ROCZNIKI TEOLOGICZNE
Tom LXVIII, zeszyt 9 – 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18290/rt.21689.9

DARIUS J. PIWOWARCZYK SVD

TURNING *INDIOS* INTO NATIONALS. THE FIELD OF INDIGENISM IN BRAZIL AND PARAGUAY FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE 19TH TO THE END OF THE 20TH CENTURY

A b s t r a c t. Indigenism is a particular Latin American version of cultural field (in Bourdieu's sense) whose various participants (most notably government agencies, missionaries, anthropologists, media people, members of non-governmental organizations, as well as political and religious leaders of indigenous communities) vie for the prerogative to determine and enforce a historically specific notion of "Indigenousness" as part of the process of defining the national self. This process includes, among other things, efforts to "convert" and incorporate indigenous population into national society in reference to four narratives: universalism, citizenship, ethnicity, and – beginning in the 1970s – the (frequently subversive) voice of indigenous peoples themselves. This article is a comparative analysis of this process in Brazil and Paraguay, in the period extending from the early 19th to the end of the 20th century.

Keywords: Indigenism; Brazil; Paraguay; nation-building; Catholic missions; Bourdieu; modernization processes.

INTRODUCTION

This article concerns the field and the discourse of "indigenism" in Brazil and Paraguay conceptualized as a field of cultural production in Bourdieu's sense. The indigenist discourse has been historically created by interplay of three narratives – universalism, citizenship and race – in the process of defining and redefining the boundaries and the content of Brazilianness and Paraguayanness, in which the Indian was given the negative (inverted) features

Prof. dr hab. DARIUS J. PIWOWARCZYK SVD – Anthropos Institut, Arnold-Janssen-Str. 30, 53757 Sankt Augustin, Germany; e-mail: piwowarczyk@steyler.eu

of the "other." I further discuss the process of historical development of the field of indigenism in Brazil and Paraguay, respectively. In the early modern period (colonial America and the first decades of independence), an interplay of the narratives of universalism and citizenship in what later became independent nations of Brazil and Paraguay frequently resorted to the image of "noble savage" through which the Creole elites intended to distinguish themselves from Spaniards, on the one hand, and from Indians on the other. Similarly, in the modern period (1850-1970), in accordance with the dominant positivist ideology of progress, the Indian was perceived as "uncivilized," "childlike," or racially inferior in order to enhance the new definition of Brazilianness and Paraguayanness as "progressive," "modern," and – in the case of Paraguay – Christian. In the course of the 1970s, however – in the context of the emerging postmodern global discourse of "cooperation-participation" – the fourth, indigenous voice was added to the equation: universalism – citizenship – ethnicity. Part of that process was also a redefinition of the missionary presence of the mainstream Christian churches among indigenous peoples of the Americas, particularly after the Conference of Barbados (1971).

1. INDIGENISM AS A DISCOURSE AND AS A FIELD OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION

Alcida R. Ramos defines "indigenism" as a "set of ideas (and ideals) concerning the incorporation of indigenous peoples into nation states." She further expands this definition by including the "realm of popular and learned imagery about the Indians" and the "force field generated in the interethnic realm, [which] creates the conceptual and practical reality that is perhaps uncommon outside Brazil."[1] Seen in this way, indigenism is a Latin American version of Said's orientalism – the cultural strategy of constructing the "other" as the inverted/invented image of the self.[2] In other words, it is a discursively created ideological construct about otherness and sameness in the context of ethnicity and nationality.

[1] Alcida R. Ramos, *Indigenism. Ethnic Politics in Brazil* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), 6f.

[2] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979), 67.

Ramos identified, therefore, three structural components of indigenism: state policies toward indigenous population; the ideological/discursive construct (imagery); and what she terms the "force field." She emphasizes the ideological/cognitive element, namely, the discursive construction of the Indian as the "other" as an inversion of the national "self." Here, I wish to elaborate on the third component of Ramos' definition – that is, indigenism as a field – and specifically as a version of the field of cultural production.[3] I also go beyond Ramos' Brazilian perspective by including Paraguayan indigenous policies. Indigenism is, therefore, understood here as part of a broader discursive praxis of "inventing" and "re-inventing" nations in the ever-changing context of global political and socioeconomic processes.

