1. Introduction

In this paper I will outline Brazilian language policy from colonial times to the present and focus on the legislation that governs the indigenous groups. I will show the evolution of official attitudes towards the indigenous peoples and their languages and the implications of these attitudes.

In order to make the reading of this paper easier, it is important that I explain some of my language choices. Firstly, the term *transplanted* is used to identify the communities of immigrant origin. In Brazil, the word *foreign* has traditionally been applied to describe those communities and the non-Brazilian languages spoken by them. Indeed, some of these languages are officially taught as *foreign languages* (e.g. German, Japanese, and Italian). However, I understand that the word *foreign* can imply ‘non-Brazilian people’, without allowing the idea of regional cultural distinction. On the contrary, the term *transplanted* conveys the idea of setting out from one place to the other, transferring the old to revitalise the new in integration.

Secondly, I use the term *lingua franca* in order to indicate a language used within an area as a commercial or contact language among members of the different speech communities. A lingua franca is not necessarily a *lingua mista*, i.e. a hybrid language formed by the merger of the vocabulary systems of two or more languages, such as the *lingua geral* (a language which was based on Tupi and used by the Jesuits to contact African and indigenous people in early colonial times in Brazil).

Thirdly, I avoid the use of the word *Indian* which presents a systemic ambiguity in the English language: it represents both the natives of India as
well as the native American inhabitants. The use of the word *Indian* in reference to the native Americans seems to imply the continued acceptance of the distorted Colombian view of the land the Europeans had reached as “India”. The retention of this misapplied geographical term still carries unfortunate implications of the colonial discourse which has been avoided, in English, by the use of the modern word *Amerindian*. In Portuguese, such ambiguity is avoided by the use of two different terms: *indiano*, the generic term used to define natives of India, and *índio*, the word to designate indigenous peoples in the Americas. I chose to introduce this last word to my English text. However, whenever I am translating the names of Brazilian organisations and institutions, I respect the agreed translations into English which retain the word Indian.

2. Linguistic context in Brazil

Brazil is a multilingual and a multiethnic country. Its population of around 156 million inhabitants is made up mainly of lusophones who live with several transplanted linguistic communities and 206 indigenous groups who speak their own native languages.¹

The Brazilian variety of Portuguese is the official language which is widely spoken throughout a country that is 8.547.403.5 km² (three times the size of India and 35 times that of Great Britain). Brazilian Portuguese is used in government departments, in official schools and by the media.

However, bilingualism is present in transplanted communities where Portuguese and their mother tongue are spoken in their daily lives. In places like these, Portuguese may well be the second language but it is, nonetheless, a necessity for communicating with people from the dominant society.

Where the indigenous communities are concerned, the language spoken will be one of the 170 Brazilian native languages (Rodrigues, 1986; Assis, 1993). The only exceptions are those indigenous groups who have lost their language -- e.g. the Pataxó (1,762 people) and the Pataxó-Hãhãhãe (1,270), in Bahia.² As in the case of transplanted language minorities,
Portuguese is also a second language for the indigenous groups for communicating with the dominant society and, in addition, as a lingua franca amongst themselves.

The response of the Brazilian State, in the face of such linguistic diversity, has varied significantly from one historical moment to another. To date, the government has failed to produce a consistent language policy towards its minorities. Policy has oscillated between harsh repression\(^3\) and complete neglect of the linguistic minorities and although, more recently, official steps have been taken to support minorities, most attention has been paid to the situation of the indigenous peoples.

