Revista leetra Indígena

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF INDIGENOUS PRODUCTIONS: TRANSLATION AS AN ATTEMPT TO REPAIR SILENCING

A INTERNACIONALIZAÇÃO DAS PRODUÇÕES INDÍGENAS: TRADUÇÃO COMO UMA TENTATIVA DE REPARAR O SILENCIAMENTO

Patrick Rezende[1]

Abstract
This article examines the intersections between scientific production, internationalization, and Anglophone hegemony, considering epistemological tensions derived from the coloniality of knowledge. Grounded in the concept of *mondialisation* (Mongin, 2005), which transcends economic globalization by contemplating cultural and identity transitions, we analyze the paradox of English as a global scientific language: while facilitating transnational knowledge circulation, it perpetuates historical asymmetries, privileging perspectives from the Global North (Phillipson, 2008). In the Brazilian context, university internationalization is tensioned between English adoption and the invisibilization of local knowledge, especially indigenous epistemologies, which possess their own systems of epistemic registration and transmission (Rezende, 2019). We argue that critical translation practices can function as mechanisms for epistemic emancipation, expanding the circulation of indigenous epistemologies. We conclude that scientific democratization requires not only the inclusion of subalternized voices but also the transformation of hegemonic criteria for scientific validation.
Keywords: English hegemony; Coloniality of knowledge; Indigenous epistemologies; Scientific internationalization; Translation.

Resumo
Este artigo examina as intersecções entre produção científica, internacionalização e hegemonia anglófona, considerando as tensões epistemológicas derivadas da colonialidade do saber. Fundamentado no conceito de *mundialização* (Mongin, 2005), que ultrapassa a globalização econômica ao contemplar transições culturais e identitárias, analisa-se o paradoxo do inglês como língua científica global: enquanto facilita a circulação transnacional do conhecimento, perpetua assimetrias históricas, privilegiando perspectivas do Norte Global (Phillipson, 2008). No contexto brasileiro, a internacionalização universitária tensiona-se entre a adoção do inglês e a invisibilização de saberes locais, especialmente indígenas, que possuem sistemas próprios de registro e transmissão epistêmica (Rezende, 2019). Argumenta-se que práticas tradutórias críticas podem funcionar como mecanismos de emancipação epistêmica, ampliando a circulação de epistemologias indígenas. Conclui-se que a democratização científica requer não apenas inclusão de vozes subalternizadas, mas transformação dos critérios hegemônicos de validação científica.
Palavras-chave: Hegemonia do inglês; Colonialidade do saber; Epistemologias indígenas; Internacionalização científica; Tradução.

Scientific Production, Internationalization, and the English Language

The French writer and editor Olivier Mongin (2005) observes that globalization has often been conceived in a reductive manner, limited to a strictly economic and market-driven dimension characterized by intense financial, commercial, and technological flows. However, the author emphasizes that the contemporary global processes in which we are embedded

[1] Permanent Professor in the Department of English Language Studies, Literature and Translation at the Federal University of Ceará. Ph.D. in Language Studies from the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). Email: patrickrezende@hotmail.com

constitute a significantly more complex and multifaceted dynamic, marked by profound migratory displacements, cultural hybridizations, identity crises, and the emergence of new forms of belonging. According to Mongin (2005), these transformations directly impact our perceptions of space and time, reshaping the traditional frameworks that structure social experience. In this context, the author proposes the notion of *mondialisation* (worlding) to designate this expanded and more comprehensive phenomenon, which transcends the boundaries of a purely economic logic.

For Mongin (2007), the processes of global decentering have their roots in the colonial projects of the 15th–19th centuries, which consolidated a binary narrative of center (Europe as the civilizing metropolis) and periphery (colonies as subaltern spaces). This paradigm, however, undergoes radical transformations throughout the 20th century—first through the crisis of nation-states and the independence movements of former colonies, and later through the technical and financial reconfiguration of globalized capitalism by the century's end.

In contemporary times, this decentering intensifies through two seemingly contradictory dynamics. On one hand, there is a tendency toward technical and cultural homogenization, driven by the financialization of flows, the relocation of industrial production chains, and the diffusion of digital technologies. On the other, there is a growing fragmentation of identities, manifested in the resurgence of local, religious, and communal particularisms that challenge the presumed universality of Western values. Mongin (2006) argues that this duality does not represent a transient historical phase but rather a structural paradox inherent to the process of *mondialisation*, whose tensions decisively shape the social, cultural, and political configurations of the contemporary world. The author contends that this dynamic does not unfold linearly or progressively: decentering does not imply the replacement of the traditional center-periphery logic with a new stable hierarchy but rather establishes a world-space characterized by paradoxical polycentricity. In this sense, *mondialisation* is less an evolutionary stage or a delimited historical phase than a continuous process of deterritorialization, which simultaneously redefines the categories of global and local, straining their boundaries and interdependencies.

In this scenario of global decentering, the linguistic question takes on particularly complex contours, emerging within an agenda marked by tensions between dominant dynamics and local resistances. On one hand, there is the undeniable consolidation of English as the

hegemonic *lingua franca* of transnational flows—economic, media-related, academic, and technological—granting it a position of functional centrality in the global space. On the other, there is a resurgence of local linguistic-cultural identities that, in response to the symbolic homogenization imposed by global centers, articulate strategies of resistance and affirmation. This constitutes a paradoxical configuration in which the instrumental universalization of the language coexists with the revaluation of situated linguistic affiliations, highlighting the ambivalences that characterize contemporary processes of cultural globalization.

