

Decolonial Methodologies: A Commitment to Make the Peasantry Visible as an Epistemic Subject*

[English version]

Metodologías decoloniales: una apuesta para visibilizar el campesinado como sujeto epistémico

Metodologias decoloniais: uma aposta para visibilizar o campesinato como sujeito epistémico

Received on 11/04/2025. Accepted on 09/16/2025

› How to cite:

López-Galeano, C. M. & Alvarado, S. V. (2026). Decolonial Methodologies: a Commitment to Make the Peasantry Visible as an Epistemic Subject. *Ánfora*, 33(61), 126-145.
<https://doi.org/10.30854/anf.1238>
Universidad Autónoma de Manizales. L-ISSN 0121-6538.
E-ISSN 2248-6941.
CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Claudia Marcela López-Galeano**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8692-1796>

CvLAC https://scienti.minciencias.gov.co/cvlac/visualizador/generarCurriculoCv.do?cod_rh=0001493219

Colombia

Sara Victoria Alvarado Salgado***

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0115-8075>

CvLAC https://scienti.minciencias.gov.co/cvlac/visualizador/generarCurriculoCv.do?cod_rh=0000095214

Colombia

* This paper is derived from the doctoral research thesis: *Exploring the capacity of agency in peasant and neo-peasant children and young people in the context of food sovereignty as a practice of political subjectivity in the midst of good living*. Within the framework of the Doctorate in Social Sciences, Childhood and Youth of the Universidad de Manizales and CINDE. *Rural Development and Rural Education* (Uniagraria and CINDE) and *Political, Ethical and Moral Perspectives on Children and Youth* (Universidad de Manizales and CINDE) research groups. Funding: There is no funding. Conflict of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest. Data Availability: All relevant data can be found in the paper.

** Doctoral candidate in Social Sciences, Childhood, and Youth. Universidad de Manizales - CINDE. Email: clalopg.27@gmail.com

*** Postdoctorate in Social Sciences, Childhood and Youth. Universidad de Manizales - CINDE. Email: salvarado@cinde.org.com

Abstract

Objective: This paper presents a reflection on the relationship between decolonial methodologies and the peasantry as an epistemic subject, highlighting its transformative potential from a critical perspective of colonialism by questioning the dominant ways against conducting science and proposing alternative methods built from a dialogue of knowledges and communal contemplation. **Methodology:** coloniality from the perspective of authors such as Quijano, Mignolo, and Maldonado-Torres promotes the creation of patterns of subalternization that define who creates and receives knowledge, without space for co-creation. Decolonial methodologies are an alternative to deconstruct the established canons by breaking the observer-observed relationship and promoting scenarios of knowledge agency. **Results:** agroecology as a multidimensional field, and food sovereignty as a political propositions to food production, are commitments within decolonial methodologies that recognize knowledges made invisible or extracted from peasant communities by Westernized hegemonic knowledge. **Conclusions:** This work underscores the need to maintain the development of new decolonial methodologies that recognize the creation of knowledge from below, with social actors, and through listening, not only to their needs, but also to their aspirations for change.

Keywords: colonial; methodology; method; knowledge; peasants (obtained from the UNESCO thesaurus).

Resumen

Objetivo: este artículo presenta una reflexión sobre la relación entre metodologías decoloniales y el campesinado como sujeto epistémico, destacando su potencial transformador desde una perspectiva crítica frente al colonialismo, al cuestionar las formas dominantes de hacer ciencia y proponer métodos alternativos construidos a partir del diálogo de saberes y el contemplar comunal. **Metodología:** la colonialidad, desde autores como Quijano, Mignolo y Maldonado-Torres promueve la creación de patrones de subalternización que definen quién construye el conocimiento y quién lo recibe, sin espacio a la co-creación. Las metodologías decoloniales son la alternativa para deconstruir los cánones instaurados, al romper la relación observador-observado y al promover escenarios de agenciamiento del conocimiento. **Resultados:** se reconoce la agroecología, como campo multidimensional, y la soberanía alimentaria, como una apuesta política para la producción de alimentos, son apuestas dentro de las metodologías decoloniales, al reconocer los saberes invisibilizados o extraídos en las comunidades campesinas por el conocimiento hegemónico occidentalizado. **Conclusiones:** se destaca

la necesidad de mantener el desarrollo por nuevas metodologías decoloniales que reconozcan la construcción de conocimientos desde abajo, con los actores sociales, y a partir de la escucha; no solo de sus necesidades, sino también de sus apuestas por el cambio.