3. Minority language policy in Brazil

In 1500 when the Portuguese colonisers arrived in Brazil introducing their own language, they found a population of around 5 million people who spoke their own indigenous languages (Rodrigues, 1986; Bortoni, 1986). The Portuguese ruled the country for almost four hundred years (1500-1889) but it was not before the 18\(^{th}\) century, during the reign of Don José I, that the Portuguese language was required for official purposes. Don José’s First Minister, the Marquis of Pombal\(^4\), prescribed through the Indian Directive (Diretório dos Indios, 1759) the use of Portuguese within the missions controlled by the Catholic Society of Jesus. The Jesuits used the lingua geral, as a means of spreading God’s Word because, though it was a Tupi-based language, it was supra-ethnic in the sense that it was widely spoken among the different indigenous peoples. It was also the language that literacy as well as the uniformity of the religious discourse (both seen as essential for the preservation of orthodoxy) was introduced. Grammars, dictionaries and religious texts written by the Jesuits were used in all the Jesuit missions and schools. In these schools, pupils were required to know the lingual geral and, remarkably, the focus of the training of Jesuit novices was on language translation rather than on theology itself. It was more important to learn the lingua geral than even to learn Latin (Orlandi, 1985; Bortoni, 1986; Barros, 1993a; 1993b).
The whole question of who manipulated communication with the native population quickly became a fundamental conflict between the Jesuits and the colonisers over the control of indigenous slave labour. The Jesuits started to replace the colonisers as official interpreters for the Portuguese administration during their expeditions to capture and enslave indigenous people. At this point there was a commonality of interest between the Jesuits and the colonial administration, which explains why the Portuguese government did not oppose the **lingua geral** policy introduced by the Jesuits. However, as the Jesuits turned into a threat to the Portuguese rule, that policy was officially ended in 1759. The Jesuits were expelled from Portugal and, only a year later, from Brazil itself. On the part of the colonial administration, this policy was not only linked to the micro use of language within the Society of Jesus but also to the macro issue of overall imperial control of Portuguese colonial territories.

Indeed, in order to understand language policy towards the indigenous minorities in Brazil, one cannot divorce linguistic rights from the whole issue of indigenous rights in general, including land rights.5

Since 1850, Brazilian territory has been divided between **public land**, which was owned by the State, and **private land**, which was owned by those who had legal documentary evidence of this right and, therefore, official possession of the land. At this time the territories of the indigenous peoples were considered private but, as the indigenous peoples were unable to provide legal evidence of their ownership of the land because they were not literate in Portuguese nor had access to knowledge about administrative procedures, many were expelled from their land or deceived and dispossessed.

The Republican period – from 1989 – was marked by struggle between the indigenous peoples and the non-indigenous members of dominant society. Land possession became a tug of war which lasted until 1910 when a new indigenous policy was introduced with the creation of the SPI, Serviço de Proteção ao Indio (Service for the Protection of the Indian). The SPI was set up on 20 July 1910 under the direction of an individual of indigenous origin, Mashal Cândido Rondon, a visible sign of the new policy. By this policy the
indigenous peoples acquired the right to live within their own distinctive traditions. This policy was never thoroughly implemented and, in 1967, three years after the *military coup d'etat* \(^6\), the SBPI was replaced by the FUNAI/Fundação Nacional do Indio (National Indian Foundation)\(^7\).

The new institution – under the auspice of the Ministry of the Interior – was charged with the administration, conservation, expansion promotion of the indigenous patrimony. Gathering information and allowing scientific studies and research among the native peoples was also its role. Underlying all these responsibilities was the fundamental requirement of guaranteeing the basic education needed to bring about the progressive integration of the members of indigenous communities into the mainstream society. Further, FUNAI was even given the responsibility of exercising power of policing and controlling indigenous areas.

During the years of nationalistic ‘euphoria’ created by the rule of General Emílio Medici\(^8\), the PIN, Plano de Integração Nacional (National Integration Plan), started expanding the road network towards the North aiming to integrate the Amazon region with the rest of the country To this end, development programmes on education, health and agriculture directed at individual communities with technical aid called DCs, Desenvolvimento de Comunidades (Community Development), were taken into rural and indigenous communities (such as the Krahô, Gavião, Xavante and Yanomami groups). The ideological assumption underpinning these programmes was that “better conditions of life” brought into ‘underdeveloped’ would prevent “the danger of socialism” (Ammann, 1984: 24) – a recurrent nightmare for a right wing regime. In addition, the development programmes would be a way of turning these areas into new markets with new consumers; political and economic integration. The means of achieving this transformation was the provision of scientific and technical aid\(^9\).

After the Estatuto do Índio (Indian Statute, Law No. 6001, from 19 December 1973) was passed, educational programmes were allowed to introduce the indigenous languages along with the Portuguese as is read in article 19:
Literacy teaching among **indios** is to be done in their groups’ native language as well as in Portuguese and **the first is to be safeguarded**.

_Estatuto do Indio, Article 49. (My emphasis)._
The education of the *índios* will be oriented towards integration through a process of gradual comprehension of the general issues and values of the mainstream society, as well as the use of their individual aptitudes.