Bourdieu defines the field as a "patterned system of objective forces [...], a relational configuration endowed with a specific gravity which it imposes on all objects and agents which enter in it."[4] As such, the field acts as a prism, in the sense that it refracts external forces (e.g. socioeconomic processes, ideas, etc.) according to its particular internal structure. Moreover, the field is also a space of conflict and competition wherein participants compete for a form of "capital" that is typical for this field, such as – for instance – the scientific authority in the academic field or the cultural authority in the cultural field.[5] Bourdieu's typology of fields and capitals includes, besides the cultural field, also the economic field, the religious field, the field of politics, etc. A sort of meta-field is what Bourdieu identifies as the "field of power" – the space of struggle for power among holders of the determinate amount of specific capital (economic and cultural capital in particular) that is sufficient to occupy the dominant position within their respective fields.[6]

One of the most significant features of cultural field, of the "field of cultural production," is that it exists in a subordinate position within the field of power whose principle of legitimacy is based on the possession of economic and political capital. As Johnson put it, the cultural field is situated within the field of power because of its accumulation or a high degree of symbolic capital, but in a dominated position because of its relatively low

---

[3] Cf. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

[4] Pierre Bourdieu, and Loïc J.D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 17.

[5] Ibidem.

[6] Ibidem, 76, fn. 16.

degree of economic capital.[7] In other words, the cultural field is the domain in which discourses are formulated and from which they are projected, although holders of cultural capital usually constitute the "dominated faction of the dominant." Cultural capital takes two forms: the symbolic capital – e.g. charisma, prestige, celebrity, or consecration – which hinges upon public recognition, and the cultural capital *sensu stricto* that is based on certain amount of cultural knowledge and skills. The dynamics of the cultural field manifests itself in the struggle between holders of these two types of cultural capital, which often takes the form of conflict between charisma and routine – that is, between "producers" and "reproducers" of symbols and cultural contents.

To summarize, "indigenism" belongs to the field of cultural production because its participants are generating discourses and practices aimed at securing the prerogative to define the "Indiannes".[8] They are, in the first place, holders of cultural and symbolic capital – media people, novelists, missionaries, NGOs workers, anthropologists, as well as indigenous political and religious leaders who – recently supported by certain representatives of the dominant society – often intend to correct (if not even invert) the image that has been imposed on them by the official – colonial, missionary, national, modernizing, etc. – transcripts.[9]

2. THE INDIGENISM AND THE "OTHERING" OR RE-INVENTING THE NATION IN BRAZIL AND PARAGUAY

In this section, I discuss the process of re-inventing the nationhood in Brazil and Paraguay through the interplay of narratives of universalism, citizenship and ethnicity in the course of the last two hundred years. This process led to the emergence of modern indigenist discourse in the 1970s, in the context of the transition to democracy in Brazil (1985) and in Paraguay (1993), and global cultural shifts labeled as "postmodernism." Missionaries

[7] Randal Johnson, "Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature and Culture," in Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 15f.

[8] Carmen Martinez Novo, *Who Defines Indigenous? Identities, Development, Intellectuals, an the State in Northern Mexico* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

[9] Ramos, *Indigenism*, 6. While the West is dominant in the material realm, Chatterjee says, the spiritual – the space where the essential marks of cultural identity are to be found – belongs to natives (1986, 59).

of various Christian denominations have made important contributions to these developments.

A. The Early Modern Period: Universalism vs. Citizenship and Natives as Noble Savages

The concepts of "universal human rights" and of "citizenship," as defined in the „Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen" (1789), are founded on the assumption that a single set of norms should be applied to all people regardless of their cultural diversity: the human being – his/her social standing and cultural specificity notwithstanding – exercises these rights as an individual rather than as a member of a group, society, or nation. Nonetheless, the same document also contains the idea that set in motion the process of emergence of nation-states – something quite opposite to its universal assumptions. What is meant here, specifically, is the "voluntarist" conception of nationality, according to which a "nation" signifies a political category of freely associating individuals who exercise their rule over a sovereign territory – a nation-state.[10]

This paradoxical interplay of universalism and nationalism also characterized the nation-building processes and the emergence of modern national identities in Brazil and Paraguay, whereby the notion of noble savage, coined by Jean Jacques Rousseau, was frequently used to draw cognitive boundaries between Brazilians or Paraguayans, on the one hand, and Indians and Spaniards (or Portuguese), on the other. Thus, the popular social movements of the 1780s in New Granada, Peru and in Paraguay (the *comunero* movement) manifested those political/economic cleavages between Spaniards and "Americans," and incipient nationalist feelings of the latter. Similarly, the ideologues of the Tupac Amaru rebellion in Peru (1780-1782) distinguished between *la gente peruana* – which included all "natives of Peru": whites, *mestizos* and Indians alike – and *la gente europea*[11]. Among those who gave cultural expression to "americanism" were also Jesuits expelled from the Spanish colo-

[10] Geoff Eley, and Ronald G. Suny, eds., *Becoming National: A Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 4. Here we can detect one of the paradoxes typical for modernity – an ironic outcome of the universalist discourse which ended up arguing for the particular. As Anderson put it: "No nation imagines itself as conterminous with mankind." Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso, 1991), 7.