As early as the 1990s, in the first edition of his seminal work *English as a Global Language*, David Crystal (1997) critically reflected on the multiple vectors sustaining the contemporary hegemony of the English language. According to the author, this predominance cannot be attributed solely to historical factors, such as British colonial expansion or the consolidation of the United States as a global power in the post-World War II era. He also underscores the centrality of economic, media-related, scientific, and cultural elements that, collectively, contributed to the diffusion of English as the global language of transnational circuits. Crystal cautions, however, that such linguistic supremacy is not without consequences, as it entails significant risks of marginalization and erosion of other languages and cultures, jeopardizing global linguistic diversity.

It is understood that the hegemonization of English, intensifying particularly during the Cold War, cannot be comprehended solely through the lens of communicative functionality. It is equally imperative to consider the profound power asymmetries that permeate and structure global relations, given that the diffusion of certain languages at the expense of others is intrinsically linked to geopolitical, economic, and cultural dynamics that perpetuate hierarchies and inequalities in the international system. In this regard, a critical and vigilant stance is necessary—for instance, toward the very notion of *lingua franca*, since this designation, as Phillipson (2008) warns, may misleadingly evoke the idea of linguistic neutrality. The author stresses that labeling English as a "is a neutral instrument for ‘international’ communication between speakers who do not share a mother tongue" (Ibid., p. 251) not only poses an ideological risk but also constitutes a falsehood, given that English operates as a vector of hierarchies that reproduce power asymmetries inherited from colonial structures and reiterated by the imperialist practices of contemporary neoliberalism. Phillipson (2008) further emphasizes that its predominant use in the realms of economics, diplomacy, and academic and

scientific production does not stem exclusively from practical criteria or an equitable choice but rather reflects the consolidation of structures that favor native speakers and Anglophone nations while marginalizing other languages and cultures.

Within the context of English linguistic hegemony, it is pertinent to note that renowned scholars in the field, such as Pennycook (2006), Canagarajah (2012), and Jenkins (2015), argue that this process should not be understood as a monolithic or unidirectional system. In other words, English does not function as a homogeneously imposed instrument but rather as a language constantly reconfigured and resignified by its users, who mobilize hybrid and multiple repertoires in constructing situated meanings. This perspective highlights the dynamic nature of language, demonstrating how speakers' linguistic practices incorporate and adapt elements from different communicative systems, generating forms of expression that transcend prescriptive norms.

Such an approach displaces English from its traditional status as an imperial language, revealing how it is continuously deterritorialized and relocalized in everyday practices—whether through lexical borrowings, code-switching, or grammatical adaptations. For Canagarajah (2017), these phenomena should not be interpreted as mere deviations from a centralized norm but rather as legitimate linguistic performances that subvert traditional hierarchies. Thus, although English remains embedded in global power structures, its discursive materiality is continuously resignified by subjects who use it—not as passive agents but as protagonists of linguistic practices that challenge the authority historically conferred upon so-called "native speakers."

The local reappropriations that subvert the linguistic legacies of colonial ventures have also contributed to the consolidation of English, in recent decades, as the primary language of global communication. This condition is particularly evident in the academic sphere, where the language plays a central role in the production and circulation of knowledge. The predominance of English in this context stems largely from the expansion of possibilities for dialogue among researchers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, making it a privileged instrument for the international dissemination of knowledge.

In this regard, English occupies a central role in fostering integration among global scientific communities, facilitating collaborations, joint publications, and access to international research networks. However, it is crucial to reiterate that this centrality does not

necessarily entail the suppression of national or community languages, nor the erasure of the cultural identities of the peoples who use it in academic contexts. On the contrary, it may be understood as a strategy for projecting knowledge and scientific production beyond local boundaries, overcoming linguistic barriers that might otherwise restrict their circulation. Thus, English—as previously discussed, with its multiple variations and accents—can paradoxically contribute to the valorization and strengthening of local identities and cultures within the very process of internationalization (Knight, 1999).

Nevertheless, this seemingly inclusive and functional dimension of English in academia should not obscure the tensions that permeate its use as the *lingua franca* of science. By mobilizing the concept of *locus of enunciation*, as proposed by Walter Mignolo (2003), it becomes evident that the English language—despite the Western desire for universal neutrality—is always produced from specific historical, social, and cultural coordinates. For Mignolo, all knowledge is enunciated from a determined place, and the concealment of this place—a recurring practice in Western scientific tradition—constitutes one of the strategies of the coloniality of knowledge. Thus, the English used in academic publications is not a transparent or disinterested language but rather one imbued with the geopolitics of knowledge, inheriting a colonial project that sought to universalize itself. This perspective destabilizes the notion that scientific English is a neutral medium of rationality, revealing instead that it is permeated by situated worldviews that reflect interests, silences, and exclusions. Recognizing this marking is essential for problematizing the linguistic and epistemic hegemony that English represents while simultaneously creating space for other forms of enunciation—often marginalized but equally legitimate and potent in knowledge production.