*Estatuto do Índio*, Article 50.

A preoccupation with the primacy of the language and the culture of the mainstream society lie behind the Indian Statute. As a consequence of this policy of integration carried out by the State, the indigenous languages were used only in the initial primary school years as a tool for facilitating assimilation. The schools were presented with curricula which, though supposedly bilingual, were by no means bicultural – something that was to be made clear as the 70s were closing down.

The period had the merit of promoting an academic debate on the introduction of indigenous languages in educational programmes. On the one hand, the use of native language in educational programmes was seen as a means of revitalizing the indigenous cultures while, on the other, it was seen as a means of facilitating submission to the dominant culture.

In 1979, the Comissão Pró-Indio (Pro-Indian Commission) convened the 1º Encontro Nacional de Trabalho sobre Educação Indígena (1 National Working Party on Indigenous Education) in the city of Sao Paulo where the debate on indigenous education was publicly initiated. In that meeting, different educational programmes – either run by FUNAI or by religious missions – were analysed and the need to establish an important and the need to establish an important terminological distinction between *educação indígena* (indigenous education) and *educação para os índios* (education for the *índios*) emerged.

*Indigenous education* is defined as a set of different traditional processes of socialisation and processes for the reproduction of knowledge which are specific to each indigenous culture. The characteristics of this type of education are that: (1) one is educated through life, i.e. by living and participating in different community events; (2) education reaches everyone equally; (3) knowledge which is essential for surviving is commonly shared by all; (4) knowledge transmission is carried out orally, i.e. literacy practices are not native procedures; and (5) there is no specialised institution with an educational role, i.e. there is no equivalent to our schools (Silva, 1981: 2). In
the indigenous communities, education is a continuous and multiple process (developed by different members of the community) and learning is constructed by means of imitation and spontaneous play in which everyone learns with and from everyone (Meliá, 1979).

**Education for the indios** happens in a different context; that of contact between the indigenous groups and dominant society. This may happen informally (as a product of the relations between natives and members of the mainstream society around the indigenous area, between natives and FUNAI officials or between natives and missionaries) or, equally, can take place formally inside school. Grizzi and Silva (1981: 16) have restricted this type of education to the school context and have based themselves on the principle that education for the indios can never be neutral. They further subdivide this kind of education into two types: (a) official and (b) alternative education. Educational programmes of the first type are linked to an official orientation and respond to the belief that the indios are going to/should merge with the mainstream society, while those of the latter trend are linked to an alternative indigenous movement which is based in the conviction that the indios are going to/should survive. **Official education** is described as “lacking in respect” for the indigenous peoples; instead of protecting them, this type of education “dominates and destroys” them since it is “cloaked in an authoritarian paternalism” (Grizzi and Silva, 1981: 17). **Alternative education** is described as a product of the critical awareness emerging from the coming together of the indigenous movements in the 1970s.

As papers published by the Pro-Indian Comission/SP (Meliá, 1981; Silva, 1981; Grizzi and Silva, 1981; Rodrigues, 1981) have documented, education is a political process and is, therefore, linked to the new vision of education raised further issues connected with the kind of bilingual programmes which have been developed in indigenous communities.

Assis (1993) carried out an overall analysis of the reports published by the Pro-Indian Committee (1981) in the light of two models of bilingual education. First, the traditional model under which the home language is used as a means of instruction only until the students have acquired sufficient
control of the mainstream language. The work among the Kaingang (Nascimento, 1981) is described as “a typical example of the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) (SIL)”, a religious organisation – very active in the late 60s and in the 70s –whose “overall project was translating the Bible into indigenous languages and then helping the native speakers of those languages to become literate in their own languages”. Other researchers (such as Meliá, 1979; Orlandi, 1987; 1985; Rodrigues, 1988; Barros, 1994b) have covered the issue of assimilation in the SIL literacy programmes in Brazil.

The second model of bilingual education analysed by Assis (1993) is the maintenance model which upholds the long term use of the L1 (native language) and the right of the students to maintain their native language and culture. The bilingual education developed in the Xavante (Ferreira, 1981) and in the Suruí (Altman and Zwetsch, 1981) speech communities are cited among others as attempts of the maintenance models. Paula and Paula (1981) supporters of the language maintenance model, “ended up using the transitional model” in their experience with the Tapinaré. They started with the L1, but were forced to stop because of their lack of vocabulary and the problems they were having with syllabic structure and spelling in the indigenous language.

