

Filmic counter-narratives by the Guarani Mbya: decolonial acts of institutional disobedience in indigenous cinema¹

Contranarrativas fílmicas Guarani Mbya: atos decoloniais de desobediência institucional no cinema indígena

MARCOS AURÉLIO FELIPE^a

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Education Center, Department of Educational Practices and Curriculum. Natal – RN, Brazil

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the documentary production of the Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective. By linking film studies with post-colonial criticism, our aim is to understand how indigenous filmmakers, insofar as they appropriate audiovisual registers about themselves, problematize the official versions and stereotypes about their history. From a decolonialist theoretical framework, we identify an imagery regime that configures acts of film and historical disobedience, besides unveiling the colonial character of the power, knowledge and essence surrounding the Guarani people. We also identified metalinguistic processes that mix filmic and historical spaces, create an intricate network between the films and force this cinema to move beyond its borders.

Keywords: Guarani Mbya, decolonial perspective, indigenous filmmakers, documentary, metalanguage

RESUMO

Este trabalho analisa a produção documental do Coletivo Guarani Mbya de Cinema. Intercalando à crítica pós-colonial os estudos fílmicos, o objetivo é compreender como os cineastas indígenas, à medida que assumem os registros audiovisuais sobre si, problematizam as versões oficiais e estereotipadas sobre o seu mundo histórico. A partir da matriz decolonial, identifica-se um regime imagético que configura atos de desobediência fílmica e histórica, além de desnudar a colonialidade do poder, do saber e do ser em volta do povo Guarani. Identificam-se também processos de metalinguagem, que confundem os espaços fílmicos e históricos, criam uma rede intrincada entre os filmes e forçam o cinema para além de suas fronteiras.

Palavras-chave: Guarani Mbya, perspectiva decolonial, cineastas indígenas, documentário, metalinguagem

¹ This article is the result of our postdoctoral research project in progress: “Visions of the indigenous world: filmic mediations of the historical world of the native peoples in Brazil - production and audiovisual formation of the project Video in the Villages (VNA)” – at Universidade do Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN) and the Postgraduate Program in Communication of Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (PPGCom/UFPE), under the supervision of full Professor Angela Prysthon.

^a Associate Professor III of the Department of Educational Practices and Curriculum (DPEC), Centro de Educação (CE), Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte-UFRN. Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5529-0100>. E-mail: aurelio.felipe@uol.com.br

TOGETHER WITH THE subgroups Kaiowá, Ñandeva, Guayaki, Tapiete, Guarayos, Chiriguano, Izozeños, the Mbya belong to the Tupi-Guarani linguistic matrix. They inhabit territories of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Brazil² and comprise a population of roughly thirty thousand people. They recognize themselves collectively as *nhandéva ekuéry* (all those that we are), although it is not, ethnographically, a self-denomination. Meanwhile, Guarani Mbya³ is a colonizing designation, even when self-referential, born from the contact with the white world (Ladeira, 2008, pp. 61-66). Marked by the Companhia de Jesus, in 1609; by the Guaranítica War (1754-1756); and, after 1801, by societal dismantling, the Guarani are present in the *guaranization* of various ways of being and living in Rio Grande do Sul, but whose reintegration into Brazilian society was “a tragedy that triggered ethnocide, subaltern inclusion and isolation of indigenous people” (Golin, 2014, p. 165).

Endowed with a great spirituality, the Mbya dawn around the bonfire revering *Nhanderú* (the Divine Father), whose rays guide the connection with the deities and with the teachings of the grandparents and the dreams. Around the fire, concentrating on the yerba mate and the sacred smoke of the *pentygua* (pipe), they search for the *Ñe'è* (the soul-word) and harmony with the beings of the forest, which causes the parents to put parrot pups to grow next to the *Ñe'ë pyau'í* (children). On the other hand, *Jerojy oka regua* (dance at dusk) is what imparts meaning to life, as by dancing together, they reach the balance of their bodies before entering the *Opy'í* (house of prayer): “the source of eternal joy, education, health, fun and the decisions that guide the community’s daily conduct and ground the *Ore rekó* (the way of being Mbya)” (Poty, 2015, p. 56).

The Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective, like the other collectives of indigenous filmmakers (Xavante, Kuikuro, Ashaninka, Panará, Kisédjê, Huni Kuin), appears in the video-training workshops of *Vídeo nas Aldeias* (Video in the Villages – VNA)⁴. It is one of the last to be formed, in 2007, when the first workshops take place in Anhetenguá Village, in the outskirts of Porto Alegre, RS, with the participation of members of Koenju Village, São Miguel das Missões, RS⁵. As a result, an audiovisual production pervaded by the notion of collective, as a center of convergence of transindividual intensities (Migliorin, 2012), because, although some films bear the signature of a single director, the methodology of the workshops allowed members of the community to take the diverse functions for the production of a documentary (camera, sound, lighting etc.).

On the other hand, due to the strategy of displaying the raw material in the villages (Carelli, 2011), a set of mirrors is installed that expands to the

² Present in eight Brazilian states: Espírito Santo-ES, Pará-PA, Paraná-PR, Rio Grande do Sul-RS, Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Santa Catarina-SC, São Paulo-SP and Tocantins-TO.

³ Due to the great variety, for all (self) denominations of the original peoples, we chose the spelling adopted by the Instituto Socioambiental (ISA).

⁴ Created in 1986 as the intervention program of the Centro de Trabalho Indigenista (CTI), *Video in the Villages* (VNA) is fundamentally based on two actions: audiovisual production and the training of indigenous filmmakers. On the development of VNA, see Lacerda (2018) and Araújo (2015).

⁵ The documentaries of the Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective are part of the Indigenous Film Collection (DVD) launched by VNA from 2007.

community as a whole, who, upon seeing itself, suggests changes to the filmed material. Filmmaker Ariel Ortega's testimony states:

People saw themselves, they understood what was going on . . . I think the people at Koenju began to realize the importance of the video when they watched the sequences there in the ruins of São Miguel das Missões and from there in Lomba do Pinheiro. (Vídeo nas Aldeias, 2010)

In the case of the Guarani Mbya, the collective signs the direction of three of the seven films. Ariel Ortega (Kuaray Poty) and Patrícia Ferreira (Para Yxapy) have a more effective participation with the first, individually or in partnership, taking part in the direction of all of the documentaries. The partnership with non-indigenous directors (Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho) takes place in *Tava, a casa de pedra* (2012) (2012) and *Desterro Guarani* (2011) – in which Patrícia is also featured as a maker.

Year	Movies	Min.	Directors
2008	<i>Mokoi Tekoá, Petei Jeguatá – Duas aldeias, uma caminhada</i>	63	Ariel Ortega, Germano Benito and Jorge Morinico.
2009	<i>Nós e a cidade</i>	6	Ariel Ortega, Germano Benito and Jorge Morinico
2011	<i>Bicicletas de Nahanderú</i>	45	Ariel Ortega
2011	<i>Desterro Guarani</i>	38	Ariel Ortega, Patrícia Ferreira, Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho
2012	<i>Mbya mirim</i>	22	Ariel Ortega and Patrícia Ferreira
2012	<i>Tava, a casa de pedra</i>	78	Ariel Ortega, Patrícia Ferreira, Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho
2014	<i>No caminho com Mário</i>	21	Collective Guarani Mbya

TABLE 1 – Filmography of the Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective

Source: Film credits – our systematization.

In order to investigate the decolonial counter-narratives of the Guarani Mbya Collective, we chose as corpus the totality of its filmography performed until then (Table 1). Thus, the definition of the corpus does not obey a priori conceptual categories to be validated by the films, because we understand that, before responding to theoretical injunctions, cinema also introduces problems and conceptual systems (Bernardet, 2003). The selection of the corpus followed a course that would allow us to analyze the development of an indigenous cinematography in a network perspective, starting from the work as a whole,



from different (historical, ethnic and filmographic) contexts rather than from isolated cases that exemplify analytical categories that “find what they pretend to seek [but which is already given beforehand] . . . with a network of concepts that seem made to fit in the film . . . if the action is cut in slices thin enough to fit without friction” (Ramos, 2009, p. 9).

Thus, the notion of Guarani Mbya film-making as an organism, whose images invade, echo and overflow into one another, is born mainly by a comparison of the films, resulting from a linear and relational archaeological course. Firstly, we base ourselves on a chronological course and then on the immanent-contextual analysis, putting form and content in dialogue, the *purely* real and the *purely* cinematographic; and the certainty that we were not before the historical world in images, but before a *postcolonial* imaginal, mediatized and filmic indigenous world. As in other studies that we develop, rather than the links with reality we seek to understand how films, as they are constituted as language, constitute the dialectic with the historical world that they (trans)figure, (de)form, (re)invent and are constitutive of spaces, histories and realities that communicate with what we know and inhabit.