[11] John Lynch, "The Origins of Spanish American Independence," in *The Independence of Latin America*, ed. Leslie Bethell (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 38.

nies in 1767.[12] Equally important was the philanthropic sentiment which brought about a recognition of the rights of Indians by Latin American writers and social activists. As Griffin states, "in part this was a mere reflection of the romantic cult of the noble savage in Europe, but it had practical consequences," such as the abolishment of the tribute, or a new legislation which created freer conditions for indigenous citizens.[13]

Still, the concept of the noble savage was something more than "a mere reflection" of romantic emotions with philanthropic consequences, as Griffin suggests; it also became a symbolic reference in the process of emerging Latin American nationalisms. A universal feature of every human being, Rousseau argued, is his/her natural goodness that was nonetheless spoiled by society; as such, the natural human being stands in opposition to the civil man. Rousseau's choice was to create a citizen without denying those natural (hence universal) qualities of man.[14] This idea of being "natural" and yet "civilized" made the concept of noble savage an attractive instrument in the process of construing national identities by members of Creole and *mestizo* elite who were "like Indians" and "like Spaniards," and yet somebody different. In this sense, as Bartra argues, "the myth [of the wild man] found a niche in the very kernel of new forms of humanist thought, for which some form of representing *otherness* became indispensable in a modern world more inclined toward defining the individual identity of the modern man [...] [It was] intrinsically linked to the definition and the wisdom of oneself: the I and the Other are inseparable."[15] How did this process develop in Brazil and Paraguay?

The attitude of the Portuguese toward indigenous inhabitants of what later became Brazil was – to say the least – ambivalent, as it oscillated between the admiration of their "natural" qualities and the urge to civilize them. Pero Vaz de Caminha, for instance, in his letter written in 1500 praised the Tupi-

[12] Ibidem, 39. Consciously or not, these clerical authors drew on the discourse of popular sovereignty as defined by the Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen, although their nationalism was rather cultural than political and was not in incompatible with imperial unity.

[13] Charles C. Griffin, "Enlightenment and Independence," in *Latin American Revolutions, 1808-1826: Old and New World Origins*, ed. John Lynch (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 252.

[14] Jakub Bronowski, and Bruce Mazlish, *The Western Intellectual Tradition: From Leonardo to Hegel* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1993), 291f.

[15] Roger Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass: The Mythic Origin of European Otherness* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), 169.

namba for their innocence, their cooperation and desire to trade, but at the same time he viewed them as a fertile ground for Christianization/civilization.[16] Later, at the end of the eighteenth century, the notion of noble savage even became part of the emerging Brazilian identity. One of the most interesting examples in this regard is the poem "Caramuru," written by the Augustinian friar José de Santa Rita Durão and published in Lisbon, in 1781. It is the story of a Portuguese man who "went native" and an indigenous woman who adopted French aristocratic customs. The "fusion of these two worlds," Ramos says, "was possible only because the Europeans [...] projected their ideal virtues onto the Indians." In this way, however, Europeans and Indians were "inextricably intertwined in the same glorious destiny, that of an emerging nation."[17]

A similar process was occurring in the Province of Paraguay – then the northern part of the Viceroyalty of Rio de la Plata. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, there existed in Paraguay two divergent policies toward natives: the "civilizing" (or *acriollante*) approach – represented by Governor Hernandarias de Saavedra – and the "universalist" or protectionist (*proteccionista*) policy, embraced by Royal Visitator Francisco de Alfaro.[18] Governor Hernandarias was interested in a complete integration of the Guarani Indians into colonial society by means of their concentration and subsequent Christianization in what was termed "Indian towns" (*los pueblos indios*) – first under the supervision of colonial authorities and later, since 1609, under the Jesuit tutelage.[19] On the other hand, the policy of Francisco de Alfaro was based on the universalist principle of "natural liberty" which implied the abolishment of serfdom and prohibition of any kind of offensive warfare against natives. These norms were later put in practice in the Franciscan and Jesuit reductions, although sometimes with unexpected results. Thus, when friar Luis de Bolaños ushered the *Ordenanzas de Alfaro* in the Indian towns of

[16] Ramos, *Indigenism*, 61.

[17] Ibidem, 65f. Interestingly, at the time José de Santa Rita Durão was writing his poem, the Portuguese dominion in Brazil was showing the first signs of decline. In this context the elites of the colony were encouraged to promote a "Brazilian" identity in order to justify their separatist economic-political ambitions.