A third model of bilingual education is the enrichment model (Fishman, 1976; Mackey, 1972; Paulston, 1975), in which the opportunity of becoming bilingual is also open to mainstream language speakers. It is obvious that educational experiences following such model would imply a change of attitudes on the part of the State.

When the military government ended, the need for the writing of a new Constitution arose. The New Republic (as the period after civilians returned to power has been called) brought an end to more than two decades of dictatorship, censorship, limitation of civil rights and disrespect for human rights. As rights start to be discussed by the Assembléia Constituinte the issues about minorities start to be addressed. When the New Constitution was proclaimed on 5 October 1988, the indigenous peoples were granted the status of distinctive.
The rights of the *índios* to their social organisation, customs, *languages*, beliefs and traditions, and over the lands that they traditionally occupy are recognised, having the Union the duty of protecting and making all their state respected.

*Constituição do Brasil* (1988), Chapter VII, Article 231. (My emphasis).

If the lack of the Portuguese language allowed the indigenous peoples to be deceived and disposed of their own lands in the past, the maintenance of indigenous languages is presently seen as a marker of identity which will testify to their rights over the land. However, as Orlandi (1990) has shown in her study of the Pataxó group, language is not the only criterion for the recognition of the identity of the *índio*.

In 1988, at last, the Brazilian State officially recognised the indigenous languages. Until then, Brazil was considered to be a monolingual country. The Constitution of 1946 and 1967 alluded only to a *national language* – understood as Brazilian Portuguese – that was the only one to be used in primary school. The actual wording in each Constitution were respectively:

O ensino primário é obrigatório e só será dado na *língua nacional*. Primary schooling is obligatory and will be taught only in the *national language*.

*Constituição do Brasil* (1946), Chap. 2, Art. 168, I.

O ensino primário será *somente* ministrado na *língua nacional*. Primary schooling is to be taught *exclusively* in the *national language*.

*Constituição do Brasil* (1967), Art. 176, § 3, I.

The use of the term *national* in official legal enactment over a period of more than forty years – the 1946 and 1967 Constitutions and the 1973 Indian Statute – is *per se* indicative of the firmly held view of Brazil as a monolingual and monocultural society.

The 1988 Constitution was therefore a significant step forward in favour of the indigenous minorities. The Indian Statue had facilitated the use of indigenous languages in schools but it was the new Constitution that legitimised their use and made possible the introduction of their own pedagogies. The terms of the Constitution read as follows:
O ensino primário regular será ministrado em língua portuguesa, assegurada às comunidades indígenas também a utilização de suas línguas maternas e processos próprios de aprendizagem. Basic education is to be provided in the Portuguese language, safeguarding the indigenous communities’ right to use their mother tongues and their own learning procedures.


Despite the 1988 Constitution the responsibility for schools located in indigenous areas was not made clear. These schools remained outside the official educational system until 1991 (Cavalcanti, 1996). In 1991, the Brazilian Ministry of Education was given official responsibility for them.

In 1993 the Ministry of education presented written directions for a specific policy for those schools. The document recognised that an education policy towards indigenous minorities was to respect their cultural differences, including their languages and their own pedagogic procedures (Grupioni, 1994).

In 1994, a national committee – CEEI, Comitê de Educação Escolar Indígena – made up of people elected every three years was then formed to discuss aims of the schools of the indigenous areas for the next ten years. The committee consists of (a) indigenous representatives, (b) representatives of the FUNAI and of the Ministry of Education, (c) representatives of no-governmental organizations, (d) academics representing the Brazilian universities and (e) researchers representing the Associação Brasileira de Linguística, ABRALIN (Brazilian Association of Linguistics), and the Associação Brasileira de Antropologia (ABA, Brazilian Association of Anthropology) (Grupioni, 1994).

3. Shortcomings of the present minority language policy

A nation can openly support and preserve its minority languages by recognizing them in the national Constitution and by giving them status in the regions where they are used. The Brazilian State has taken a step forward in this direction, at least with respect of the indigenous communities – but the Constitution does not provide the basis for fully equitable language policy.
According to Grosjean (1982), there are factors to be considered by policy makers, e.g. political militancy, attitude towards the minority languages, numerical importance of the speakers of each of these languages, the teaching materials designed for them, the number of trained teachers to work with these communities and the use and function of their languages.