The role played by the English language in contemporary times constitutes one of the multiple reflections of the *mondialisation* process described by Mongin (2006), with the language itself being traversed by an inherent tension between homogenizing tendencies and movements of identitarian fragmentation. This tension becomes particularly visible in the case of languages with colonial trajectories, such as English, which—as Mariani (2004) argues—carries with it an institutionalized memory: "the memory of the colonizer about their own history and their own language[2]" (p. 24). In other words, even when mobilized to name or

[2] Translated from Portuguese: “a memória do colonizador sobre a sua própria história e sobre sua própria língua”.

represent other realities, English remains anchored in a semantic logic shaped by categories and meanings historically produced within the colonial context.

In this sense, Mariani (2004) emphasizes that the meanings previously institutionalized by the dominant language tend to persist, as local discursive practices, while seeking to name new contexts or resignify events, implicitly operate within a politics of meaning organized from the language of the metropole. Thus, even when subverted or resignified in global academic production, English continues to reproduce the effects of a colonial legacy manifested in the ways science and knowledge are organized, validated, and disseminated.

It is therefore imperative to recognize the tensions that permeate the use of English as the *lingua franca* of science, rejecting its conception as a mere neutral instrument of communication or as a simple means of expanding the reach of academic production. The paradox between the drive toward universalization and the persistence of colonial markers underscores the urgency of constant epistemological vigilance and continuous critical reflection on the linguistic practices that hegemonize knowledge production spaces.

From this perspective, it is essential to emphasize that English, as the *hegemonic language* of global science, transcends its role as a mere technical medium of communication, constituting instead a field of epistemological contestation where historical power relations are constantly reenacted. The deconstruction of the colonial structures of knowledge thus demands not only the amplification of voices and discursive practices that challenge the centrality of English but also the recognition of the symbolic marks this language carries—marks that continue to shape the boundaries of academic knowledge on a global scale.

The centrality of English as the language of science is unequivocally reflected in the internationalization process of Brazilian universities, a phenomenon that gained significant momentum in recent decades and has contributed to the country's insertion into global knowledge production circuits (Morosini & Nascimento, 2017). In this context, academic production in English emerges as one of the primary strategies for integration into international research networks, fostering the circulation of knowledge and collaboration among researchers from different world regions. However, this process of internationalization—deeply intertwined with linguistic issues—does not occur free of tensions, as it is situated at the intersection of global demands and the specificities of local realities. The adoption of English as the predominant language for international publication and collaboration, though consolidated as

an institutional strategy (Knight, 2003), imposes significant challenges, particularly by marginalizing research that does not align with global linguistic and epistemological standards or that faces difficulties in accessing adequate resources, thereby exposing the limitations of this internationalization dynamic.

Thus, researchers situated beyond the walls of this scientific center often find themselves in a position of epistemic subalternity in global knowledge production, meaning that their investigations—developed in non-hegemonic languages, even if belonging to the European linguistic canon—lack broad dissemination and consequently tend to assume an endemic character, circulating predominantly in local circuits. Conversely, when opting to produce scientific work in English, they necessarily submit to the normative and paradigmatic protocols imposed both by the politics of meaning inherent to English and by structural factors, such as the guidelines of transnational academic journals. This entails not only linguistic translation but may also imply conformity to hegemonic epistemological and methodological archetypes, often detached from the sociocultural and contextual specificities of their autochthonous realities. While this process may enhance these researchers' international visibility, it imposes substantial challenges by demanding their adaptation to a scientific system that, intrinsically, may not fully accommodate their theoretical perspectives and investigative approaches.

Indigenous Knowledge Production and the Challenges of Academic Dissemination

In broad segments of Brazilian society, a persistent misconception holds that Indigenous peoples constitute *non-literate* societies—lacking writing systems and, consequently, devoid of historiographic preservation mechanisms, collective memory, or documentary archives. This assumption is rooted in a Eurocentric epistemology that establishes a false dichotomy between orality and writing, wherein orality is reductively understood as mere phonetic expression, while writing is narrowly conceived only in its Western alphabetic form (Rezende, 2019).

It is crucial to deconstruct the recalcitrant notion, constructed by Western discourse, that the historical—or even contemporary, in certain ethnic groups—absence of Western alphabetic writing in Amerindian societies constitutes a communicative limitation. On the contrary, as argued in previous research (Rezende, 2019), there exists a myriad of graphic expressions endowed with communicative intentionality, materialized in sophisticated recording systems that traverse the cultural diversity of Brazil's Indigenous peoples.

As Souza (2006) discusses, writing can be conceived as an interactional modality that transcends the alphabetic system, manifesting through manual marks left on various surfaces, representing concepts, cultural principles, or narratives. From this broader perspective, the author argues that Brazilian Indigenous peoples have always developed writing practices, evidenced in the graphic designs present in ceramics, textiles, wooden artifacts, woven crafts, and body inscriptions.

In this sense, it is pertinent to emphasize that "Indigenous communities in Brazil, therefore, are not lacking in writing but are independent of an alphabet[3]" (Rezende, 2019, p. 100). Their mnemonic archives have historically been safeguarded through oral traditions while simultaneously being preserved through recording forms that exceed Western alphabetic models.

An illustrative case of Indigenous writing systems is the *kusiwa* art of the Wajãpi, a sophisticated set of body graphic patterns that transcends mere ritual ornamentation. As Vivas (2008) notes, this is an aesthetic and creative tradition embedded in daily family life, composed of collectively recognized patterns referencing elements of fauna or material adornments. This dynamic and ever-expanding graphic repertoire effectively constitutes a non-alphabetic form of writing, as it produces culturally shared meanings, functioning as an expressive vehicle for Wajãpi cosmologies—even before this people's recent adoption of alphabetic writing.

