deal "in its current state" with the Mercosur bloc. *(BBC)*

**08/23/19** Government authorizes hiring fire brigades in the Amazon *(Agencia Brasil)*

**08/29/19** Brazil bans the use of fire in the Amazon for 60 days *(CNN)*

**08/29/19** Ibama delayed hiring of fire brigades *(O Globo)*

**09/18/19** 230 big investors representing $16.2 trillion call on firms to protect world's rainforests *(Reuters)*

**06/23/20** In light of rising deforestation, 251 financial institutions representing over $17 trillion demand action over the dismantling of environmental policies and protection agencies *(Folha de São Paulo)*

**09/15/20** On the first 14 days of September 2020, the Amazon already has more fires than in all September 2019 *(Folha de São Paulo)*