In relation to political militancy, there has been a strong reversal in attitudes among the indigenous peoples of Brazil since the mid 70s but not yet to that stage. Typically the indigenous peoples have not been militant but, since then, they have started to mobilise.

The transplanted communities have not yet reached the stage of mobilisation. During the deliberations of the Assembléia Constituinte (1987-88), they did lack a voice in the discussion of linguistic rights and policies towards minority languages. The only mention of the transplanted languages was registered by the Committee of Education, Culture and sports in the minutes of 17 July 1987 when the anthropologist marina Vilas Boas referred to the “existence of thirty different foreign languages of European, Asian and African backgrounds in Brazil”. It is significant that this remark was made in the context of her defence of the use of the indigenous peoples’ native languages and own pedagogical procedures in their communities.

On the contrary, the cause of indigenous groups and their languages was strongly supported by anthropologists, sociologists, linguists, educators and missionaries, as well as by different national and international academic organisations. A good deal of pressure has been put on the Brazilian government by several non-governmental institutions created by people who were critical of the policy towards indigenous minorities; among which are the Conselho Indigenista (CIMI, Indigenous Missionary Council, founded in 1972); the Centro Ecumênico de Documentação Indígena (CEDI, Ecumenical Centre for Indian Documentation, 1974); and the Associação Nacional de Apoio ao Índio (ANAI, National Association for the Support of the Indian, 1977). The first two have religious support, while the third is a secular group. These organisations have gathered supporters for the indigenous cause throughout the country. 
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Several indigenous leaders have now risen to political posts that have been crucial in terms of decision-making about their destinies.\(^\text{16}\) They have also organised themselves into a national association, União das Nações Indígenas (UNI, Association of Indigenous Nations)\(^\text{17}\) whose representative, Ailton Krenak, spoke to the Sub-Committee of Education as registered in the minutes of 17 July 1987. From 1988, indigenous leaders’ speeches had much more impact than the defence provided by the representatives of non-governmental organisations and academic institutions.

**Attitudes** towards indigenous languages have changed significantly as political mobilisation has increased. The ignorance about indigenous languages and cultural diversity among lay members of the Brazilian population is now receding as greater numbers of researchers are becoming involved in the field and more publicity on the topic has been given by the media. The positivist approach to the study of the Brazilian indigenous languages traditionally held by researchers has been replaced by empowering methodologies. According to Da Cunha (1990: 31), political attitudes have been marked, even in academic discourse, by the introduction of expressions such as "education for the índio" (*educação pró-índio*) and "education against the índios" (*educação anti-índio*). Orlandi (1990: 164) has written that the índio is not "the other, someone from another continent" but "the next to us (Brazilians), or even ourselves".

Nevertheless, in spite of the growing feeling of sympathy and respect for the indigenous heritage throughout the nation, some government officials and military authorities have shown they are uneasy about the areas which are inside the 150 km strip along the Brazilian borders, such as the area of the Yanomami (Aparício, 1992). Also, political and economic regional groups have been pressing the Congress to change some of the indigenous rights over the land guaranteed in the 1988 Constitution (for example, the right to use the wealth in the soil, rivers and lakes of their land\(^\text{18}\)). The arguments for the amendments are based on statistics which contrast the poor living conditions of large numbers of the Brazilian lower classes with the land wealth of the small numbers of the indigenous population.
The numerical importance of the indigenous peoples has also been a controversial issue in relation to language policy. Data on indigenous groups shows that, in 1990, the indigenous population was approximately 235 thousand. During the deliberations of the Assembléia Constituinte, the indigenous population was estimated to be only 0.14% of the total population of the country. Since colonial times the massive population decrease (from the 5 million reported in 1500) has been due to a number of factors: extermination and slavery as a result of the European settlement, epidemics of contagious diseases brought in from the Old World, and the progressive reduction of land relied upon for subsistence (hunting, food gathering and planting). Recent figures published by CIMI show that the number of Brazilian indigenous population has estimated in “between 250 and 300 thousand from 200 different groups speaking 170 native languages and living in 497 reserved areas (900,000 km²) which occupy 10.52% of the Brazilian territory”. (Jornal do Brasil, 19 April 1995).