If with the virtual platform *Vídeo nas aldeias – filmoteca*, launched on April 18, 2018 and its catalog in streaming, we could finally penetrate the filmic, cosmological and historical source of the indigenous cinematographies; the current situation of the problem of indigenous peoples instigated the investigation of their forms of resistance in the field of image, especially in a context in which leaders are systematically murdered and communities are invaded and destroyed by public power, allied to private power, whose ballast is provided by the speeches of the presidential candidates in 2018⁶ through the pressure of the Brazilian rural and agribusiness parliamentary groups and the current government⁷. In the case of the Guarani Mbya Collective, unlike the other collectives, the films point to a central problem: the indigenous issue⁸ – the secular process of expropriation and resistance of the original peoples in defense of their territorial and cultural patrimony. As *decolonial image leitmotiv*, with historical space intermingled at all times with filmic space, we see in the (packed, museified, pedagogized) Jesuit ruins of São Miguel a counter-narrative locus that bares the latent coloniality (Quijano, 2005; Mignolo 2017).

A proposed analysis device for our methodological course is mainly in the field of metalanguage (Corrigan, 2015), which, to the narrative materiality, incorporates the displacement as cultural and filmic ethos and, from a *system of image reuse* (of frames, sequences, segments), creates an intricate documentary network, as if we were before an organism that moves, fits and permanently completes itself – besides the perception of natural and historical scenarios as

⁶ During a visit to Mato Grosso do Sul, the region with the greatest conflict between farmers and indigenous people, the presidential candidate of the Brazilian Social Democracy Party (PSDB) Geraldo Alckmin said that he will facilitate the access to arms to guarantee the legal security of the rural man (Mecchi; Jornada, 2018).

⁷ According to the Conselho Indigenista Missionário (2016, p. 17) “Report on Violence against Indigenous Peoples in Brazil - Data for 2016,” “indigenous murders in 2016 correspond to ‘aggression, neglect and ill-treatment’. Deaths amount to 118. With more incidence on the Yanomami people (44 deaths from aggressions) and, as in previous years, Mato Grosso do Sul is the state with the largest death toll (18 in all).”

⁸ Elsewhere, we analyze how *Martírio* (2016, Vincent Carelli - co-directed with Ernesto de Carvalho and Tatiana Soares de Almeida) and *Serras da desordem* (2006, Andrea Tonacci) deal with the indigenous issue between the front recording and the artifice (Felipe, 2018).

filmic scenarios. In this course, we also used postcolonial criticism (of Latin American decolonial matrix) and cinema studies to better analyze the Guarani Mbya counter-narratives. In addition, we understand the films as a point of departure and arrival, never as absolute objects or pretexts, but, continually, intercalating different specificities and contexts that surround them (historical, ethnic, filmographic) (Penafria, 2009). Our choice, therefore, was not to analyze a particular film, isolating it in itself (Belisário, 2016, Brasil, 2012a), but, from the work set (Table 1)⁹, we enter the Guarani Mbya Collective's poetics, which, in our view, constitutes what Walter Mignolo (2010) calls *acts of institutional disobedience*.

FROM POSTCOLONIAL CRITICISM TO DECOLONIALITY

The term *postcolonial*, among the *post* tendencies arising from the crisis of modernity following World War II, oscillates between postcolonialism as a historical period and as a theoretical framework (Ballestrin, 2013). Stam and Shohat (2005, p. 408) recall that "Third World' theory is now largely absorbed in the postcolonial field . . . as an interdisciplinary field (including history, economics, literature, film) which investigates issues of colonial heritage and postcolonial identity". As a historical moment, it refers to the decolonization of Africa and Asia in the 1950s, whose countries joined the Third World, along with the former Portuguese and Spanish colonies. Thus, post-colonialism frames the processes of "independence, liberation and emancipation of societies exploited by imperialism and neocolonialism" and the "theoretical contributions stemming mainly from literary and cultural studies, which from the 1980s have gained prominence in some US and English universities" (Ballestrin, 2013, p. 90).

In turn, the postcolonial critique has three scopes: political, cultural and intellectual. Therefore, the tensions between power, subjectivity, identity and knowledge are central to thinking of colonialism (Ballestrin, 2017, p. 511). If *post* "is about reconfiguration of the discursive field . . . , colonial, in turn, goes beyond colonialism and alludes to diverse situations of oppression" (Costa, 2013, p. 261). The trend that radically interpreted postcolonialism in Latin America was the *decolonial perspective*, which emerged in the 1990s but was consolidated from the 2000s with the Modernity/ Coloniality (M/C) Group. Thinkers like Aníbal Quijano and Walter Mignolo anchor their reflections on the concepts of coloniality of power, knowledge and being; the invention of race; the colonial difference; and, most of all, the epistemological colonization(s), that is, they are concerned with processes of discursive construction and subjectivation¹⁰.

⁹ Exemplary of a study on indigenous film in a network perspective, noting its various contexts (filmographic, historical and ethnic) is the work of Ruben Caixeta de Queiroz and Renata Otto Diniz (2018) on the cinema of collective Tikm 'n-Maxakali, from Minas Gerais.

¹⁰ With Ballestrin (2013), postcolonial criticism can historically be distributed in four moments: *French triad* (Fanon, Césaire and Memmi – as well as Said); *sacred triad* (Chatterjee, Chakrabarty and Spivak) of the Indian Subaltern Study Group; and the *intellectual diasporic* (Hall, Bhabha and Gilroy); and the *decolonial perspective*. To the epistemologies of the South, Boaventura de Sousa Santos was added, in search of the Portuguese specificity – colonizer and colonized at the same time (Almeida, 2013, p. 15).



With the new colonial matrix of power (CMP), which was born with the occupation of America in 1492, the decolonial perspective considers that the “social classification of the world population according to the idea of race” legitimized “relations of domination” and, in the face of the false “biological distinction”, placed conquerors and conquered at opposite poles “of social hierarchies, places and roles” (Quijano, 2005, p. 107). The division was established between civilized and primitive, rational and irrational, superior race (European) and inferior race (indigenous) (later yellow, as logic of *coloniality*, geographically expanded).

In this context arise “all forms of control of subjectivity, culture and, in particular, knowledge”: “expropriation of colonized populations”, “repression of their forms of knowledge production” and “imposition of partial learning of the dominators’ culture” (Quijano, 2005, p. 110). In conceiving coloniality as the dark side of modernity, Walter D. Mignolo (2017) shows the dominance in the field of subjectivities from the *pachamama*: “The phenomenon that Western Christians described as ‘nature’ existed in contradiction to ‘culture’; furthermore, it was conceived as something external to the human subject. . . . [For these peoples] there was not, nor is there today, a distinction between ‘nature’ and ‘culture’” (Mignolo, 2017, p. 17). Colonialism thus advances in the territory of subjectivity, it openly shows “how science takes part in this project of domination” and how “discourses create and recreate realities in the same proportion as they are enunciated or silenced” (Miglievich-Ribeiro & Prazeres, 2015, p. 28).

In the light of these lenses, placed in crisis and radicalized by the decolonial perspective because they also seek to (de)colonize knowledge, we understand that the barbarian of the ancient world, designated as one who did not enjoy the same Greekness¹¹ in the field of Athenian knowledge and customs, gains other references: wild, primitive, irrational. In this sense, one of the strategies was to reduce to the *Indian* category a cultural complex that involves very different and, identity-wise, idiosyncratic peoples. Thus, with the generic *Indian* label, “a racial, colonial, negative identity” is adopted (Quijano, 2005, p. 116). From the colonization of America to neocolonialism, “barbarism, malice and incontinence, [become] ‘identity’ marks of the colonized, while goodness, civilization, and rationality belong to the colonizer” (Castro-Gómez, 83).

Thus, with a generic label, the original peoples were deprived of their historical, technical, biocorporal, linguistic, economic and cosmological specificities, as if Aztec, Aymarás, Guarani, Ashaninka, Nambiqwara, Pankararu, Yanomami, Potiguaras, Minuano, Enauenê Nawê, etc., would rather constitute a unit and not multiple cultural complexes so different and distant from each other that Western taxonomy would not be able to categorize. It was only necessary to envision, from the complexity, the body-nature, man-habitat intersections, how much a

¹¹ It designates civility, belonging to the same sets of cultural values and traits of Greece, specifically Athenian, to delimit the place of the other – which is not only a territorial space, but also of knowing and knowledge (Hartog, 2014).

people like the Matis differs from the Xikrin Kayapó and Ashaninka peoples, even though the Amerindian perspectivism guiding the cosmologies of the original peoples, their forms and ways of seeing and conceiving the world, according to the anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2017), point to a certain unity of vision about the intersections between humanity and nature¹².