[18] Branislava Sušnik, and Miguel Chase-Sardi, *Los indios del Paraguay* (Madrid: MAPFRE, 1995), 63. Hernandarias de Saavedra expressed his position in the *Ordenanzas indigenistas* promulgated before 1603. The protectionist policy was laid out in the *Ordenanzas de Alfaro* issued before 1614.

[19] Ibidem, 64.

Yuty and Caazapá, the Guarani understood the "natural liberty" as a permission to return to their previous lifestyle in the forest.[20]

The motif of noble savage persisted in the political discourse during the war of independence (1810-1811) and the first years of the republic. In 1810, for instance, during military operations against the newly independent Paraguay, General Belgrano, who represented the Junta of Buenos Aires, issued a circular letter directed to the inhabitants of the Province of Misiones, in which he declared that Indians are equal to the Creoles. The foundation of this status, Belgrano declared, was the fact that both "races" [*han tenido*] *la gloria de nacer en el suelo de América*.[21]

B. Citizenship vs. Ethnicity. The Civilizing Program or the Indian as a "Dressed Animal"

After the independence of Paraguay (1811) and Brazil (1822) had been achieved, there emerged the problem of legal status of indigenous peoples within the newly created states. The category of "noble savage" was no longer desired as a marker of distinctions between Creoles and Spaniards, and the Indians were ambiguously perceived as being naturals of the land and yet exotic foreigners to some extent. Consequently, they were expected to surrender their ethnic identity in order to become members of the national community in legal terms, and the legislators of both states cautiously avoided using the word "nations" in relation to indigenous groups, substituting it instead with the terms *etnias* or *parcialidades*.[22] Such approach was based on the premise of certain ontological incompleteness of Indians – "evidenced" by such "inhuman" customs like cannibalism, nudity, or incest – and resulted in concrete policies of eradication of particular ethnic identities in the name citizenship and becoming "one people".[23]

The notion of inferiority of Indians and the official (government and ecclesiastical) programs of civilizing them persisted in the following decades. Beginning with the second half of the 19th century, they were usually legitimated by positivist ideology of progress and by cultural evolutionism. This process intensified in the 1930s, during the economic crisis in the western world, when Latin American countries experimented with the so-called import

[20] Ibidem, 67.

[21] (Both races) "have had the honor to be born on the American soil." Ibidem, 218.

[22] "ethnic groups;" "tribes."

[23] Ramos, *Indigenism*, 73.

substitution industries (ISI), and later – in the 1960s – after the United States had launched the program and the discourse of development in the context of the political conflict with the Soviet Block. It was also accompanied by discursive "soul searching" and redefinition of nationhood across Latin America in terms of "progress" and – later – "development," as opposed to what was perceived as "savagery" and "backwardness" of indigenous or peasant sectors.

In Brazil, this new view of the Indian was again first expressed in the literature. Thus, although Indians were still idealized as somewhat similar to Brazilians in Gonçalves Dias' *I-Juca Pirama* (1851) and in José de Alencar's *O Guarani* (1857), this idealization took, however, a naturalistic twist: as the "indigenous blood" is a necessary component of Braziliannes, indigenous peoples will eventually disappear as distinct ethnic entities.[24] Consequently, in the late nineteenth century, the Comtean idea of civilizational (technical) progress became the benchmark of indigenous policies in Brazil. The ultimate purpose of those programs was to catapult Indians from their "fetishist" level directly to the "scientific" stage by skipping the intermediary – and undesirable – "metaphysical" phase.[25] The basic assumption here was that Indians are not only nature creatures to be studied by naturalists and anthropologists (Fig. 1) but also nation's children to be educated and acted upon. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Brazilian Civil Code of 1916 defined Indians as individuals possessing the status of relative legal incapacity, just like minors, married women, and prodigal sons.[26]

These policies intensified in the course of the 1960s – the era of "projects of development" masterminded and financed primarily by Western government agencies.[27] It was also the time of reinventing Brazilianness and its

[24] Cf. ibidem, 67.

[25] One of the most important figures of the emerging Brazilian indigenism of that period was Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon (1865-1958) – a military officer who undertook a series of expeditions into the Brazilian interior and contacted several indigenous group in Goias and in Mato Grosso. Rondon "assumed his destiny" of becoming empirical builder of the nation, thus putting into practice teachings of his military training which nourished the idea of "salvation through progress" (cf. Ramos, *Indigenism*, 155).

[26] Cf. ibidem, 154-157.