Palabras clave: colonial; metodología; método; saber; campesinos (obtenidos del tesoro UNESCO).

Resumo

Objetivo: este artigo apresenta- uma reflexão sobre a relação entre metodologias decoloniais e o campesinato como sujeito epistêmico, destacando seu potencial transformador a partir de uma perspectiva crítica frente ao colonialismo, ao questionar as formas dominantes de fazer ciência e propor métodos alternativos construídos com base no diálogo de saberes e no contemplar comunal. **Metodologia:** a colonialidade, a partir de autores como Quijano, Mignolo e Maldonado-Torres, promove a criação de padrões de subalternização que definem quem constrói o conhecimento e quem o recebe, sem espaço para a co-criação. As metodologias decoloniais configuram-se como alternativa para desconstruir os cânones instaurados, ao romper a relação observador-observado e ao promover cenários de agenciamento do conhecimento. **Resultados:** se reconhece a agroecologia, como campo multidimensional, e a soberania alimentar, como uma aposta política para a produção de alimentos, constituem propostas inseridas nas metodologias decoloniais, ao reconhecer os saberes invisibilizados ou extraídos nas comunidades camponesas pelo conhecimento hegemônico ocidentalizado. **Conclusões:** destaca-se a necessidade de fortalecer o desenvolvimento de novas metodologias decoloniais que reconheçam a construção de conhecimentos a partir de baixo, com os atores sociais e a partir da escuta; não apenas de suas necessidades, mas também de suas apostas por mudança.

Palavras-chave: colonial; metodologia; método; saber; camponeses (obtidos do tesoro UNESCO).

Introduction

Neoliberalism around the production of knowledge implies exposing the different forms of coloniality to which the territories of *Abya Yala* and, especially, peasant communities have been subjected. The economic model, as an expansion of modernity and the Cartesian panorama that divides the subject/object, myth/logos, mind/body, nature/culture (Quijano, 2014a), promotes the creation of patterns of hierarchization and subalternization from the coloniality of power, of being, and the knowledge that define who creates and receives knowledge without space for participation or co-creation.

The coloniality of power strengthens the relationships of the institutions that led models of education or research (Quijano, 2014a; Horta-Cmhorta, 2019), such as States, academia, corporations, or publishers, to promote hegemonic knowledge that responds to the logic of cognitive capitalism for the fetishization of science as a commodity. The "coloniality of being" according to Maldonado-Torres (2007) influences the subjectivities of the subjects, their thoughts and emotions, and causes the unconscious adoption of the knowledge produced by traditional science. It entails the separation of Mother Earth from the human and the loss of critical thinking. Finally, the "coloniality of the knowledge" (Mignolo, 2006) —on which this paper focuses— is a way of coercing the scientific/commodity system that reproduces educational models of production and distribution of knowledge that disqualify other forms of knowledge and understanding to explain the world outside of neoliberal logic. It puts into judgment the perception of who is the subject of the episteme or for the episteme.

Therefore, decolonial methodologies are the alternative to deconstructing the canons established by the coloniality of knowledge, by breaking the observer-observed relationship, and promoting knowledge aggregation scenarios with and by communities (Arroyo-Ortega & Alvarado-Alvarado, 2016). They recognize that knowledge is alive, diverse, dynamic, and polymorphic. Knowledge is woven from the relationship with people, territories, and with a great capacity for transformation.

Agroecology, as a multidimensional field that seeks to harmonize agricultural practices with the sustainability of resources (Altieri, 2015), and food sovereignty, as a political commitment of the territories for food production, (López-Galeano & Alvarado-Salgado, 2025) are wagers for decolonial methodologies to recognize the knowledge, reduced, rejected, invisibilized, or extracted from peasant communities by hegemonic knowledge. This demands the need to claim the knowledge produced by peasants, who for years have developed food systems that resist the

guidelines established by agro-capitalist models that associate natural resources and food as commodities.