It is a consensus that postcolonial criticism, “in essence, was an argument committed to overcoming the relations of colonization, colonialism and coloniality” (Ballestrin, 2013, p. 91), that is, at the same time theoretical and political constructor. For Prysthon (2006, p. 6), it constitutes one of the tendencies of Cultural Studies that reaffirms the “role of the periphery in History and the peripheral History itself”. Problems related to representations, identity, and stereotypes, for example, have become a *reference point*, objects of questioning, subversion, resistance and overcoming. That is why, for Mignolo (2018, p. 51), “Frontier thinking is the one that affirms the space from which the [marginalized, subaltern, oppressed] thought was denied by modernity”¹³. As Miglievich-Ribeiro (2014, p. 67) recalled, “In the different perspectives and peculiarities, we call postcolonial the effort of articulation of subaltern voices in search of the condition of subjects of their own speech and history”. Walter Mignolo himself (2014, p. 7) wrote that decolonial thinking is not the “study of something”, “application of theory” or “a method”, but “the doing itself: they do in the thinking . . . [constituting] the very act of thinking making us, in a dialogical and communitarian way”¹⁴.

In this sense, postcolonial criticism is not just a theory. It is the political action of thought, of epistemic disobedience, in consonance with the critical use of the term postcolonial, which shifts “the most evident linguistic sense of ‘post’ as ‘after’ or ‘end’ to a gesture of going further” and shows “that contemporary societies are marked by the tension between the end of official colonization and its reiterated presence” (Almeida, 2013, p. 12). Intrinsic to modernity, crossing the dimension of being and knowledge, the coloniality of power is a process embodied in the contemporary forms of domination, exploitation and subjugation of the *Other*¹⁵. In this sense, quoting Grosfoguel, Ballestrin (2013, p. 100) analyzes that coloniality “denounces the continuity of colonial forms of domination after the end of colonial administrations, produced by colonial cultures and by the structures of the modern/colonial capitalist world-system”.

In the wake of this problematics, we finally know that the concept of internal colonialism is central to postcolonial criticism and, above all, to the Latin American decolonial perspective. Since “modernity is a alterity-generating machine that, in the name of reason and humanism, excludes from its imaginary the hybridity, multiplicity, ambiguity and contingency of concrete forms of life”,

¹² In Amerindian perspectivism, “humans, under normal conditions, see humans as humans and animals as animals Predatory animals and spirits, however, see humans as animals of prey, while animals of prey see humans as spirits or predatory animals They see their food as human food (jaguars see blood as *cauim*, the dead see crickets as fish, vultures see rotten meat worms as roasted fish, etc.), their body attributes (hair, feathers, claws, beaks, etc.) as adornments or cultural instruments, their social system as identically organized to human institutions (with chiefs, shamans, rites, marriage rules, etc.)” (Viveiros de Castro, 2017, pp. 303-304).

¹³ In the original: “El pensamiento fronterizo es el pensamiento que afirma el espacio donde el pensamiento fue negado por el pensamiento de la modernidad”. (Texts were translated by the author of this article.)

¹⁴ In the original: “el hacer mismo: hacen en el hacerse pensando”; “el acto mismo de pensar haciéndonos, de modo dialógico y comunitario.”

¹⁵ In Marcus Freire’s sense (2011, p. 75): “The Other, the non-Western, the different, his body, ornamented or naked, his land, his habitat, his beliefs, his sexual and gastronomic acts”.

in the conclusions of the Colombian researcher Santigado Castro-Gómez (2005, p. 80), the invention of the *Other* is foundational, ‘because the construction of the imaginary of ‘civilization’ necessarily required the production of its counterpart: the imaginary of ‘barbarism’” (Castro-Gómez, 2005, p. 82). Films have already been used to construct the idea of the *Other* and propagate the *Indian* category, and film studies have already theorized about this generic colonial racial label.

An example is the imagery of the original peoples produced by the documentation department of the Rondon Commission, from 1912, when it created the *Cinematography and Photography Section*, which was in charge of the records of expeditions through cinema and photography under the supervision of the then lieutenant Luiz Thomaz Reis, a pioneer of ethnographic film in Brazil and in the world. As Fernando de Tacca (2001, p. 18) points out, “Rondon had strong support from press agencies, where he always published articles about his work and, completing his marketing, presented the films made by Major Thomaz Reis in public presentations.” From record to political propaganda of the expeditions that explored the country in the early twentieth century, the cinema served two purposes. Still with Fernando de Tacca (2001), in his seminal study on the first images of the cinema in Brazil regarding the indigenous world, shows how the direction of Major Thomaz Reis created an imagery of the *generic Indian*. From the image of the good savage, attached to the origin myth from the time of discovery, modulated in the narrative of the first films of the Rondon Commission (*Rituaes e festas bororo*, 1917)¹⁶, passing through other conceptual constructs – such as the *pacified* and *integrated Indian* –, Thomaz Reis changes perspective (*Ronuro, selvas do Xingu*, 1924) over time. While at first his camera was searching for the *indicial* (tribal) *Indian*, the Rondon imagery then proposes the *integrated generic Indian* – demonstrated in the sequence in which Captain Vasconcelos, before a row of naked Indians, begins to dress them, one by one; and to undress them showing the nudity that did not want to conceal any shame. “The use of standardized clothing, equaling the Indians of various ethnicities that accompanied the expedition, making them a ‘generic Indian’, confirms Reis’ method of filmmaking” (Tacca, 2001, p. 75). The *Other*, therefore, changes face, as the devices of power/knowledge, which respond by the processes of material and symbolic production, subjectivation and discursive, have their goals changed.

¹⁶ *Rituaes e festas bororo* portrays the funeral ritual of the Bororo people, which involves burial, daily unearthing and subsequent disembodiment of the corpse (Tacca, 2001, pp. 22-51).

COUNTER-NARRATIVES/METALANGUAGE

Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguat... is the first film of the Guarani Mbya Collective. The result of the first VNA workshop in the community, in 2007, it has three segments,

clearly defined in space and time, and two narrative fissures: the sequences in downtown Porto Alegre (at two moments) and in Santa Catarina (in the choir presentation). The camera of Ariel Ortega, Germano Benites and Jorge Morinico, in the two first segments, follows the daily life of the Guarani villages and, at the end, closes in the Jesuit ruins of São Miguel, consolidating a writing that exposes coloniality under the mask of modernity. In this first film, the record demarcates specific situations, with similarities in the segments filmed in the Anhetenguá and Koenju villages: the way of being and living in the world – the daily interrelations, banal conversations, basket, bows and arrows making, leisure practices, community living and rooted gestures (which, in the observation of an old Guarani, before the circular dance of young and old people, we felt the communal desire: “I wish it could always be this way”). Other themes and situations of the Mbya ethos can be identified in material production (handicrafts, hunting, extractivism, trade in city spaces); in the narratives of memory (the ancestral village) and mythologies (the opposite brothers - Papa Mirim and Xariã – the reverse of each other, to delineate destinies and lack of union). In this context of the village, because of its proximity to urban centers, the *white* world continues to *invade* the Guarani Mbya Indigenous Land (IL): the itinerant trade of fruit and vegetable, electronic games and Western ornaments have long been incorporated. Inescapable contact that is the subject of a speech by Kuancito (Francisco da Silva), a kind of spiritual and cultural mentor, addressed to a group of young people: “We cannot forget our culture”. The fact is also the subject of a conversation between Mariano Aguirre (then chief of the Koenju village) and an old Guarani woman about the whites’ recurring speech of having forgotten their customs.

This contact is featured in *Bicicletas de Nhanderú*, with night parties with plenty of card games and binge drinking – targets of Ariel’s own reflection on the need to rethink these “open doors” by which “bad things come in the community.” But it reaches paroxysm with the insertion of American *pop* music, when the spiritual and communal dimensions of the film are split by the free universe of the Mbya childhood – resulting from the spontaneity of the boys Palermo and Neneco imitating Michael Jackson (the camera is directed by their movements) and the incidental *Thriller* on the soundtrack (the reality of the camera splits the historical world). These are the *extra-field splinters*, in their geopolitical dimensions, coextensive with the village (that is, the field), in André Brasil’s analysis (2012b; 2016), which are released at various moments in the Guarani Mbya Collective filmography. If in *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá...*, in the sequence in which, from the perspective of the forest, the inter-world contact reaches us in a general take of the village surrounded by the city, in the last

A

segment, which takes place in the Jesuit ruins, the contact has rooted colonial marks (or direct dimensions of coloniality): “Are you Guaranis?”, “Can I take a picture?”, “Do you still hunt with a bow and arrow or not?”, finally asks the tourist to a young Guarani of the Koenju village, who sells handicrafts in the museum of the former reduction. In this sequence, with the installation of the cultural difference and the objectification of the *Other*, its symbolism openly shows the place reserved for the Guarani in the national society. In a field of symbolic violence, from a play scene of approaches and departures of subjects, all the characters of History – ghostly and contemporary – are present in the same colonial stage of times past.