The case of the Wajãpi, currently situated in Amapá, exemplifies—among many other possible examples—how writing practices can manifest through representational systems distinct from the alphabetic paradigm. By endorsing this conception of writing, we necessarily dissolve the artificially established boundaries between orality and literacy. Although Brazil's Indigenous societies were historically classified as *non-literate* or *oral* by colonizers due to their lack of an alphabet, an epistemological shift is necessary, aligned with Tania Clemente de Souza's (2017) perspective, which recognizes them as *oral-based societies*. This conceptual repositioning not only values orality as a constitutive trait of these peoples' identities but, more fundamentally, enables an understanding of these cultures through their own discursive materialities rather than comparative parameters with Western literate societies.

[3] Translated from Portuguese: "as comunidades indígenas brasileiras, portanto, não se mostram carentes de escrita, mas independentes de um alfabeto"

Clemente de Souza (2017) proposes a reconceptualization of orality as a historically constituted phenomenon and as a socio-historical space of semantic production, configuring itself as a linguistic social practice endowed with specific materiality. This perspective, however, does not imply the absence of writing systems in these societies, as previously demonstrated.

> To understand Indigenous peoples as members of oral-based societies is to consider them not from an external perspective—framed by the Western gaze of *lack*—but from a standpoint that begins with their own forms of signification, recognizing the presence of diverse inscription modalities within orality[4] (Rezende, 2019, p. 101).

Thus, various linguistic expression modalities among Indigenous peoples are marked by fluidity between orality and writing, as well as between verbal and non-verbal communication. These manifestations materialize in oral narratives, body graphics, artifacts, dances, ceramics, featherwork, and other semiotic supports through which historically situated subjects express their worldviews, social organizations, and ideological stances.

Tania Clemente de Souza (2017) argues that to understand discursivity in oral-based societies, one must recognize that they operate in an integrated manner between verbal and non-verbal domains, without being confined to a single system of signification. The traditional narratives of each Indigenous community, for instance, are performed through orality and articulated with gestures, body paintings, musical instruments, garments, and various other expressive modes that function as supports for memory and cultural transmission.

Munduruku (2006) observes that in Indigenous oral-based societies, writing is not restricted to the graphic materiality recognized by Western rationality. It is an *other* writing—invisible to urban codes—that articulates spiritual, cosmological, and existential dimensions. This form of inscription, embedded in the body itself and in collective memory, sustains ways of life, knowledge systems, and resistances, configuring itself as an expression of Indigenous thought that challenges the epistemic limits of the West and affirms other possible ontologies. Thus, the absence of alphabetic writing among Amerindian peoples should never be interpreted as a deficiency but rather as an expression of *non-necessity*, given that these cultures have historically developed their own symbolic systems to interpret, represent, and transmit reality.

[4] Translated from Portuguese: "Ao entendermos os indígenas como membros de sociedades de oralidade, a ambição é pensá-los não de uma perspectiva externa, a partir do olhar ocidental da falta, mas de um ponto de vista que parta de suas próprias formas de significação, enxergando a presença de diferentes formas de inscrição na oralidade".

From this perspective, a critical stance is imperative—one that recognizes that the preservation of Indigenous memories, narratives, knowledge, and cultural aspects does not (and did not) depend on alphabetic writing for its legitimacy or continuity (Rezende, 2019).

In contemporary times, Indigenous peoples have been reappropriating this exogenous technological resource—imposed violently over five centuries ago—as a political tool for preserving their collective memories. In doing so, these peoples strengthen their cultural resistance mechanisms, using writing as a means of circulating their knowledge and ensuring self-preservation against persistent forms of physical and symbolic violence.

In this process, it is essential to highlight—as defended in prior research (Rezende, 2019)—that oral-based societies do not perceive alphabetic writing as a mere representation of speech but rather as a *supplement* (*supplément*) in the Derridean sense (Derrida, 1967[2011]). That is, not as a complement to something supposedly complete (as if writing secondarily represented an original and self-sufficient speech), but as an element that reveals speech was never fully autonomous. Thus, as previously noted, Indigenous societies have always relied on diverse semiotic forms for communication. However, alphabetic writing—though historically used to subjugate societies independent of it—is also subject to the logic of insufficiency, as both speech and writing are marked by *différance* and the deferral of meaning, precluding any instance of plenitude or absolute presence. In Derrida's framework (1967[2011]), speech and writing are not independent or hierarchizable instances; both are manifestations of the same fundamental structure of signification, marked by difference and the absence of an original plenitude.

From this understanding, we observe that Indigenous peoples, in adopting alphabetic writing as a mode of supplementation, not only resignify a technology historically used for their disqualification but also incorporate it as a means of reinscribing and intensifying their semiotic practices. Thus, what emerges is an appropriation that does not constitute mere adaptation to Western norms but rather a practice of subversion and transformation—one in which writing becomes a fluid, multimodal space traversed by orality, enabling the recovery, preservation, and continuous reinvention of Indigenous traditions without ever fixing itself in a stable or full origin.

