

## Editorial

### The coloniality of knowledge and situated knowledge

Juliana Tabares Quiroz\*

The En-Contexto Journal of the Faculty of Administrative and Economic Sciences of the Tecnológico de Antioquia, University Institution calls for the recognition of the Colombian scientific production that reflects the needs and challenges that we face as a society and likewise, that is developed with the highest investigative standards, showing us that the national research community has a way to go, but that it is prepared to do so.

Traditionally it has been recognized that, in South America, there are limitations to develop scientific research. Recently, Julián D. Cortés (2022), a researcher at the Universidad del Rosario, called on us to rethink the participation of the scientific community from the global south within the global scientific elite and the impact of our knowledge production in regional and international contexts. international. Cortés highlights the interaction that the production of Nobel Prize-winning science researchers has had with the production of researchers in the region. This raises a change of vision regarding the way science is done, great scientific discoveries are not isolated efforts of research centers or universities, on the contrary, they are the result of discussions of the academic community in spaces such as magazines, academic events or knowledge networks. This implies recognition of the dynamic and social nature of science.

In this order of ideas, seeing science and knowledge in their social dimension distances us from the positivist vision of knowledge as a neutral object, and provides it with historicity, but also with its political dimension. This recognition questions us about the place we want our production of knowledge to occupy, who we want to impact or who we want to dazzle, who we want to be recognized. This leads us to the discussion about the coloniality of knowledge.

---

\* PhD in International Studies and Administration. Master in Administration Sciences and Sociology. Teacher and researcher. Member of the Public Observatory Research Group. Tecnológico de Antioquia. Medellín, Colombia. [juliana.tabares68@tdea.edu.co](mailto:juliana.tabares68@tdea.edu.co)  
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7444-9922>

The coloniality of knowledge is the epistemic, gnoseological dimension that reproduces the coloniality of power, “it refers to the effect of subalternization, folklorization or invisibility of a multiplicity of knowledge that does not respond to the modalities of production of ‘Western knowledge’ associated with science conventional and expert discourse” (Restrepo, 2010, p. 136).

The coloniality of knowledge is the hegemonic system of knowledge construction that excludes, eliminates or limits other ways of seeing and constructing knowledge that are outside Eurocentric theological, philosophical, scientific and technological conventions. At this point, the hegemonic system would validate what is familiar to it, such as the abstract and universal procedures to replicate experimentation, such as the condition of neutrality and objectivity, such as the management of instruments and technology to order, measure and control nature and the social and would reject what is mentioned by indigenous, black communities or regions and populations or groups configured from other non-European or Western-centered realities.

The coloniality of knowledge separates expert knowledge from knowledge of the world of life. In this sense, he attributes to science the only valid place where knowledge is produced, expert knowledge would be an element produced in neutral scientific spaces and devoid of evaluative statements. Science, as a privileged place of expert knowledge, removes from its principles the role of the researcher, his interests and particularities, and of the social actors who daily build and reproduce logics that shape knowledge, thus turning it into a product that can be transformed, shaped and redeemable. Knowledge is a product without a subject.

Linda Smith (1999) states that knowledge, thought from the liberal, modern, industrial tradition, can be “discovered, extracted, appropriated and distributed in an organized and systematic process” (p. 58) And continues adding that “The production of knowledge, new knowledge and transformation of old knowledge, ideas about the nature of knowledge and the validation of specific forms of knowledge become commodities of colonial exploitation as another natural resource. (p. 59). This idea seems very powerful to me to illustrate the way in which knowledge is reified, fetishized, put in a condition of entity or thing and not as something alive, dynamic that is produced by people in particular conditions.

Western science, producer of expert discourses, would be the new eye of God, the one that can judge and reject or validate, its logic moves in the positioning of dichotomies, of extreme points that are irreconcilable, and that directly locate what is not. European or Western at the opposite pole, not due, not validated. Truth or falsehood, knowledge or ignorance, the objective or the subjective, neutrality or the value charge, the universal or the particular, the replicable or non-replicable. In this

sense, the production of knowledge in other latitudes is found between a pendulum that fragilely struggles to move from “non-knowledge” to “Western knowledge” and from which they require their approval.

In this sense, Linda Smith (1999) argues that non-European-centered forms of knowledge, that is, indigenous peoples from Asia, America, the Pacific and Africa, their classification systems, technologies, and codes of social life begin to be kept by Western science in the eighteenth century, and were recorded as “new discoveries” of Western society, denying the contribution of such societies. This emphasizes that the foundations of Western knowledge lie in non-Western knowledge. The West and its science are thanks to the non-Western.

Likewise, Ramón Grosfoguel raises the ego-politics of knowledge as that way in which knowledge manifests itself devoid of history, place and body, thus making it universal knowledge (Restrepo and Rojas, 2010, p. 139). As a counterpoint to this egopolitical perspective, there is the claim that the authors of the Decolonial Turn make that the production and appropriation of knowledge occur from historically situated, localized, embodied subjects. This position poses new challenges to the construction of non-European-focused knowledge, which recognizes the racial, sexual, class, gender, place, spirituality, history and geography character.

Edgardo Lander (2000) also criticizes the way in which the coloniality of knowledge is aligned with the coloniality of power. That is, how knowledge is articulated to the organization of power, referring to the dichotomous separations developed by the West God, man vs. Nature, Body vs. Mind, Reason vs. World. For this author, “The world became what the modern world is for citizens, a despiritualized mechanism that can be captured by the concepts and representations built by reason” (2000, p. 14).

These criticisms and deconstructions and many others that have been developed are especially important when thinking about who we are contributing to as researchers. Colonized knowledge has the purpose of continuing to reproduce ways of social control and legitimization of Western supremacy, it is crucial to understand the origin of this supremacy and propose ways to recognize and build different perspectives that break with the status of Western science as the only valid. Being close to the Nobel Prize winners and to the international academic discussion is relevant, but if this is devoid of identity and does not help to solve our own problems, the knowledge produced would be empty.

This issue of En-Contexto Journal is oriented to recognize the importance of situated knowledge, to give an account of the social, organizational, and territorial phenomena that surround us from a look at the territory from its multiple dimensions

(environmental, planning, education, and social agents). change) enriching our position on its manifestations and configurations. The invitation remains open to think about and give new meaning to the place that we are building from science for our society.

## References

- Cortes, J. (2022). Time to rethink the impact of Global South scientists? *Latin America and Caribbean Centre*. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/latamcaribbean/2022/12/08/time-to-rethink-the-impact-of-global-south-scientists/>
- Lander, E. (Editor) (2000). *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales*. Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales CLACSO.
- Restrepo, E. y Rojas, A. (2010). *Inflexión decolonial: fuentes, conceptos y cuestionamientos*. Editorial Universidad del Cauca.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and indigenous people*. Zed Books Ltd.

## How to cite this article:

Tabares, J. (2022). The coloniality of knowledge and situated knowledge. *En-Contexto*, 10(17), 41-44. Doi: 10.53995/23463279.1176