Not by chance the stage are the edges of a museum.

In line with the decolonial analysis of Fernando de Tacca (2001) (in the theoretical field), in *Desterro Guarani* (2011) filmmakers Ariel Ortega and Patrícia Ferreira, in partnership with non-indigenous filmmakers Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho (in the field of cinema)¹⁷ go further in laying bare the coloniality, starting with the projection of Roland Joffé’s *The Mission* (1986) in the Koenju village – a movie within a movie – in a critical reception context which, at no time, generates ambivalence in the “interior of a colonial spectator [commonly] fissured” as in African contexts (Shohat, Stam, 2005, p. 401). This is one of the metaphysical dimensions of the Guarani Mbyá Collective, the VNA collectives, and Vincent Carelli’s own cinema, during which the *audience* is mixed with a portion of the characters on screen and, at that moment, there could be what Frantz Fanon analyzes about the spectatoriality in a colonial context, since it “modifies the process of identification itself” and promotes “conventional identification with the hero’s gaze, which implies a self-denial” (Stah; Shohat, 2005, p. 401)¹⁸. But, on the contrary, as *The Mission* goes on and the Guarani see themselves projected/mirrored/object, other narratives come to the fore: “Look at the ruin”, we hear from the audience. “The make-believe ruin”, is the response – a dialogue superimposed on an upward traveling that, from the interior of the forest to the Jesuit *cathedral* of San Miguel in the background, mobilizes the critical spectatoriality.

Other sequences succeed this scene, with the member of the Spanish court entering the sacred scenographic space, with a choir of Guarani children in unison, slow motion and solemn music marking the scene, the movement of the actors and the coloniality in process: “A church full of Guarani children dressed in white singing in praise of the Christian God. This is what appears in the history books” – we can hear Ariel himself off-screen analyzing Joffé’s perspective. However, beyond the history books, we know that the image of the *integrated generic Indian* is also propagated by the cinema. “But if they all died, then who are we!?” – says Ariel after the film within the film comes to an

¹⁷ In co-direction with Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho.

¹⁸ “[Watch] the projection of a Tarzan film in the Antilles and in Europe. In the Antilles, the young black man identifies himself *de facto* with Tarzan against blacks. In a cinema in Europe, . . . the audience, which is white, automatically identifies him with the savages on the screen. This experience is decisive. Black feels he is not black with impunity” (Fanon, 2008, p. 135).

end and the audience is gone. We thus reach the metafilm as an anti-esthetic public experience, which is not designed, in Corrigan's perspective (2015, p. 183),

to function as an artistic commentary [about another work], "to imitate aesthetic terms and questions", but "[refract and deflect], to bring the film back to the world and ideas about the world... for matters of aesthetic value and judgment in other semantic contexts", such as "cultural and historical differences"

An image is emblematic of the Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective: the ruins of the São Miguel reduction. They enclose an almost epigraphic image, which pendulously points to the past and to the social condition of the Guarani under the order of coloniality (Quijano, 2005, Mignolo, 2014, 2017): the darker side of modernity – based on the idea of totality, progress, rationality – which, in the sphere of power, being and knowing, relies on colonialism, which does not finish with the end of the neocolonial empires in the 1950s. As a physical and symbolic trait, historical and scenographic stage, space of reinvention, of memory (tourist, museological and school), this image appears in all the films of the Collective, except in *Bicicletas de Nhanderú*; and, in the way it is circumstantiated, it constitutes a counter-narrative locus capable of laying bare the official history and coloniality impregnated with the social condition of the Guarani people – and, by extension, of the original peoples in permanent confrontation with the public and private power. In this sense, what remains of the missions would contain only one epigraph if, each time they were pictured, the lenses of Guarani filmmakers (Ariel Ortega, Patrícia Ferreira, Jorge Morinico and Germano Benites, among others) did not mobilize decolonial acts of film and historical disobedience, which, in contrast to official and stereotyped narratives, unveil colonialism¹⁹. Placed in the context of *indigenous media* (Cordova, 2011, Ginsburg, 2011, Stah; Shohat, 2005, 2006), marked by (self)production, (self)representation and (self)reception, without mediations, in a more radical reading other than that of the indigenous world itself, the poetics of the Guarani Mbya Collective is linked to a broader historical-theoretical-cinematographic organism, with its already defined categories.²⁰

The historical context of the Jesuit reductions, of the Guarani War of *The Mission* and, most of all, of the contemporary social condition of the Guarani people, is marked by the arrival of the Company of Jesus in 1609 and by the Treaty of Madrid, of 1750 – which recast the Treaty of Tordesillas, of 1494, and delivered to Portugal in exchange for the Colony of the Sacramento the Seven Peoples of the Missions of the Jesuit Province of Paraguay – a Theocratic Regime within the Spanish Kingdom (Golin, 2014, p. 75-77)²¹. It is precisely

¹⁹ As I write these lines, *Google Alerts* reports the eviction of the Guarani Kaiowá, in Caarapó-MS, from its ancestral territory on August 26th, after a police action with permission to use "tear gas" and helicopter firing and blasting" (Diário Causa Operária, 2018).

²⁰ See Araújo (2015: 75-110) for various Indian media experiences, such as the Sol Worth "pilot" and John Adair with the Navajos in Arizona in the 1970s; the attempts of filmmaker Andrea Tonacci, in Brazil, with the Canela Apanyekrá people, in the 1970s; the history of the VNA.

²¹ "Each missionary people resembled a contemporary municipality . . . Each was administered by an authority – called *cabildo* [composed of morubixaba chiefs representing different ethnicities] – that defined the general and operational guidelines of management, justice, internal and military police . . . The cities were structured in three sectors [the religious domain in the style of medieval European abbeys, with church, cemetery and two courtyards; a Spanish-style building, with a central courtyard and internal porches, as well as the children's orphanage and the old people's asylum; and the traditional indigenous village] . . . In the center of the missionary city was the square, a community space of millennial tradition . . . [The missions occupied] an area of approximately 1,300 x 700 kilometers" (Golin, 2014, pp. 23-25, 75).



the Treaty of Madrid that triggers the fuse for the Guaranitic War, which disrupted the Jesuit mission project and decimated thousands of Guaranis who resisted the agreements between the Spanish and the Portuguese. The scenario of the old reduction in ruins, which features the poetry of the Guarani Mbya Collective, would already suffice regarding the coloniality of the practices of reduction of the *Other* that do not stop with the decolonization of the continent, mainly because it remits to colonial processes that, in addition to advancing on the territory, annul the cultural base of indigenous peoples advancing through the most hidden places of being, affecting their spiritual imaginary and self-perception.

As Mignolo points out (2014, p. 17), “The colonial matrix of power is then a complex structure of intertwined levels ... Control of economy and authority [political and economic theory] depend on the basis upon which knowledge, understanding and feeling rest²². We have seen this colonial configuration, not resting only on the political domain, through Patricio Guzman’s lenses in *O botão de pérola* (2015), which show the story of the native Jemmy Button (1815-1864) from the Yamana Patagonian people, who, taken by the navigator FitzRoy, was transformed into an English vassal and, three years later, returned to Patagonia with body and spirit transfigured into another body and spirit – equidistant between the learned English values and the native values latent in his imaginary. We also saw similar problems in the former French colony of Indochina, but this time we are led by the archives of the Cambodian director Rithy Panh, in *France Is Our Mother Country* (2015), which testify to the Cambodians’ cultural transfiguration with the implantation of a new religious thought (the segment of the mass and courtship around a priest); of new knowledge, educational and linguistic modes (the segments in the school) and new artistic-cultural forms (the segment of native dancers). As decolonial counter-narratives, in converging past and present in the emblematic image of the Jesuit ruins, the segment in São Miguel das Missões fights the “conspiracy of silence around colonial truth . . . , which speaks through enigmas, obliterating proper nouns and proper places” (Bhabha, 2014, pp. 203-204). A devastating silence, which the lenses of the Guarani Mbya Collective evidence, deconstruct and confront, because, as pointed out by Bhabha, they know that “those who hear their echo lose their historical memories” (Bhabha, 2014, p. 204).

With Mignolo (2010, p. 24), observing that “decolonial aesthetics displace imperial aesthetics”²³, we conclude that decolonial acts and projects are also processes of institutional deconstruction in their various faces, such as history and art criticism, the museum, the cinema and/or other forms of circulation of skills and knowledge.

²² In the original: “La matriz colonial de poder es entonces una estructura compleja de niveles entrelazados . . . El control de la economía y de la autoridade (la teoría política y económica) dependen de las bases sobre las que se asiente el conocer, el comprender y el sentir”.

²³ In the original: “Las estéticas decoloniales desplazan las estéticas imperiales”.