[27] The ideology of development was a regime of representations and a domain of thought and action which became dominant in the West and, through the intervention of Western institutions, expanded to those part of the globe that had been undergoing the process of decolonization (Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 31. It also created a bipolar vision of the world according to which the "West" and the "Soviet Block" – defined as the "First" and the "Second World," respectively – occupied its "developed" extreme, while Latin America and

Fig. 1. Family of the Caingang Indians of Brazil, 1876 (Beatrice Kümin, *Expedition Brasilien. Von der Forschungszeichnung zur ethnographischen Fotografie*. Bern: Benteli, 2007, 103)

reinforcement through – among others – its inscription in space, as Holston[28] argues in his book about President Kubitschek's project of building Brasilia – the nation's new capital in the interior. The city was conceived as the nucleus of a new, developed, and modern Brazil. As part of this project, the government published a map which contained the grid of linkages from the projected capital to the major cities of the country – the axes of development and the vectors of political unification of the "backward," indigenous interior with the established industrial and commercial centers on the coast (Fig. 2). Indeed, in the following decades, especially after the military coup in 1964, the development programs concentrated on the "peripheral areas," especially on Amazonia inhabited by numerous indigenous groups.[29] On the

the decolonized countries of Asia, Africa and Oceania were placed on its "underdeveloped" pole as the "Third World."

[28] James Holston, *The Modernist City. An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

[29] During the military administrations of Emilio Medici and Ernesto Geisel in the 1970s, Amazonia was the target of grandiose economic schemes, such as the road construction (e.g. the Transamazon Highway), settlement projects (the so-called *agrovilas*), mining, hydroelectric works, and cattle ranching.

other hand, the contacted groups were also exposed to diseases and suffered loss of land and social disruption.[30]

Fig. 2. Brasilia and national development,
(Holston, *The Modernist City*, 19).

Similar processes were also occurring in Paraguay since the mid-1800s, especially after the devastating Triple Alliance War (1864-1870).[31] The Burbonian project of "liberating" Indians through the dissolution of Jesuit missions was completed only in 1848, during the presidency of Carlos Antonio López, who – by the decree of October 7 of the same year – declared that all Indians were Paraguayan citizens and their land was property of the state. This act was also founded on the premise that there was no place for any independent indigenous communities within a nation state.[32] The subsequent

[30] Ramos, *Indigenism*, 201.

[31] The War of the Triple Alliance ("Paraguayan War") was fought from between Paraguay and the alliance of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. It was the deadliest and bloodiest inter-state war in Latin America's history. Paraguay suffered catastrophic losses in population and it was forced to cede territories in dispute to Argentina and Brazil.

[32] Sušnik, and Chase Sardi, *Los indios del Paraguay*, 224, 231). The reforms of King Carlos III Bourbon, implemented in Paraguay by Viceroy Aviles and later by Governor Velasco, were based on the universalist ideology of human rights. As such, they sought to "free" Indians from the communal system introduced by the Jesuits in their reductions and grant them right to private property in order to integrate them into regional economy (ibidem, 212).

Fig. 3. Guarani-Mbyá, early 1920s (Franz Müller, "Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Guaraní-Indianer im Östlichen Waldgebiet von Paraguay," *Anthropos* 29, no. 1-2 (1934): plate II)

Paraguayan governments opened the country, including the tribal territories that were now considered fiscal lands, to foreign investments. Thus, the law concerning the sale of public lands, promulgated on October 2, 1883, during the presidency of Bernardino Caballero, opened to "progress" extensive areas of forests, *yerbales*, and pastures. Another relevant piece of legislation was the law "concerning conversion of Indians to Christianity and civilization" approved on September 7, 1909.[33] Among organizations that later benefited from those regulations were also the Steyler Missionaries (SVD) – the German Catholic missionary society founded in 1875. In 1909, the society purchased around 100 sq. km of forest in East Paraguay and set up a mission among the Guarani-Mbyá. Their explicit goal was the conversion of Indians

[33] The article 3 of that legal act read that the Paraguayan government may grant up to 2000 hectares of fiscal lands to persons or institutions that would establish "reductions" aimed at "converting Indians to Christianity and civilization" (cf. Darius J. Piwowarczyk, "Missionaries of the 'Iron Cage.' The Indigenist Sector of the Society of the Divine Word [SVD] in Paraguay, 1910-2000," *Anthropos* 99, no. 2 (2004): 505.

by to Catholicism by means of catechesis, schooling and inculcation of Western technical skills.[34]