This paper presents theoretical-reflexive research with a decolonial approach, based on a philosophical-political analysis and supported by authors such as Quijano, Mignolo, Maldonado-Torres, and Corona, among others. It aims to reflect on the relationship between decolonial methodologies and the peasantry as an epistemic subject, highlighting its transformative potential from a critical perspective of colonialism, as a way of producing knowledge that questions the dominant ways of conducting science and proposes alternative methods from the dialogue of the knowledge and communal contemplation, among other non-hegemonic methodological practices in communities such as the peasantry.

Finally, this paper is divided into three sections. The first is concerning key foundations for the commitment to decolonial methodologies. The second covers peasantry addressed as a subject for the construction of knowledge necessary in the development of food sovereignty and agroecology. Finally, decolonial methodologies are reviewed as related to the peasantry for the sustainability of food sovereignty and agroecology.

Fundamentals of Decolonial Methodologies: the Beginning of Transforming Traditional Science

The development in decoloniality emerged in the mid-1990s as a critical response to the management and production of knowledge by colonial power structures, thanks to Latin American thinkers such as Aníbal Quijano and Walter Mignolo, among others. This turn is based on statements inherited from authors such as José Carlos Mariátegui – who addresses power relations and the indigenous situation in Peru and Latin America in the 1920s. José María Arguedas discusses racism and discrimination of the native languages of Peru vis-à-vis languages other than Spanish. Pablo González Casanova and Rodolfo Stavenhagen propose the term "internal colonialism," later taken up by Quijano (2014a).

These approaches develop readings on how modernity, in the capitalist framework, is linked to colonization, highlighting discussions around racism, economic exploitation and extractivism as indivisible elements of the modern world-system to generate a series of "processes and practices of re-humanization of the material and symbolic structures that besiege humanity caused by globalization and construction of identities" (Lara, 2015, p. 26).

Among the commitment of decolonialism in the field of knowledge is the need to rethink the conceptual categories with which the world is understood and the perceptions around the modern research, which tends to decontextualize research processes and reproduce inequality and exclusion between communities (Avalo, 2023). In this sense, the construction of knowledge with and from communities demands setting aside the traditional hierarchies between the researcher and that researched, inherited from the "Eurocentric [...] project, called 'rational' [...] imposed and admitted into the whole of the capitalist world as the only valid rationality and as a symbol of modernity" (Quijano, 2014a, p. 287).

This change is only possible because of the methodological component. The research subject, within the traditional conception, fosters a vertical relationship between researcher and what is studied. It generates a series of limits specifying what is observed and categorizes the object of study that, sometimes, is completely alien to the researcher.

The critique of the European paradigm of rationality/modernity is indispensable, even more, urgent. But it is doubtful if the criticism consists of a simple negation of all its categories; of the dissolution of reality in discourse; of the pure negation of the idea and the perspective of totality in cognition. It is necessary to extricate oneself from all the linkages between rationality/modernity and coloniality, first of all, and definitely from all power which is not constituted by free decisions made by free people. It is the instrumentalization of the reasons for power, of colonial power in the first place, which produced distorted paradigms of knowledge and spoiled the liberating promises of modernity. The alternative, then, is clear: the destruction of the coloniality of world power (Mignolo, 2010, p. 15).

As Enrique Dussel (2001) states, Cartesian epistemological universality makes other rationalities invisible, so a radical critique is required that displaces the modern subject as the exclusive center of knowledge production.

The decolonial turn, as a theoretical-methodological commitment, seeks to create new paths that are closely related to the experience of the researcher or dialogue partner (Spyer & Rocha, 2021). The call involves welcoming and disengaging from categories that traditionally promoted colonialities of knowledge and practice and generated consensus with people or territories so that they can choose their own way of living and be subjects of agency without hegemonic means of coercion, based on their conscience and self-management.