The criticism and historiography of art that accompany these processes are themselves transformed into decolonial criticism and historiography . . . [since] decolonial acts are the ones that force the decolonization of history and art criticism, and the construction of decolonial *aesthesis*²⁴. (Mignolo, 2010, p. 25)²⁵

Acts subvert the racial, colonial, negative, generic imagery construct from counter versions of official History, which undress modernity based on stereotypes, racism and the invention of the *Other*, who is invariably framed in the wild, primitive or barbaric categories. This is what happens in *Desterro Guarani*, which, going deeply into the cultural specificities of the Mbya subgroup, reverses colonial notions crystallized as truth. In the testimonies of Olívio Dutra, Emílio Correa and, most of all, in the voice of filmmaker Ariel Ortega, for example, we have the characterization of the Guarani Mbya ethos of displacement, mobility or multilocality (Garlet, 1997; Pissolato, 2007 apud Lacerda, 2018). We are before a distinct “notion of property,” which conceives the territory as a great village, without the need for settling down in a single place. This displacement, which expands territoriality, is incorporated in the narrative materiality of *Desterro Guarani*, which resembles a “nomadic device” (Brasil, 2013, p. 261): across villages, across cities, across countries – we would add for greater empiricism. Its materiality, which confuses form and content, deconstructs the image of the “idle wanderers” (in the critical account of former governor Olívio Dutra), who, by not settling down, in the view of the national society, do not belong to the territories claimed. Given the mobility that results in the *Jeguatá* (sacred walk), besides being invisible, in Ariel’s reflection, the Guarani became foreigners in a land where they always lived.

In addition to the official history of the missions, this study accompanies *decolonial acts* of the Guarani Mbya Collective, which also challenge the Western image of the Guarani modes of being and conceiving the world as notions of belonging, territory, and temporality. That is, they do not consolidate counter-narratives aimed only at historical objects, mainly because, in the decolonial perspective, the dimension of coloniality is broad and permanent. However, it is not about finding a theoretical label for the Guarani cinematographic poetics, but rather putting into dialogue two areas of knowledge on the problem of coloniality, which, in consonance, corroborate the deconstruction of the processes of oppression and denial of postcolonialism and which are defining the historical condition of indigenous communities invisible to Brazilian society. For Mignolo (2010),

²⁴ In the original: “La crítica y la historiografía del arte que acompañan estos procesos se transforman ellas mismas de crítica a historiografía decolonial. Es más, son [los actos] decoloniales los que fuerzan la decolonización de la historia y la crítica de arte, y la construcción de *aesthesis* decoloniales”.

²⁵ By adopting Kant’s concept of aesthetics, linking the sensations common to all living beings to the concept of the beautiful and the sublime, universal sensations are restricted to the Western parameters of beauty. “This cognitive operation constituted, nothing more and nothing less, the colonization of *aesthesis* by esthetics . . . The word *aesthesis*, which originates in ancient Greek, [...] revolves around words like ‘sensation’, ‘process of perception’, ‘visual sensation’, ‘gustatory sensation’ or ‘auditory sensation’. Hence the term *synaesthesia* refers to the interweaving of senses and sensations, and which has been absorbed as a rhetorical figure in poetic/literary modernism.” (Mignolo, 2010, p. 13). In the original: “Esta operación cognitiva constituyó, nada más y nada menos, la colonización de la *aesthesis* por la estética [...] La palabra *aesthesis*, que se origina en el griego antiguo, [...] gira en torno a vocablos como ‘sensación’, ‘proceso de percepción’, ‘sensación visual’, ‘sensación gustativa’ o ‘sensación auditiva’. De ahí que el vocablo *synaesthesia* se refiera al entrecruzamiento de sentidos y sensaciones, y que fuera aprovechado como figura retórica en el modernismo poético/literario”.

A

²⁶ In the original: “Opresión y negación son dos aspectos de la lógica de la colonialidad. El primero opera en la acción de un individuo sobre otro, en relaciones desiguales de poder. El segundo lo hace sobre los individuos, en la manera en que niegan lo que en el fondo saben”.

Oppression and denial are two aspects of the logic of coloniality. The former operates on the action of one individual over another, from unequal relations of power. The latter is inscribed over individuals, in the way they deny what they know deep inside²⁶ (Mignolo, 2010, p. 9).

In the documentary *Eu já fui seu irmão* (1993, by Vincent Carelli) about the struggle of the Gavião Parkatejê people to maintain their traditions, the denial is made explicit by the natives themselves: “many no longer want to be Indian”, “no longer speak the language”, “nor do they know their festivals and rituals”. Quoting Fanon, Mignolo (2014, p. 16) reminds us that

colonialism does not simply conform to imposing its rule over the present and future of a dominated country . . . , nor to molding the native’s brain with all sorts of form and content. In a perverse logic, it turns to the past of this people: it distorts it, disfigures it, destroys it.

It is in this sense that the relation between the decolonial theoretical base and the Guarani Mbya documentary writing deconstructs the image of the missions as a communal model: “utopia of civilization” and “utopia of the encounter of cultures” – as identified by Lacerda (2018) –, where, as the official History suggests, the Guarani could maintain their traditions. One has only to read the historian Tau Golin (2014, p. 11) and his theory of reductions as a “historical example of rupture of the continuity of colonial rule”. But what was the rupture, if in the wake of Quijano, Mignolo (2014, p. 16) concludes that “knowledge is an imperial instrument of colonization”²⁷? In *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá....*, unable to obtain subsistence in a very small territory, we accompany the Guarani selling handicrafts in the old reduction. At that moment, we must return to this locus and colonial situation, with the camera watching tourists and students trying to capture the remnants of the *indicial Indian* (Tacca, 2001). “Can I take a picture?” asks the visitor, who immediately receives a negative answer, thwarting her expectations. In addition to the little wooden animals, baskets, bows and arrows, of course, she also wanted to bring the image – in her colonial look – of the *Indian on display* on the edges of the Jesuit Mission museum. In the historical scenario, constituted as a counter-narrative filmic scenario, the deconstruction of coloniality, rather than another version of history, comes into play – whose forms that continually reduce the *Other*, “manifest themselves in stereotypes”, which are “stigmata, and as such, reducers of reality. The incompleteness of their misrepresentation capable of *defining* (put an end, take as finished, take as complete) something or someone leads, ultimately, to dehumanization (of those

²⁷ In the original: “el conocimiento es un instrumento imperial de colonización”.

who are different)” (Miglievich-Ribeiro, Prazeres, 2015, p. 27). In this context, the visitor’s question: “Do you still hunt with a bow and arrow or not?” who, in search of Pero Vaz de Caminha’s epistolary character, moved about as if she were facing “living fossils of the past” (Durham, 2018, p. 17)²⁸.

If the old São Miguel reduction, as an emblematic image of the Guarani Mbya Collective, concludes *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá...* and starts *Desterro Guarani*, it gains vertically in the Guarani oral tradition recorded in the movie *Tava, a casa de pedra*. In this documentary, a transnational investigative course is undertaken across countries, from Brazil to Argentina; across villages, from Koenju, passing through Cantagalo, Varzinha, RS; and, consequently, across territorialities, characters, histories and places of the great Guarani village. Above all, because we are facing the particular ethos of a people, which remits to another notion of territoriality, it reverberates in diverse cultural practices and, in the wake of Maria Inês Ladeira (2008), we return to the foundations to reinforce a certain Guarani Mbya cinematographic ethos: “The notion of land is thus included in the broader concept of territory, known by Mbya to be included in a historical context that is cyclical (mythical) and, therefore, infinite, since it is the Mbya world itself” (Ladeira, 2008, p. 98). Thus thickening the deambulatory nature of the films, by impregnating them, in Jennifer van Sijll’s sense (2017), with moving locations and landscapes, incorporating the movement into the narrative materiality as if we were in a road movie. The deconstruction of official History is intensified in its own way, even though, as a counterpart and, paradoxically, in the same terms as stated by Brasil (2013, p. 265), it occurs in a

radical referential alterity, of an ontological, and not only representational, nature: [for] the ruin of the Jesuit missions transformed into a museum and the walls stained with blood and fat that the Indian [Mariano] makes a point of indicating to us are not the same thing.

However, rather than returning to the field of the image a historical object, reiteration as a symbolic figure of the old reductions consolidates a system of reuse of images (of takes, segments, scenarios, characters...) of the same loci and situations. Which makes the films unfold in others, from a process of feedback and mirroring, in which the Mbya documentaries invade, complement, and elongate in each other, from the dialogical play between films²⁹. A dimension that expands the mobility in the image to a mobility between images, configuring what we call mobile narrativities and, in Corrigan’s conceptualization (2015, p. 182), characterizes the metafilm as “critical act of thinking cinematographically” – “which abstracts the very activity of thinking through a cinematographic process”.

²⁸ It refers to the demystifying contribution of Malinowski’s *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (2018).