Despite the powerful reappropriation of alphabetic writing by Indigenous societies, it is imperative to recognize that these populations continue to face persistent forms of epistemic

violence, including in contemporary academic and scientific spheres. This persistence stems largely from the requirement that the production and circulation of their knowledge not only occur through alphabetic writing—a technology already critically and creatively incorporated, as demonstrated—but also through the grammaticalization of their native languages and, above all, through articulation in colonial languages: first, in the Brazilian context, Portuguese, and more recently, English, due to the dynamics of scientific internationalization, as discussed in the previous section.

This linguistic imposition functions as a renewed exclusionary mechanism, establishing filters and hierarchies that delegitimize Indigenous epistemologies within their own frames of reference, forcing them into translation and conformity with Western discursive models. Thus, the coloniality of knowledge reasserts itself, shifting from explicit silencing practices to more subtle mechanisms of linguistic-discursive normalization, which continue to obstruct the full recognition of the epistemic and ontological plurality constituting Indigenous cosmologies.

In this landscape of tensions and contradictions, a growing Indigenous presence in academia highlights the strength, resistance, and vitality of their epistemologies—even in contexts historically marked by systematic exclusion and silencing. Justino Rezende (2024), for instance, appears as co-author of the article *"Indigenizing conservation science for a sustainable Amazon"*, published in *Science*, one of the world's most prestigious academic journals, reaffirming the centrality of Indigenous knowledge in constructing alternatives for planetary sustainability. Another significant example is the work of Trudruá Dorrico, who stands out in literary and critical studies by articulating memory, resistance, and identity from Indigenous perspectives. These experiences attest to the potency of Indigenous epistemologies in reconfiguring knowledge production spaces.

Nevertheless, Indigenous researchers continue to face structural barriers, including limited access to funding, precarious publication resources, and the need to conform to editorial criteria favoring Eurocentric academic formats. Scientific journals and university presses, even those committed to epistemological diversity, predominantly operate under logics that privilege methodologies, writing styles, and argumentation forms aligned with Western paradigms—often incompatible with Indigenous thought structures, temporalities, and expressive modes. This scenario underscores the urgent need not only to expand mechanisms for Indigenous

visibility but also to critically deconstruct the prevailing criteria of knowledge legitimization in academic spaces.

In light of these challenges, translation emerges as a potentially transformative tool for the visibility and legitimization of Indigenous academic production on the international stage. Beyond mere linguistic operations, translation practices—when approached from an intercultural and postcolonial perspective—function as epistemic bridges. They enable Indigenous *knowledges*, worldviews, and methodologies to traverse geopolitical and disciplinary boundaries, even if they inevitably involve negotiations with varying degrees of domestication and erasure intrinsic to any translation process.

Thus, translation must be conceived not merely as a technical instrument for the internationalization of Indigenous production but as a political and ethical exercise that facilitates the circulation of historically marginalized epistemologies, challenging the hegemonic structures of global academia. By allowing these discourses to traverse different linguistic and cultural contexts, translation not only fosters the dissemination of Indigenous authors but also promotes a reconfiguration of dominant epistemological parameters in academic and scientific spheres, broadening horizons for an effective plurality of *knowledges*.

Translation and Epistemic Violence: Attempts at Reparation

From the earliest days of Brazilian colonization, translation processes constituted fundamental instruments of territorial domination and control. Far from being a purely linguistic activity — which it never is—translation functioned as a tool of asymmetrical mediation, facilitating the imposition of European values and power structures upon Indigenous populations. It is worth noting that the figure of the *"língua"* — an interpreter who mediated communication between colonizers and Indigenous peoples—emerged as a key player in this context, not as a mere facilitator of intercultural dialogue but as a strategic agent of the colonial project (Wyler, 2003; Rezende, 2023). These interpreters were, for the most part, Portuguese exiles who, abandoned in Brazil during the early years of colonial invasion, established prolonged contact with Indigenous populations, acquiring proficiency in native languages. Their role proved crucial to the consolidation of the Portuguese Empire's colonial strategies, as they provided both linguistic and cultural advantages. By serving as mediators, they facilitated negotiation processes, forged strategic alliances, and enabled the collection of essential

information about territories, natural resources, and the sociopolitical dynamics of Indigenous communities. Thus, they became indispensable agents in the expansion and consolidation of Portuguese colonial rule in the Americas. Translation, therefore, was not an act of respect for linguistic alterity but rather a sophisticated political maneuver designed to access Indigenous subjectivities in order to better implement Lusitanian domination policies and, later, Catholic catechization—effectively weaponizing native languages against their original speakers.

Throughout the colonial period, translation processes thus functioned as central devices of what Mignolo (2000) conceptualizes as the *coloniality of knowledge*. The subjugation of Indigenous languages to European grammatical structures, as well as the translation of their cosmologies into Christian categories, exemplify practices that enacted what Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2000) terms *"epistemicide"*—that is, the systematic erasure of local knowledges by foreign epistemologies, in this case, of European origin. In this sense, "translation enabled the invaders to engineer Indigenous knowledge and thought systems in alignment with Western paradigms[5]" (Rezende, 2023), thereby consolidating intellectual domination as an extension and deepening of the colonial project.