The "positivist spirit" was also implicit in the writings of leading Paraguayan intellectuals of that period. Manuel Dominguez, for instance, in his work "El Alma de la Raza" (1918) stated in reference to Jesuit reductions: *El cristianismo y la música dulcificaron la crueldad nativa del indio antrópofago*.[35] Similarly, Eloy Fariña Nuñez, an adherent to cultural evolutionism, wrote in 1918 that the Guarani (Fig. 3) possessed only a "rudimentary" and "mythic" (superstitious) imagination.[36] A decade later, in 1930, a member of the Paraguayan parliament pointed to what he termed "rusticity and ignorance of Indians and argued that it is a duty of the Legislative to create legal basis for their "conversion" to civilization.[37]

C. The postmodern period: the indian as a co-national

In the course of the last two hundred years, the meaning of Brazilianness and Paraguayanness has been defined and re-defined a number of times in the ever-shifting setting of broader economic, socio-political and cultural processes. As Marianne Heiberg put it: "Social boundaries provide interfaces for the necessary process of social classification and ordering. They are the means by which those perceived as 'similar' are separated from those who are perceived as significantly 'different' [...] [They] are responses to specific social circumstances [and] reflect and affect the distribution of political, economic and social resources in a particular society at a particular historical moment.[38]

In this section, I argue that the "particular historical moment" in which the redefinition of the national "self" in Brazil and Paraguay also produced a new conceptualization of the indigenous "other" was the decade of the 1970s – the time of a deep crisis and restructuring of world economy, accompanied

---

[34] Juan Bockwinkel, *Los heroes del Monday: Historia de la Mision Verbita en el Monday, 1910-1925* (Asunción, Editorial Salesianito, 1993), 121; Piwowarczyk, "Missionaries of the 'Iron Cage'", 505-509.

[35] "Christianity and music sweetened the native cruelty of the anthropophagous Indian."

[36] Sušnik, and Chase-Sardi, *Los indios del Paraguay*, 283-285.

[37] Ibidem, 287.

[38] Marianne Heiberg, "Basques, Anti-Basques, and the Moral Community," in *Becoming National. A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley, and Ronald G. Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 325.

by the so-called discourse of "cooperation-participation,"[39] with its particular stress on the local, the ecological, and the ethnic. This new trend, as Harvey says, was first visible in the domain of architecture, which accepted "the challenge to communicate with different client groups in personalized ways, while tailoring products to different situations, functions and taste cultures [...] as well as to be concerned with [...] signs of history [...] ethnic domain, signs of being neighbourly.[40]

As for the field of indigenism, a path-breaking event was the "Symposium on Inter-Ethnic Conflict in South America," held on Barbados in January 1971,[41] that assembled (predominantly Protestant) missionaries and anthropologists and set new standards for relations between national societies and indigenous peoples in South America. The final document of the symposium, the "Declaration of Barbados," urged nation states to end all forms of colonial exploitation of indigenous peoples on their territories. It also accused religious missions of "ethnocide" and anthropology of justification of colonialism, and concluded that Indians should be "protagonists of their own liberation."[42]

As such, the Declaration of Barbados was yet another manifestation of the "postmodern condition" of the world, which – with the stress on "ethnicity" and "participation" – also brought about a thorough restructuring of the field of indigenism. Specifically, the fourth "voice" – that of Indians themselves – was added to the existing three narratives: universalism, citizenship, and race (or missionary, state, and scientific discourses respectively). In today's field of indigenism, the Indians are generally holding the "symbolic capital,"[43] and in this position they intend to correct official definitions of Brazilianness Paraguayanness, etc. founded on the negative, "inverted" vision of the Indian as the „other" – namely, a "pagan," a "savage," or a "child."[44]

---

[39] Cf. Sharryn Kasmir, *The Myth of Mondragon. Cooperatives, Politics and Working-Class Life in a Basque Town* (New York: State University of New York Press 1996), 5f.

[40] David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1990), 76.

[41] Also known as the "First Conference of Barbados." It was organized by the World Council of Churches.

[42] Walter Dostal, ed., *The Situation of the Indian in South America* (Geneva: WCC, 1972), 376-81.

[43] Jacques Galinier, and Antoinette Molinié, *Les néo-Indiens. Une religion de IIIe millénaire* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006).