²⁹ At another moment (Felipe, 2019), we will analyze this category “between films” with Vincent Carelli’s work.

A

In this way, cinema no longer mirrors the world, but it constitutes itself in the very act of thinking, making itself and, procedurally, undoing itself, entangling (itself), from the places, characters, circumstances and situations of coloniality as if it were a single filmic body.

Almost all the scenes of the short film *Nós e a cidade*, for example, are from *Mokoi Tekoá Pegui Jeguatá...*, except for a couple producing baskets not present in its final cut. It is not about thematic condensation, since the very title of the film already speaks of the historical world of its editing, not coinciding with the theme of the Collective's first film, although the Guarani's relations with the various urbanities (tourists, schoolchildren, cultural audiences) constitute sparse microthemes. It does not even consist of extracting a complete segment of *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá...* as if *Nós e a cidade* were born from their guts, like the short film *A história de Akykysia, o dono da caça* (1998, by Dominique Gallois), which, in its entirety, is extracted from *Segredos da Mata* (1998, by Vincent Carelli and Dominique Gallois), because it integrates it as one of the episodes about the mythologies of the Wajãpi people. With variations in the form and degree of reutilization, the same happens in the relations established between the short film *Mbya mirim* and *Bicicletas de Nhanderú*. From the latter, the former extracted plans of the adventures of the boys Palermo and Neneco and gained narrative autonomy to compose the editorial collection *Um Dia na Aldeia*³⁰. In this process of feedback, which varies from the literal use to the systematization of additional material that was not used in the final cut of the previous film, *Tava, a casa de pedra* feeds on the images of *Desterro Guarani*: the segment of the projection of *A Missão*; the plans and excerpts from the testimonies of old Adolfo, from Aldeia Varzinha, in Caraá, RS; the Guarani old couple, from Aldeia Cantagalo, Porto Alegre, RS (but, temporarily, with the testimony and the filmic space distended); and, practically, the entire final sequence of the site of the Battle of Caiboaté, in São Gabriel, RS. "In the dangerous and risky business of dismantling the work, 'breaking its frames' . . . [indigenous filmmakers do not run the risk of] destroying their object", using Corrigan's words (2015, p. 190) about another meta-cinematic context. These are, in a better characterization, cases of reordering the previous imagery construct and, still in the wake of Corrigan, for "a filmic thinking of the world . . . [and not for] commenting its own making" (Corrigan, p. 190).

This dialogue that takes place in the filmic materiality, making the films of the Guarani Mbya Collective one and the same cinematic body, provides a broader discussion of metalanguage in the documentary, rather than just identifying the presence of directors in frame. However, this play between the field, extra-field, ante-field and off-field³¹ is intense in the Guarani scene. But,

³⁰ A VNA partnership with publisher Cosac Naify, who launched six illustrated volumes of indigenous children's stories. Each of the volumes features a DVD with short films made within the scope of the VNA and that integrate its collection.

³¹ See the works of Brasil (2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2016). About the ante-field: "This is about the space behind the camera, with the subjects it houses (the director, the team, the equipment). In certain films, they move to the front of the camera, implying themselves and positioning themselves in the scene" (Brasil, 2013, p. 249).

before any definite reflexivity, the deconstruction of language, the documentary truth or the transparency of the “film being constructed” (Penafria, 1999; Nichols, 2005) is not at stake. In the metacinema of the Guarani Mbya Collective, what stands out is the modeling of film space as the space of the historical world. If, in the documentary, the homogeneity and spatial contiguity between what is present (in the field) and absent (in the off-field or ante-field) of the image is an undisputed fact (with the exceptions that do exist, such as the reconstitution films); in the Guarani Mbya cinema, the historical, social and corporal identity, in spatial contiguity, of the subject that holds the camera with the subjects and environments being filmed is evident. For Brasil (2013, p. 249), the “exposure of the ante-field . . . allows the director to engage in the scene, simultaneously as director of the film and as a member of the village; as a member of the village and as a mediator between the village and what is outside it”. Therefore, the same eye that films, that looks at the world in front of the viewfinder; and what is filmed, seen, cohabit the same imaginary body. If we “breathe coloniality in modernity every day” (Maldonado-Torres, 2007, p. 131)³², the counter-narratives of the Guarani Mbya Collective problematize the historical condition of the Guarani today, because, by filming their world and themselves in this world, the device renders the materiality of cinema and the materiality of the village inseparable.

³² In the original: “respiramos la colonialidad en la modernidad cotidianamente”.

In addition to the film within the film being projected, such as in *Desterro Guarani* and *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá*, other forms of metalanguage constitute the Collective’s film space: indigenous filmmakers filming, preparing the environment for recordings, participating as characters in conversations with others relatives about the historical condition of their people; dialoguing with the village about the images made; the very process of building films; and assuming the very elocution of narration. But in contrast to a certain reflexivity, in the documentaries of the Guarani Mbya Collective, in no hypothesis the camera follows an ethics of retreat, in the position of – presumed – invisibility of the subject that enunciates, present in the direct cinema, like a *fly-on-the wall* – offering the spectator the world as a parallelepiped (Ramos, 2005, pp. 174-177). On the contrary, the indigenous camera is all the time denounced, caught and object of jokes, because it belongs to the reality about which it produces images (the filmmaker), is intimate with it, and seeks to capture the view of the *Other* (of the Guarani Mbya, or rather, of itself). In *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá*..., in a painting, Ariel Ortega carefully explains to the chief Cirilo the construction of the film, how it happens, what it is necessary to do to close an idea; and, in a simple way, a Guarani child fills the entire screen with his face, after stating that he was seeing the world through those lenses. In *Bicicletas de Nhanderú*, around a bonfire, Ariel talks with Solano

A

to understand the spirituality of their people; and Germano Benites, inside a typical Guarani house, prepares the light for filming. In *Desterro Guarani*, with camera in hand and eye in the viewfinder, Patrícia Ferreira follows Mariano Aguirre through the woods – filming inside the frame while being filmed. In *Tava, a casa de pedra*, Ariel Ortega and Patrícia Ferreira film and are filmed, talk and interview other relatives, confront the official versions and establish their own visions of history.

In *No caminho com Mário*, the last film of the Collective, the protagonist boy promotes all kinds of interaction with the camera: almost runs over it with his bicycle at the opening, whose sensoriality of “fact” is palpable in the instability of the frame; places his hand and throws corn in the lenses, challenges it as he hears a question whose answer was obvious: “Are you plying the fool, filmmaker?” At another time, he tries to direct it, when, in *Tava* (or rather in the ruins of the San Miguel reductions), he looks up and warns that the movement of the camera should follow the movement of his eyes; and in acting, as if in a spontaneous conversation with other relatives from the Koenju Village, a dialogue on the reasons for the destruction of the missions. He thus formulates and reformulates the historical experience. Perhaps we can say that *No caminho com Mário* is Collective Guarani Mbya’s film where the final cut more has most welcomed, in Jean-Louis Comolli’s definition (2008, p. 60), the *self-mise en scène* of the *Other*, or the “native point of view”³³. If decolonial acts and projects happen, especially when they affirm the space from which subaltern thought was systematically denied. For this to happen, in the context of *indigenous media*, marked by the centrality of the historical world of the original peoples in the representational/spectatorial field (Stam & Shohat, 2005), one of the forms necessarily passes through authorship. We can finally conclude that an ethic of the *Other* as subject and no longer as an object in the documentary film imposes itself with the Guarani Mbya Cinema Collective. It would already be obvious that we are within the political and filmic praxis of the non-governmental organization (NGO) Vídeo nas Aldeias, in which it is a standard procedure – especially in the second phase, when the project became a *cinema school*, to hand over the camera to the native for him to produce his own films, make his own pictures and representations of his history, culture and condition. So that he mainly reverses the roles – from object to subject - dear to the *new ethnographic film*.

In short, this authorship could already be recognized as a fact, because we are facing a praxis that is, above all, foundational of an *indigenous media* that is not limited to the films about the *Other*, even though it opens as a space that guarantees an effective place and the reception of the native’s *self-mise*

³³ In *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, a classic book of ethnography on the habitants of the Melanesian Trobriand archipelago, “The key idea of capturing the native’s point of view through field research continues to define anthropology Instead of developing a theory about magic, [Malinowski] sought the ‘Kiriwina natives theory of magic’ . . . That the anthropologists contemporary to Malinowski were ill-prepared to accept these theories is recorded in the misuse of expressions as ‘Malinowski’s theory of magic’, or ‘Malinowski’s theory of language’, when these are actually Trobriand theories of magic and language, which Malinowski captured among the natives” (Peirano, 2018, pp. 13-14).

en scène. Considering that editing is not assumed by the Collective Guarani Mbya (which happens only in *No caminho com Mário*, according to the final credits of the film)³⁴, it would be possible to object with Bernardet (2003)³⁵ on the authorship limits of indigenous cinema, because, as a consequence of having taken the camera, the Guarani filmmakers did not have control over the final cut, which is crucial for what should or should not be included in the frame, “a delicate moment to choose, articulate and construct the film from the tangle of raw material, the fragmented and disordered real” (Corrêa, 2004, p. 37)³⁶. Nevertheless, from the *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá... to No caminho com Mário*, what we see is a greater concreteness from “the native point of view” in the image and, thus, a greater leading role behind and in front of the camera. The indigenous authorship, in fact, materializes in the narrative body, in the historical problems and in the filmmakers’ intimacy with the filmic space that mixes with the daily, spiritual and historical space of the village. In each scene, even in works in partnerships with non-Indians, the real reception of the *mise en scène* of the *Other* (Comolli, 2008) and the implementation of a *reverse anthropology* (Caixeta de Queiroz, 2008, p. 116) occur and reveal not only their historical dimension, but their real presence in today’s world³⁷.