The enactment of the *Diretório dos Índios* (Directory of the Indians) in 1757 provoked an even deeper reconfiguration of linguistic dynamics within the colony. Among its imposed measures was the mandatory exclusive use of the Portuguese language in colonial territories, which significantly diminished the role of translation in the colonial context. Translation, which until then had played a strategic role in imposing and reorganizing communication systems between Europeans and Indigenous peoples, lost much of its centrality, while Portuguese consolidated itself not only as an administrative and religious language but also as an instrument of forced assimilation and cultural homogenization of Indigenous populations.

Faced with this historical backdrop, translation processes underwent a notable reorientation, shifting primarily toward relations between Portuguese and hegemonic European languages, particularly French and English. This configuration, which privileges the Lusophone axis in translation practices, persists as a dominant contemporary paradigm and represents one of the consequences of systematic policies aimed at forcibly incorporating Indigenous peoples into the Brazilian national identity project—a process that not only marginalized their languages

[5] Translated from Portuguese: "a prática da tradução viabilizou aos invasores uma engenharia das formas de conhecimento e pensamento dos povos indígenas em consonância com os paradigmas ocidentais"

and knowledges but also stripped them of the essential right to determine their own cultural and political destinies.

Since the 1990s, contestatory movements challenging Portuguese hegemony have granted increasing visibility to Indigenous languages in the Brazilian context. The process of recovering and re-elaborating Indigenous narratives exemplifies this phenomenon, offering new translational approaches. These initiatives emerge from the resistance and political articulation of Indigenous peoples themselves, who gained greater political agency by the late 20th century. In this context, the *União das Nações Indígenas* (Union of Indigenous Nations) played a decisive role in securing the advances enshrined in the 1988 Constitution, which recognized multiculturalism and guaranteed fundamental rights to Indigenous peoples, such as traditional land possession and the preservation of their cultural manifestations in environments necessary for their reproduction (Rezende, 2023).

Amid this growing Indigenous political mobilization and constitutional recognition of their rights, translation has begun to be repositioned as a potential instrument of epistemic visibility. This reconfiguration does not emerge as a mere continuation of historical translation practices but as their radical critique and resignification. Unlike colonial practices that instrumentalized translation as a vehicle for domestication and erasure, contemporary initiatives seek to establish dialogic processes that recognize Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies on their own terms—even when mediated by colonial languages—thereby challenging the supposed universality of Western thought.

However, a structural challenge remains: although translation is now largely mobilized as a tool of resistance and visibility, most research produced by Indigenous intellectuals in Brazil is still published predominantly in Portuguese. This choice, far from being merely practical or voluntary, stems from an institutional requirement of national academic journals, which demand Portuguese-language texts to facilitate peer review. In a country where the academic elite remains largely unfamiliar with Indigenous languages, Portuguese emerges as the inevitable medium for knowledge circulation within the university space. This configuration, however, reveals a double tension: on one hand, the pragmatic necessity of using Portuguese as a means of institutional insertion and recognition; on the other, the involuntary perpetuation of linguistic coloniality—which, by favoring a European language of low global prestige, limits the international reach of Indigenous epistemologies.

This reality means that many Indigenous *knowledges*, even when rewritten and reclaimed from a postcolonial perspective, remain confined to national circuits, lacking the same impact or recognition that research disseminated in English inevitably achieves. As discussed in the first section of this article, English occupies a hegemonic position as the language of contemporary academic knowledge production and legitimation—a phenomenon that deepens global epistemic asymmetry. In this context, translating the works of Brazilian Indigenous researchers into English becomes, paradoxically, a strategic act of reappropriation: not an unthinking submission to the colonial logic of English as the *lingua franca* of science, but a critical instrumentalization of this position to amplify historically silenced voices in a global arena. Thus, translation into English can operate as a tactic of epistemic insurgency, expanding the circulation of alternative *knowledges*, displacing centers of knowledge production, and ultimately challenging the linguistic and epistemic hierarchies that sustain contemporary coloniality.

Therefore, recognizing the complexity of translation in this multifaceted scenario proves absolutely essential: it not only navigates the dialectical tensions between local and global, between epistemic resistance and the reproduction of colonial structures, but also offers concrete possibilities for critically subverting these historically entrenched hegemonic dynamics. When resignified and repositioned as an insurgent practice, translation transcends its instrumental condition as mere communicative mediation and asserts itself as a political and strategic act, endowed with transformative potential within the geopolitics of knowledge. This reconceptualization of translation enables the emergence of a counter-hegemonic enunciative space capable of destabilizing the regimes of invisibility systematically imposed upon Indigenous epistemologies in the hierarchical, globalized order of academic knowledge. Translation, thus understood, reconfigures itself as a device for intervening in the power relations that structure knowledge production and circulation, facilitating the creation of contact zones where diverse *knowledges* can engage in dialogues not subordinated to Eurocentric epistemological frameworks.

Final Notes: Attempts to Amplify Voices

Contemporary scientific production remains structured according to models that privilege Western thought as the legitimate *locus of enunciation*, predominantly manifesting as

a discursive practice that is masculinized and anchored in the centrality of writing as a hegemonic epistemic norm. This configuration reinforces what Spivak (1988 [2010]) identified as the epistemic exclusion of the *subaltern*—subjects whose forms of knowledge are systematically silenced. The primacy of writing as a technology of power not only marginalizes oral traditions and embodied *knowledges* but also naturalizes hierarchies that associate scientific production with a specific model of rationality—one that is masculinized and tied to the institutions of the Global North. In this way, the sciences contribute to the suppression of dissident epistemologies, perpetuating the coloniality of knowledge even in postcolonial contexts.