Rodrigues (1986) listed 170 indigenous languages out of which only eight (Guarani, Guadalajara, Xavante, Mukuxi, Terena, Tukano, Yanomami, and Tikuna) have more than 5 thousand speakers, 13% have only one thousand speakers and 25% fewer than 100. In this context, it is disappointing to recognise that more than a hundred of the total number of indigenous languages remain to be studied at all. Although sixty have been partially described, a mere dozen have been subjected to a thorough linguistic description. In spite of Rodrigues’ call as long ago as 1966 for Brazilian linguists to commit themselves to the study of their indigenous languages, little has been done to date and the vacuum left by this failure has been filled by the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) who have, over a period of more than three decades, produced several phonological descriptions, some bilingual dictionaries, a number of bible translations, and a few pedagogical grammars (Montserrat, 1986).

On the applied side, neither the training of teachers nor the production of teaching materials - both crucial areas - have been sufficiently addressed. There has been an increase in the number of both native and non-native teachers in indigenous areas. According to FUNAI, in 1981, there were 172
non-native and 84 native teachers; in 1985, there were 186 non-native and 178 native teachers; in 1988, 451 non-native and 244 native teachers. By mid 1990, SIL claimed to have developed literacy materials in 34 different languages and trained literacy instructors in 20 of them (SIL 1990). At the same time there has been this increase in teachers and in literacy materials, there has also been serious criticism of the quality of their training as well as the materials used to teach indigenous groups (Da Cunha, 1990).19

The need for urgent action in the context of reducing numbers of indigenous language speakers is self-evident. Indeed, some linguists would fix at 5,000 the minimum number necessary for the survival of a language (Assis, 1993). However, such an assumption cannot be accepted without much fuller information on the use, functions and, in particular, the values of these languages. These issues have been, to an extent, addressed by workers in the field but most linguistic research, so far, has been limited to formal description20 and little has been done to set such descriptions within the social and cultural context of the lives of the users of the languages. My own research with the Yudja is an example of the attempt to redress this imbalance.

5. Conclusions

As I have shown in this paper, from colonial times to the present, there have been important changes in language policy towards indigenous minorities in Brazil. Since 1988, the indigenous languages have acquired official status as they have specifically been mentioned in the Brazilian Constitution. In addition, the indigenous peoples have been guaranteed the right to use their own modes of learning in their schools. However, as indigenous minority linguistic rights are linked to the general issue of indigenous rights (including those over land), these achievements in language policy are still threatened by local political and economic interest groups. If the indigenous minorities do not have their right over land guaranteed, they will probably have their communities spread and, consequently, their languages and cultures displaced.
Political militancy has proved to be important in the establishment of a new policy towards indigenous minorities but this, in itself, is no guarantee of the permanence of the policy. Further language research with a clear empowerment agenda is an urgent necessity. Language policy makers need to be made aware of the importance of taking account of the use, function and values of these languages, the design of teaching materials and the training of teachers.
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Notes:

1 Rodrigues (1986) refers to “some two hundred indigenous groups”. On 9 Feb 1994, in an official document presented to the Brazilian Congress, the FUNAI President Dinarte Nobre Madeiro accounts for 180 indigenous groups. Latest data from the Socio-environmental Instituto (Instituto Socioambiental) lists 206 groups. (Ricardo, 1996)

2 Some other groups who have Portuguese as their first language are: the Kiriri (1,800 people), the Kaimbé (1,400), the Pankararé (1,800), the Tuxá (500), all in Bahia; the Xokó (170), in Sergipe; the Xokó-Kariri (700), the Tingui (170), the Wasú (1250), in Alagoas; the Xukuru-Kariri (900), the Pankarau (4,000), the Truká (375), the Atikum (1,300), the Kambiwá (350), the Kapinawá (350), in Ceará; the Mandawaka (24), in Amazonas; the Tapuia (30), in Goiás. (CIMI, 1985)

3 On 6 April 1938, an act was signed which forbade the teaching of German and Italian in schools in Rio Grande do Sul (Henriques, 1966). Rodrigues (1981) mentions that the Japanese language was also proscribed during Second World War.

4 Sebastião José de Carvalho, Count of Oeiras and Marquis of Pombal, was the Portuguese First Minister from 1750 to 1777. He first freed the native people from slavery in the State of Maranhão, in the northeast of Brazil, where it was common to keep them as unwaged labourers. Later, in 1755, he proclaimed the indigenous freedom throughout the country and, in this way, came into conflict not only with the landowners but also with the Jesuits.