CONCLUSIONS

Resuming Dominique Gallois and Vincent Carelli (1995), one of the first articles written about *Video nas Aldeias*, we can conclude that the work of the Collective Guarani Mbya carries three conditions that hold the “native’s point of view”: the installation of the version of the *Other* about their own history, their ways of being and living; the clash of the indigenous point of view with the white world’s point of view; and the acceptance of the original peoples’ demands, more directly linked to the national society’s demands (such as territorial issues, cultural heritage, stereotypes and stigmas). For what we see in/with/through the images of the historical world of the Guarani Mbya Collective, the resource of metalanguage was decisive, as it shredded the situation of coloniality that marks the historical and contemporary context of the original peoples, in which the Guarani are a chapter.

In this sense, the imagery of the Guarani Mbya Collective, specifically of the filmmakers of the Koenju Village of São Miguel, gives centrality to their contemporary condition by taking over the mirrors that until then reflected and refracted them. In its own way, it places itself in this postcolonial moment, in which the coloniality of power, knowledge and being still manifests itself, but, face to face, to the acts of resistance

³⁴ The editing of *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá...* was done by Ernesto de Carvalho; of *Nós e a cidade*, by Tatiana Almeida and Ernesto de Carvalho; of *Bicicletas de Nhanderú*, by Thiago Campos Tôrres; of *Desterro Guarani*, by Tatiana Almeida, Vincent Carelli and Ernesto de Carvalho; of *Mbya Mirim*, by Tatiana Almeida and Thiago Campos Tôrres; of *Tava, a casa de Pedra*, by Tatiana Almeida and Vincent Carelli; and of *No caminho com Mário*, by Ernesto de Carvalho with the participation of Collective Guarani Mbya.

³⁵ Commenting on *Jardim Nova Bahia* (1971), by Aloysio Raulino, in which the character takes the camera, Bernardet (2003, p. 131) recalls that: “who selected and ordered the frames, who determined their duration, it was not Deutrades [the character], but the author of the film. Who decided the soundtrack: permanence of the camera noise, reinforcing its presence and the idea of the making, incidence of music in the course of the scene of the beggar and its continuation until the end of the sequence? The author. Who chose the song? The choice and the volume of the music are characteristic of Raulino’s style: a song that sets in the foreground, strong, present, that guides the emotion and contrasts with the foreground.

³⁶ This may be the case with the other VNA Collectives, because, given the initiation in the audiovisual language, the editing is done by the technical team, since “the formation of an editor takes longer. After two to three films, those who have talent and taste for the thing are revealed” (Carelli, 2011, p. 49). However, what demands an *in loco* research, in the speech of the workshop participants, underlies the intense collaboration of the village and the indigenous filmmakers in the editing process, with the first cut, according to Ana Carvalho, being carried out in the village and the finest editing, in VNA headquarters (Moraes, 2017, pp. 80-81).

A

³⁷ Emblematic of the sequence in the museum of the missions in *Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá ...* in which Ariel, with camera in hand, confronts the colonial vision of the Guarani, who “besides dirty” in the teacher’s vision in field, charge for the photos that visitors want to take. Ariel, in an act of disobedience and reversing the colonizing logic, explains that researchers often use Guarani images for their work, sell and receive for it. The refusal of his relatives, in Ariel’s view, is a form of resistance – accepted by the interlocutor. A classic example of what Caixeta de Queiroz (2008) calls *reverse anthropology*.

³⁸ In the original: “de modo dialógico y comunitário”.

³⁹ In the original: “actos de desobediência *aesthética* e institucional”, “Una vez que [a partir de seus traços, processos e dispositivos filmicos] la máscara de la modernidad es puesta al descubierto, y la lógica de la colonialidad aparece detrás de ella”.

⁴⁰ In the original: configuraram “proyectos decoloniales, estos, proyectos que forjan futuros en los cuales la modernidad/colonialidad será un mal momento en la historia de la humanidad de los últimos quinientos años”.

of the indigenous communities that do not abdicate “from the condition of subjects of their own speech and history” (Miglievich-Ribeiro, 2014, p. 67), “in a dialogical and communitarian way” (Mignolo, 2014, p. 7)³⁸, “[intending the] end of official colonization and its reiterated presence” (Almeida, 2013, p. 12). Assuming decoloniality as a perspective, an imagistic regime of “acts of *aesthetic* and institutional disobedience” emerges, “since [from the filmmaking processes and devices] the mask of modernity is taken off, and the logic of coloniality appears [in its entirety] behind it” (Mignolo, 2010, p. 18)³⁹. It is in a cinema of reversal of (post)colonial mirrors that we understand the interventions of indigenous filmmakers as configurations of “decolonial projects, that is, future-forging projects in which modernity/coloniality will be a bad moment in the history of humanity of the last five hundred years”⁴⁰, in Walter Mignolo’s words (2010, p. 13).

From the immanent and contextual analysis, we arrive at the historical world, in its three dimensions, as defined by Bill Nichols (2005, p. 27) and that pervades the Indian documentary film with precision: “[what, finally] was, is and what may come to be” – not a static world in its temporality, but mutant, dynamic and circular. However, unlike reality in itself, what we have seen is a world shaped by an imagistic regime, in which the filmic and historical dimensions reveal themselves in dialogue, continuously, which makes it the scene of intense aesthetic, political and historical mediations which are established, formalized and, at the same time, crumble and enter into criticism when the *Other’s* gaze provokes its instability by presenting other objects and approaches. Thinking about their metaphysical variants, other lenses that we used to peer into the narratives of indigenous filmmakers were Corrigan’s (2015), to which we can apply Guarani Mbyá Collective’s decolonial counter-narratives that tend to draw attention to the “cinematographic [that] can push beyond their borders and our borders, force us to think about a world and ourselves, which necessarily and crucially exist outside the confines of cinema” (Corrigan, 2015, p. 191). ■

REFERENCES

- Almeida, J. (2013). Perspectivas pós-coloniais em diálogo. In J. Almeida, A. Miglievich- Ribeiro, & H. T. Gomes (Orgs.), *Crítica pós-colonial* (pp. 9-32). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: 7Letras.
- Araújo, J. J. (2015). *Cineastas indígenas, documentário e autoetnografia: Um estudo do projeto vídeo nas aldeias*. (Doctoral dissertation). Institute of Arts, University of Campinas, Campinas, SP.

- Ballestrin, L. M. A. (2013). América Latina e o giro decolonial. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência Política*, 11, 89-117. doi: 10.1590/S0103-33522013000200004
- Ballestrin, L. M. A. (2017). Modernidade/Colonialidade sem “Imperialidade”? O elo perdido do giro decolonial. *Dados*, 60(2), 505-540. doi: 10.1590/001152582017127.
- Belisário, B. (2016). Ressonâncias entre cinema, cantos e corpos no filme *As Hipermulheres*. *Galáxia*, 32, 65-79. doi: 10.1590/1982-25542016223451
- Bernardet, J.-C. (2003). *Cineastas e imagens do povo*. São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2014). *O local da cultura*. Belo Horizonte, MG: UFMG Press.
- Brasil, A. (2012a). O olho do mito: Perspectivismo em *Histórias de Mawary*. *Ecó-Pós*, 15(3), 69-89. doi: 10.29146/eco-pos.v15i3.872
- Brasil, A. (2012b). Bicicletas de Nhanduru: Lascas do extracampo. *Devires*, 9(1), 98-117.
- Brasil, A. (2013). *Mise-en-abyme* da cultura: A exposição do “antecampo” em *Pi’õnhitsi e Mokoi Tekoá Petei Jeguatá*. *Significação*, 40(40), 245-265. doi: 10.11606/issn.2316-7114.sig.2013.71683
- Brasil, A. (2016). Ver por meio do invisível: O cinema como tradução xamânica. *Novos Estudos*, 35(3), 125-146. doi: 10.25091/s0101-3300201600030007
- Caixeta de Queiroz, R. (2008). Cineastas indígenas e pensamento selvagem. *Devires*, 5(2), 98-125.
- Caixeta de Queiroz, R. & Diniz, R. O. (2018). Cosmocinepolítica tikm’n-maxakali: ensaio sobre a invenção de uma cultura e de um cinema indígena. *Gis*, 3(1), 63-105. doi: 10.11606/issn.2525-3123.gis.2018.142390
- Carelli, V. (2011). Um novo olhar, uma nova imagem. In A. C. Z. Araújo (Org.), *Vídeo nas aldeias 25 anos* (pp. 42-51). Olinda, PE: Vídeo nas Aldeias.
- Castro-Gómez, S. (2005). Ciências sociais, violência epistêmica e o problema da “invenção do outro”. In E. Lander (Org.), *A colonialidade do saber: Eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Perspectivas latino-americanas* (pp. 80-87). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
- Comolli, J.-L. (2008). *Ver e poder. A inocência perdida: Cinema, televisão, ficção, documentário*. Belo Horizonte, MG: UFMG Press.
- Conselho Indigenista Missionário (Cimi). (2016). Relatório “Violência contra os povos indígenas no Brasil: Dados de 2016”. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2OLjTtT>
- Córdova, A. (2011). Estéticas enraizadas: Aproximaciones ao vídeo indígena al América Latina. *Comunicación y Medios*, 4, 81-107. doi: 10.5354/0719-1529.2012.19895