This logic constitutes a vicious epistemic cycle: by refusing to reproduce the parameters established by the Western canon, dissident researchers are excluded from the primary mechanisms of scientific validation—indexed journals, funding agencies, academic spaces—rendering their critiques invisible precisely because they do not conform to the very rules they denounce. Following Spivak (1988 [2010]), one might argue that the problem lies not only in the silencing of the subaltern but in the structural delegitimization of their modes of knowledge, systematically classified as "unscientific" for deviating from dominant validity criteria. Supposed academic principles—such as methodological rigor, neutral and technical language, and standardized formats of scientific production—function as epistemic filters that exclude knowledges misaligned with Western rationality, ranging from Indigenous knowledges rooted in orality to feminist epistemologies that contest the purported neutrality of science. Thus, subjects situated on the peripheries of academic-scientific circuits face a dilemma: to be recognized, they must adhere to protocols that, in themselves, perpetuate the exclusion of dissident epistemologies. This dynamic not only reinforces the coloniality of knowledge but also naturalizes marginalization under the pretext of alleged "methodological inadequacy." The result is the maintenance of a system that legitimizes itself while foreclosing alternatives, creating the illusion that no valid knowledge production exists outside its framework.

In this context, translation processes emerge as a potential vector of transformation, operating in the interstices of colonial structures themselves. By translating subaltern knowledges into hegemonic codes without reducing them to these parameters, a fissure is created in the system: previously marginalized knowledges gain academic intelligibility while retaining the marks of their difference. Translation, in this sense, does not erase asymmetries

but makes them evident, transforming scientific language itself into a site of struggle. When, for example, an Indigenous epistemology on ecological relations is translated into scientific discourse while preserving its non-Western key concepts, a double subversion occurs: the canon is forced to expand (albeit in a limited way), and validity criteria are destabilized. Translation, though it does not resolve the aforementioned paradox, transforms it into a tactic: by negotiating with hegemonic structures without fully submitting to them, it paves the way for a gradual, if ambiguous, erosion of the coloniality of knowledge. This is a slow—and often ambivalent—shift, but it demonstrates how epistemic resistance can operate even within oppressive systems, converting the very tools of exclusion (academic language and the predominance of English) into instruments of insurgency.

A paradigmatic example of this epistemic insurgency is the case of Justino Rezende, mentioned earlier, who leverages the prestige and legitimacy of one of the world's leading scientific journals to reposition Indigenous knowledges as central to the global scientific debate, demonstrating how the knowledge systems of Indigenous peoples offer effective environmental management models that challenge conventional conservation science paradigms. Another relevant example is Ailton Krenak, who, by writing in a colonial language and textual genres, employs a form of epistemic anthropophagy—appropriating alphabetic writing, a technology historically used to inferiorize and silence Indigenous peoples, to reinscribe autochthonous knowledges into intellectual debates, not only in Brazil but globally. His books, translated into numerous languages, have created a new political-ecological lexicon that now influences traditionally Western disciplines such as anthropology, philosophy, and social sciences.

These authors demonstrate that transformative processes are not achieved through categorical rejection of the hegemonic system but through the strategic and subversive occupation of its institutional spaces. By appropriating Western languages and scientific methodologies, these agents function analogously to Trojan devices inserted into dominant academic mechanisms, substantively altering the cadence and trajectory of their epistemic functioning.

Thus, translation, more than a mere strategy, can be understood as a crucial device in the struggle to expand and legitimize plural epistemologies. This struggle manifests simultaneously in both the propositional content of knowledge and the structures of its validation and legitimation, challenging the monolithic paradigms of Western rationality and

its universalist pretensions. However, for this contestation to be effective, it is imperative to recognize that the deconstruction of colonial scientific paradigms cannot be the exclusive task of Indigenous peoples. On the contrary, it demands critical and self-critical engagement from non-Indigenous researchers. This alliance, though necessary, must be carefully constructed to avoid both the trap of epistemic appropriation—where Indigenous knowledges are co-opted without proper acknowledgment of their authorship or context—and the paternalistic stance in which non-Indigenous actors position themselves as "spokespersons." In this sense, the role of non-Indigenous academics in this process should be one of actively unlearning the colonialist assumptions that structure their disciplines, creating institutional spaces where Indigenous epistemologies can circulate on their own terms, free from distortive mediations.

This deconstructive effort transcends mere critical awareness, demanding the implementation of transformative practices capable of amplifying the visibility and circulation of ancestral Indigenous knowledges on a global scale. The materialization of initiatives led by non-Indigenous scholars—such as multilingual scientific journals specializing in Indigenous epistemologies, training programs for intercultural mediators attuned to the ontological and epistemic specificities of these situated knowledges—constitutes an insurgent potential in the destabilization of hegemonic cognitive hierarchies.

These interventions function as mechanisms for legitimizing and recognizing the centrality of Indigenous enunciations in the transnational academic sphere. Crucially, such actions must not be understood as paternalistic concessions or magnanimous gestures toward Indigenous peoples but as acknowledgments of the relational structure of coloniality—a system that subalternizes and dehumanizes all involved subjects, including non-Indigenous people, by reproducing epistemic and ontological violences that obstruct the construction of pluriversal ecologies of knowledge and alternative civilizational horizons beyond Western modernity.