5 In this respect, see Ribeiro (1986), Baines (1993), Cárdenas and Correa (1993), Ricardo (1996).

6 Between the 1960s and 1970s, with the world increasingly polarised by the Cold War, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay -- all countries of the southernmost region of South America known as Southern Cone (Cono Sur in Spanish and Cone Sul in Portuguese) — were thrust into dictatorships by military forces. In Brazil the military dictatorship lasted from 1964 to 1985.

7 The FUNAI was created by Law # 5371, of 5 Oct. 1967.


9 See MINTER/FUNAI (1974).

10 In Brazil, the judicial code is wider than those which just cover types of procedure or penal and probate laws as in common-law countries such as England and the United States, where general law codes are based on the exception rather than the rule and the law is based on previous judicial decisions. Within the Roman heritage, a written legal code is observed by Brazilians. However, this systematic written statement proved to become out of date because of several political and social changes that have happened in the country since the first Constitution was written in 1824, in the beginning of the First Brazilian Empire, after Brazil was declared independent from Portugal on 7th September, 1822. The second text was written in 1891, after the republic was proclaimed on 15th November, 1889. The third, in 1934, written during the provisory government of Getúlio Vargas. The fourth (1937) was imposed by Vargas during the New State (his ruling years) and gave him, as President, total powers to rule. The fifth, in 1945, was written after the end of the New State (1937-1945). The sixth, written in 1967 under the military government and reformed in 1969 in order to further end the needs of the current Establishment.

11 Except for the 1967 Constitution, written by the Minister of Justice Carlos Medeiros Silva during the military regime all the other five Constitutions were the product of the work of an Assembléia Constituinte (general legislative assembly) whose members were elected by the people.

12 Until 1990 the IBGE, Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics) only published partial data about the transplanted communities and the foreign people resident in the country. Direct questions about the languages spoken by the population have not been asked so far.


14 This committee is composed by Daniel Caxibi and Domingos Verissimo (indigenous leaders from the Centre-West of the country), Euclides Pereira Macuxi and Nino Fernandes (indigenous leaders from the North), Sélia Ferreira Juvêncio Kaingang and Andila Inácio Delfort (indigenous leader from the South), Manuela Gazzeta (Ministry of Education, MEC), Jaime Mattos and Nelmo Scher (FUNAI), Ruth Montserrat and Bruna Franchetto (universities), Marinha Kahn and Jussara Gruber (non-governmental organisations), Aracy
From 1965 to 1995, there have been 30 non-governmental organisations officially registered in Brazil which are fighting for the cause of the indigenous peoples. Since the end of the 1970s, indigenous leaders have increasingly appeared on the political scene. Among the important posts to which indigenous leaders have been appointed are: Aide to the presidency of FUNAI (Ianakolá Rodarte, Kamayurai; and Mairawé Kajabi); Aide on Indigenous Affairs to the Ministry of Culture (Marcos Terena) and the Director of the Indigenous Park of Xingu (Megaron Txukahamãe and Ianaculá Rodarte). Most significantly for the democratic process, in 1982, Mario Juruna (Xavante) was elected as a State representative to the Congress by the Rio de Janeiro State as a member of the PDT, Partido Democrático Trabalhista (Democratic Labour Party). He has stood again on three subsequent occasions (in 1986; 1990 and 1994), but has failed to be elected. Before that, during the two party military regime, two other indigenous leaders had held legislative positions as representatives of small towns: Angelo Kretã (Kaingangue) was elected for Mangueirinha, in the State of Paranã, and Jair de Oliveira (Terena) for Aquidauauana (State of Mato Grosso do Sul). The careers of these two representatives are instructive. Kretã was elected as an opposition party member (MDB, Movimento Democrático Brasileiro), and, while still in post, was murdered in 1982 because of a dispute over land with farmers of the region. Oliveira, in contrast, was four times elected within the ruling party (ARENA, Aliança Renovadora Nacional).

The National UNI has never been formally institutionalised but there are some regional branches which have official registration: UNI-RT (Rio Tiquié, Amazonas), UNI-DI (Distrito de Iauaretê, Amazonas), UNI-AC (Acre).