[44] "Whereas for the nationals, according to national ideology, citizenship is a natural result of having been born and raised in the country, for the Indians citizenship is a tactic of survival amid the national population...What is natural for the Indians is their ethnic specificity...The Indian groups most successful in the politics of interethnic contact have been those who have

At the same time, the "official" holders of cultural capital active in the field of indigenism, e.g. media people, politicians, missionaries, and agents of various NGOs, are – in many instances – still carrying the modified versions of the old, "othering" discourses. As Ramos noticed for Brazil, a contemporary version of the "noble savage" narrative is the attitude of certain "friends of the Indians" among university people, journalists, lawyers, artists, anthropologists, "who seem to demand from the Indians an unshakable integrity. Indians must defend to the death, if need be, the firmness of their convictions, be these fighting for the land, resisting official or private development plans, refusing bribes, or rejecting dubious deals. [...] The problem [is] that the Indians seem to have a mind of their own – they [are] attuned to issues that do not quite coincide with those of their friends."[45] Brazilian Indians are, therefore, able and willing to project their own voice in the field of indigenism, and they are using several channels, such as the media, official political institutions, religious organizations and the NGOs to this purpose. Historically, the first channel for transmitting the indigenous point of view was provided in the early 1970s by the Catholic Church within the conceptual framework of liberation theology that began to gain momentum at that time. In 1972, the Church in Brazil established the Indigenist Missionary Council (CIMI) as part of its efforts to coordinate work among the country's indigenous groups. CIMI organized numerous "indigenous assemblies," or meetings of indigenous political and religious leaders whose purpose was to provide them with interethnic experience and to discuss common problems that were affecting their communities. Out of this experience, the leaders eventually established their own autonomous organizations, such as UNI (founded in 1980), whose goal was to promote the autonomy and self-determination of indigenous communities.

Paraguay began its transition to democracy in 1989, after President Alfredo Stroessner (1912-2006) had been removed from power by the military coup of February 3, following thirty five years of his uninterrupted dictatorship. The "transitional period" ended in 1993, with the first democratic elections in the country's history. The elections were preceded by the promulgation of a new constitution that officially recognized indigenous groups of

---

best played the natural-versus-instrumental game by pragmatically manipulating these categories as strategic devices" (Ramos, *Indigenism*, 98f.).

[45] Ramos, *Indigenism*, 70f.

Paraguay as distinct „peoples." Those political shifts also created conditions for a more explicit participation of Indians in the public life of the republic.

Even before those events, however, in the course of the 1970s, the Catholic Church in Paraguay opened the first venue for voicing indigenous complaints that was not controlled by the state. Specifically, inspired by the Declaration of Barbados, Catholic indigenists in Paraguay, led by Frs. Bartomeu Meliá SJ (1932-2019) and Josef Seelwische OMI critically rethought and redefined their work within indigenous communities. Like their counterparts in Brazil, the missionaries began to organize regular meetings of native leaders in the Chaco, particularly among the Nivaclé (under the auspices of the Oblates of Immaculate Mary – OMI), and in Eastern Paraguay – first among the Guaraní-Avá and later among the Guarani-Mbyá and among the Aché – the groups accompanied by the Steyler Missionaries (SVD) and the Sisters Servants of the Holy Spirit (SSpS).

Another indigenist organization, sponsored by the Catholic University of Asunción, was the "Marangatú Project" founded in 1974. In the same year, the indigenous leaders grouped in that organization created the Indigenous Directing Council – the first civil association with indigenous self-government in Paraguay. Their task was "to govern the Marangatú Project and provide direction to all the indigenous groups of Paraguay as a legitimate indigenous organization.[46] The Council led to the formation of the "Asociación de Parcialidades Indigenas" (API) which, however, did not achieve any significant political importance. The leaders, who by and large became "urban Indians" (with a permanent domicile in the capital), grew distant from their grass-roots base of support. Furthermore, the API leadership became involved in several affairs of corruption concerning projects of development financed by foreign governments and NGOs.[47]

CONCLUSION

Indigenism is a field in Bourdieu's sense – part of a broader cultural field in the Latin American setting – whose participants: missionaries, government agencies, academicians, the media, members of non-governmental organiza-

[46] Esther Prieto, "Indigenous Peoples in Paraguay," in *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, ed. Donno Lee Van Cott (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 239.

[47] Cf. ibidem, 240.

tions, and leaders (both political and religious) of indigenous communities, vie for the prerogative to define (and inculcate) a historically specific "Indianness" as part of the process of defining the national self. As such, it includes the politics of incorporation of indigenous population to nation-states as well as the official and popular imagery about Indians expressed in four discourses: universalism, citizenship, ethnicity, and – beginning in the 1970s – the (frequently subversive) voice of indigenous peoples themselves.