Additionally, the implementation of editorial policies that encourage bilingual or multilingual publications constitutes a fundamental device for consolidating epistemic plurality, enabling the transversal circulation of Indigenous knowledges across different linguistic systems and cultural horizons. However, such initiatives must be critically guided to ensure that the disruptive potential of these knowledges is not neutralized or domesticated but preserved in its ontological radicality, challenging hegemonic epistemic paradigms and proposing alternative cosmologies for understanding and inhabiting the world. In this way,

these efforts not only expand the territories of Indigenous epistemologies but also open concrete possibilities for a substantive transformation of knowledge production, legitimation, and validation dynamics in the globalized academy.

There is no viable, authentic, or sustainable path for the internationalization of Brazilian scientific research that does not fully recognize Indigenous epistemic productions as essential elements of this process. The incorporation of these ancestral cosmologies and methodologies goes beyond compensatory representational policies, constituting a fundamental condition for the construction of a truly pluriversal and counter-hegemonic academia in Brazil.

In this context, the translation of these productions emerges as a device capable of subverting the epistemicidal homogenization imposed by Western linguistic hegemony—particularly English, which exerts imperial dominance over global scientific output. Through translation practices attuned to the specificities of Indigenous knowledges, the possibility arises to deterritorialize dominant languages, allowing these knowledges to resist uniformization and circulate globally on their own cosmological terms, preserving their transformative potency and unique enunciative character.

This epistemic-political mobilization not only expands the boundaries of conventional academic knowledge but also establishes genuinely inclusive spaces for horizontal exchanges, where Indigenous enunciations can reverberate in their full ontological depth, cosmological complexity, and capacity to challenge the colonial structures that persist in the contemporary geopolitics of knowledge.

References

ALTBACH, Philip G. The imperial tongue: English as the dominating academic language. *Economic and Political Weekly*, v. 42, p. 3608-3611, 2007.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. *Translingual practices and neoliberal policies*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Gramatologia*. Tradução de Miriam Chnaiderman e Renato Janine Ribeiro. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2011.

JENKINS, Jennifer. *Global Englishes: A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge, 2014.

KNIGHT, Jane. Internationalisation of Higher Education. In: KNIGHT, J.; WIT, H. (org.). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Amsterdã: OECD, 1999. p. 225–240.

KNIGHT, Jane. *Updated internationalization definition*. Boston: International Higher Education, 2003.

MARIANI, Bethania. *Colonização Linguística: língua, política e religião no Brasil (séculos XVI a XVIII) e nos Estados Unidos da América (século XVIII)*. São Paulo: Pontes, 2004.

MIGNOLO, Walter. *Histórias locais/projetos globais: colonialidade, saberes subalternos e pensamento liminar*. Tradução de Solange Ribeiro de Oliveira. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2003.

MONGIN, Olivier. *La condition urbaine: la ville à l'heure de la mondialisation*. Paris: Seuil, 2005.

MONGIN, Olivier. Le Décentrement du Monde. *Esprit*, Paris, n. 6, p. 54-61, 2007.

MOROSINI, Marília Costa; NASCIMENTO, Lorena Machado do. Internacionalização da educação superior no Brasil: a produção recente em teses e dissertações. *Educação em Revista*, Belo Horizonte, v. 33, e155071, 2017.

MUNDURUKU, Daniel. A escrita e a autoria fortalecendo a identidade. In: RICARDO, Beto; RICARDO, Fany (org.). *Povos indígenas no Brasil: 2001-2005*. São Paulo: Instituto Socioambiental, 2006.

PENNYCOOK, Alastair. *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge, 2006.

PHILLIPSON, Robert. Lingua franca or lingua frankensteinia? English in European integration and globalisation. *World Englishes*, v. 27, n. 2, p. 250–267, 2008.

REZENDE, Justino et al. Indigenizing conservation science for a sustainable Amazon. *Science*, v. 386, n. 6727, p. 1229-1232, 2024.

REZENDE, Patrick. *Tradução como to mpey: tentativas de reparação das histórias, das identidades e das narrativas indígenas*. 2019. Tese (Doutorado em Letras) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2019.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. *A crítica da razão indolente: contra o desperdício da experiência*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.

SOUZA, Lyn Mário T. M. Uma outra história: a escrita indígena no Brasil. In: RICARDO, Beto; RICARDO, Fany (org.). *Povos indígenas no Brasil: 2001-2005*. São Paulo: Instituto Socioambiental, 2006. p. 203-208.

SOUZA, Tania C. C. de. Línguas indígenas: memória, arquivo e oralidade. *Policromias - Revista de Estudos do Discurso, Imagem e Som*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 2, p. 36-55, 2017. Disponível em: https://revistas.ufrj.br/index.php/policromias/article/view/7710/6228. Acesso em: 27 de abril de 2025.

SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Pode o subalterno falar?* Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2010.

VIVAS, Caroline G. Arte Kusiwa: a inserção do patrimônio indígena no cenário nacional. In: ENCONTRO DE HISTÓRIA ANPUH-RIO, 13., 2008, Seropédica. *Anais Eletrônicos*. Rio de Janeiro: ANPUH-Rio, 2008. Disponível em: http://encontro2008.rj.anpuh.org/resources/content/anais/1214604687_ARQUIVO_artigoAnpuh.pdf. Acesso em: 27 de abril de 2025.