- Corrêa, M. (2004). Vídeo das Aldeias. In M. Corrêa; S. Bloch & V. Carelli (Coords.), *Mostra vídeo nas aldeias: Um olhar indígena*. (pp. 33-39). Olinda, PE: Banco do Brasil.
- Corrigan, T. (2015). *O filme-ensaio: Desde Montaigne e depois de Marker*. Campinas, SP: Papirus.
- Costa, S. (2013). (Re)Encontrando-se nas redes? As ciências humanas e a nova geopolítica do conhecimento. In J. Almeida, A. Ribeiro, & H. T. Gomes, (Orgs.), *Crítica Pós-Colonial* (pp. 257-274). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: 7Letras.
- Diário Causa Operária (2018). *Indígenas são expulsos violentamente pela polícia de suas terras no Mato Grosso do Sul*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2uCV9uf>
- Durham, E. R. (2018). Apresentação. In B. Malinowski, *Argonautas do pacífico ocidental* (pp. 17-38). São Paulo, SP: Ubu.
- Fanon, F. (2008). *Pele negra máscaras brancas*. Salvador, BA: Edufba.
- Felipe, M. A. (2018). Escrituras fílmicas problematizadoras do mundo histórico: A “questão indígena” no Brasil. *Famecos*, 25(2), 1-30. doi: 10.15448/1980-3729.2018.2.29351
- Felipe, M. A. (2019). Variações sobre o documentário de Vincent Carelli: (Des)fazendo o novo. *Doc On-line*, 25, 6-46. doi: 10.20287/doc.d25.dt01
- Freire, M. (2011). *Documentário: Ética, estética e formas de representação*. São Paulo, SP: Annablume.
- Gallois, D. T. & Carelli, V. (1995). Vídeo e diálogo cultural: Experiência do projeto Vídeo nas Aldeias. *Horizontes antropológicos*, 1(2), 61-72.
- Ginsburg, F. (2011). Vídeo parentesco: Um ensaio sobre “A Arca dos Zoé” e “Eu já fui seu irmão”. In A. C. Z. Araújo (Org.), *Vídeo nas Aldeias 25 anos (1986-2011)* (pp. 172-179) Olinda, PE: Vídeo nas Aldeias.
- Golin, T. (2014). *A Guerra Guaranítica: O levante indígena que desafiou Portugal e Espanha*. São Paulo, SP: Terceiro Nome.
- Hartog, F. (2014). *Memória de Ulisses: Narrativas sobre a fronteira na Grécia antiga*. Belo Horizonte, MG: UFMG Press.
- Lacerda, R. (2018). O plano, o contraplano e o “plano sem plano”: Imagens ocidentais e Mbya Guarani de São Miguel. *Iluminuras*, 19(46), 135-168. doi: 10.22456/1984-1191.85245
- Ladeira, M. I. (2008). *Espaço geográfico Guarani-Mbya: Significado, constituição e uso*. Maringá, PR: Eduem.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: Contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In S. Castro-Gómez & R. Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 127-168). Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Malinowski, B. (2018), *Argonautas do Pacífico Ocidental*. São Paulo, SP: Ubu.

- Mecchi, Y. & Jornada, I. (2018). Alckmin diz que solução para conflito agrário é armamento rural. *Correio do Estado*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2HOOVQE>
- Miglievich-Ribeiro, A. (2014). Por uma razão decolonial: Desafios ético-político-epistemológicos à cosmovisão moderna. *Civitas*, 14(1), 66-80. doi: 10.15448/1984-7289.2014.1.16181
- Miglievich-Ribeiro, A & Prazeres, L. L. G. (2015). A produção da subalternidade sob a ótica pós-colonial (e decolonial). *Temáticas*, 23(45-46), 25-52.
- Migliorin, C. (2012). O que é um coletivo. In A. Brasil, M. Rocha & S. Borges (Coords.), *Teia (2002-2012)* (pp. 307-316). Belo Horizonte, MG: Teia.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2010). Aesthesis decolonial. *Calle 14*, 4(4), 10-25. doi: 10.14483/21450706.1224
- Mignolo, W. D. (2014). *Desobediencia epistémica: Retórica de la modernidade, lógica de la colonialidad e gramática de la descolonialidad*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2017). Colonialidade: O lado mais escuro da modernidade. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 32(94), 1-18. doi: 10.17666/329402/2017.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2018). *Historias locales/diseños globales: Colonialidad, conocimientos subalternos y pensamiento fronterizo*. Argentina/Espanha/México: Ediciones Akal.
- Moraes, F. (2017). A luta do cinema indígena. *Revista Zum*, 12, 76-95.
- Nichols, B. (2005). *Introdução ao documentário*. Campinas, SP: Papirus.
- Peirano, M. (2018). Prefácio a esta edição. In B. Malinowski, *Argonautas do pacífico ocidental* (pp. 11-16). São Paulo, SP: Ubu.
- Penafria, M. (1999). *O filme documentário: História, identidade, tecnologia*. Lisboa: Cosmos.
- Penafria, M. (2009). *Análise de filmes: Conceitos e metodologia(s)*. Artigo apresentado no VI Congresso Sopcom, Lisboa. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/1BGfzTa>
- Poty, V. (2015). Os Guarani-Mbyá: Palavras. In D. Christidis & V. Poty, *Os Guarani-Mbyá*. Porto Alegre, RS: Wences Design Criativo.
- Prysthon, A. (2006). Imagens periféricas: Os estudos culturais e o terceiro cinema. *E-Compós*, 6, 1-15. doi: 10.30962/ec.v6i0.73
- Quijano, A. (2005). Colonialidade do poder, eurocentrismo e América Latina. In E. Lander (Org.), *A colonialidade do saber: Eurocentrismo e ciências sociais: perspectivas latino-americanas* (pp. 107-130). Buenos Aires: Clacso.
- Ramos, F. P. (2005). A cicatriz da tomada: Documentário, ética e imagem intensa. In F. P. Ramos (Org.), *Teoria contemporânea do cinema* (pp. 159-226). São Paulo, SP: Senac Press.



- Ramos, F. P. (2009). Apresentação à edição brasileira. In L. Jullier & M. Marie, *Lendo as imagens do cinema* (pp. 9-13). São Paulo, SP: Senac Press.
- Stam, R. & Shohat, E. (2005). Teoria do cinema e espectralidade na era dos “pós”. In F. P. Ramos (Org.), *Teoria contemporânea do cinema: Pós-estruturalismo e filosofia analítica* (pp. 393-424). São Paulo, SP: Senac Press.
- Stam, R. & Shohat, E. (2006). *Crítica da imagem eurocêntrica: Multiculturalismo e representação*. São Paulo, SP: Cosac Naify.
- Sijll, J. V. (2017). *Narrativa cinematográfica: Contando histórias com imagens em movimento*. São Paulo, SP: WMF Martins Fontes.
- Tacca, F. (2001). *A imagética da Comissão Rondon: Etnografias filmicas estratégicas*. Campinas, SP: Papirus.
- Vídeo nas Aldeias (Producer). (2010). *Cineastas indígenas* [DVD]. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2ODHVqx>
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2017). Perspectivismo e multinaturalismo na América indígena. In E. Viveiros de Castro, *A inconstância da alma selvagem* (pp. 299-346). São Paulo, SP: Ubu.

Article received on September 12, 2018 and approved on December 16, 2018.