In this article, I intended to provide a comparative analysis of the evolution of this field in Brazil and Paraguay, focusing on its role in the nation-making processes. In the early modern period – that is, during the colonial era in the Americas and the first decades of independence (mid-1600s to the mid-1800s) – the Creole elites in Brazil and Paraguay, including ecclesiastical writers, were frequently using the concept of "noble savage" to mark their distinctiveness from Europeans – Portuguese or Spaniards respectively. The "modern period" (from the mid-1800s to the 1970s) was the time when the public discourse and policies towards indigenous peoples in Latin America were marked by the positivist notions of "evolution," "race," "progress," and (beginning in the 1960s) "development." During that period, "Brazilianness" and "Paraguayanness" were discursively construed as progressive, and juxtaposed against "Indianness" that was viewed as backward if not even animallike. Finally, beginning in the 1970s, the postmodern critique of the established meta-narratives (including the Christian and the positivist ones) – with its emphasis on the "ecological," the "ethnic," and the "local" – created conditions in which the indigenous voice became part of the ongoing process of defining the Brazilian and Paraguayan self in the global context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1991.

Bartra, Roger. *Wild Men in the Looking Glass: The Mythic Origin of European Otherness*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Bockwinkel, Juan. *Los héroes del Monday: Historia de la Mision Verbita en el Monday, 1910-1925*. Asunción. Editorial Salesianito, 1993.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J.D. Wacquant. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bronowski Jacob, and Bruce Mazlish. *The Western Intellectual Tradition: From Leonardo to Hegel*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1993.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Dostal, Walter, ed. *The Situation of the Indian in South America*. Geneva: WCC, 1972.
Eley, Geoff, and Ronald G. Suny, eds. *Becoming National: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
Galinier, Jacques, and Antoinette Molinié. *Les néo-Indiens. Une religion de IIIe millénaire*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2006.
Griffin, Charles C. "Enlightenment and Independence."In *Latin American Revolutions, 1808-1826: Old and New World Origins*, ed. John Lynch. 247-257. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1990.
Heiberg, Marianne. "Basques, Anti-Basques, and the Moral Community." In *Becoming National. A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley, Ronald G. Suny. 325-335. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Holston, James. *The Modernist City. An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
Johnson, Randal. "Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature and Culture." In Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*. 1-25. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
Kasmir, Sharryn. *The Myth of Mondragon. Cooperatives, Politics and Working-Class Life in a Basque Town*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.
Kümin, Beatrice. *Expedition Brasilien. Von der Forschungszeichnung zur ethnographischen Fotografie*. Bern: Benteli, 2007.
Lynch, John. "The Origins of Spanish American Independence." In *The Independence of Latin America*, ed. Leslie Bethell. 1-48. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Martinez Novo, Carmen. *Who Defines Indigenous? Identities, Development, Intellectuals, and the State in Northern Mexico*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006.
Müller, Franz. "Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Guaraní-Indianer im Östlichen Waldgebiet von Paraguay." *Anthropos* 29, no. 1-2 (1934): 177-208.
Piwowarczyk, Darius J. "Missionaries of the 'Iron Cage'. The Indigenist Sector of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) in Paraguay, 1910–2000." *Anthropos* 99, no. 2 (2004): 499-518.
Prieto, Esther. "Indigenous Peoples in Paraguay." In *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, ed. Donna Lee Van Cott. 235-55. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
Ramos, Alcida R. *Indigenism. Ethnic Politics in Brazil*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1998.
Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
Sušnik, Branislava, and Miguel Chase-Sardi. *Los indios del Paraguay*. Madrid: MAPFRE, 1995.

INDIANIN JAKO WSPÓŁOBYWATEL. POLE INDYGENIZMU W BRAZYLII I PARAGWAJU OD POCZĄTKU XIX DO KOŃCA XX WIEKU

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Autor niniejszego artykulu definiuje „indygenizm" jako specyficzną, latynoamerykańską wersję pola produkcji kulturowej (w sensie Bourdieu), którego uczestnicy (agencje rządowe, organizacje misyjne, antropolodzy, media, organizacje pozarządowe, a także polityczni i religij-

ni przywódcy rdzennych społeczności) zabiegają o „prawo" do określania i egzekwowania historycznie uwarunkowanej formy „indiańskości" w stałym procesie definiowania tożsamości narodowej. W wymiarze dyskursywnym działania te, obejmujące m.in. programy zmierzające do „nawracania" oraz włączania ludności rdzennej do dominujących społeczności narodowych, tradycyjnie odwoływały się do trzech narracji: uniwersalizm, obywatelstwo i etniczność (rasa). Począwszy od lat siedemdziesiątych XX wieku, również narracja ludności indiańskiej, prezentowana przez jej przywódców politycznych i religijnych, stała się częścią „oficjalnego" dyskursu indygenistycznego. Niniejszy artykuł stanowi analizę porównawczą tego procesu w Brazylii i Paragwaju w okresie od początku XIX do końca XX wieku.

Słowa kluczowe: indygenizm; Brazylia; Paragwaj; procesy narodotwórcze; misje katolickie; Bourdieu.