Co-creating a decolonial type of research demands rethinking and restating the meanings that the dominant, Cartesian, and Eurocentric social sciences assign

to categories or concepts. They are usually loaded with semantics that ignore, invisibilize, or subalternize subjects, cultures, knowledge, and phenomena and thereby deny certain realities.¹ The concepts that need to be rethought are the use of the terms “researcher” and “research.” The word “research,” according to Corona (2019) and Ortiz (2022), refers to a series of meanings that address the “research problems and their solutions, which [we] inherit with theoretical concepts” (Corona, 2019, p. 73) routed toward the development of a science that puts objectivity first and seeks to leave the subject aside, with the purpose of making “the subject disappear, so as to not contaminate the environment, or show its particular feeling or understanding” (Corona, 2019, p. 72). Therefore, decolonial methodologies require reconfiguring or transforming the dominant categories inherited from systems that only legitimize the hegemonic knowledge produced by neoliberalism and modernity. This to welcome those categories that best represent the feelings of the communities and recognize the creation of epistemes led by the peasantry.

According to Arroyo-Ortega and Alvarado-Alvarado (2016), the new methodological commitments with a decolonial approach allow the understanding and recognition of realities. They promote agency to transform the forms of oppression and subordination with the subjects, and co-construct paths of alterity to get relevant results

[...] for the communities and contribute, to some extent, within their worlds and far from all imposition, considering that the peoples [...] subalternated by the national society and the political system [...] have every right to collectively decide what is best for them (Mendoza-Zapata, 2022, p. 127).

The decolonial methodologies recognize the epistemic richness built in territories historically subalternized by structures like the State, academia, and other institutions that reproduce colonizing logic established in neoliberalism, development, and modernity. They also claim local knowledge and practices to support a collaborative and co-creation approach that validates community voices. That constitutes an ethical-political commitment aimed at fostering horizontal relationships based on respect and collaboration.

This contrasts with traditional research, in which, according to Ortiz and Arias (2019), the researcher dominates the process and prioritizes an epistemology that favors the subject-object relationship, in which the latter is treated as object, observed, and classified from the outside. Once these foundations have been

1 Differentiating between “episteme” (validated systematic knowledge) and “doxa” (common opinion) is key, as is the difference between “knowledge” (situated forms of understanding the world) and “the knowledge” (structures formalized by academia). These differences strengthen the decolonial discussion.

presented, the peasantry is approached as an epistemic subject that articulates it with rural experiences.

The Peasantry as an Epistemic Subject for the Construction of Food Sovereignty and Agroecology

The "peasantry," as a concept, has been an interest for several disciplines, such as anthropology and economics, which, from their own logic, produce definitions that allow them to understand this category. However, the conceptions that are woven around what being a peasant means are usually reduced to a status as a social or economic group. It is hardly recognized or conceptualized as an epistemic subject that affects the subordinate image with which it is identified and recognized.

The peasantry as a social and economic group within the frameworks of subaltern subjectivation of coloniality —coloniality of power (Quijano, 2014b), coloniality of being (Maldonado-Torres, 2007), and coloniality of the knowledge (Mignolo, 2006), related to capitalism and neoliberalism— has undergone different processes of epistemological extractivism (Grosfoguel, 2016). The reproduction of the notion of the peasantry as a group that is pre-modern, backward, or resistant to change has been the pretext to imposing models of knowledge established by the logic of modernity that establish relationships of subordination in which the peasantry is placed at the base of the production of knowledge as the subject that must receive without request and, therefore, legitimize and validate what receives.

In the case of epistemic extractivism, peasants have been victims of institutions such as the State, academia, and corporations, in this case, the ones that control capitalist food production (McMichael, 2016; Friedman, 2005, 2016), in the sense that they expropriate their knowledge and the knowledge of natural resources, their properties, or farming techniques to then be *fetishized* or *used* by the market as "green capitalism" (Friedmann, 2016). This promotes labels such as "bio," "organic," or "*free*" but hides the voracity of a system designed to encourage consumption and brands, rather than the care or preservation of Mother Earth.

This leads to the fact that, historically, peasant knowledge and epistemes are marginalized by several forms of coloniality that only capitalist and urban-centric knowledge validates. The role in consolidating processes like food sovereignty, which defends the right of peoples to establish their food policies based on indigenous diets, and agroecology, a discipline that promotes ecological techniques

and designs sustainable agricultural systems to optimize resource and energy use, is invisible.

Understanding that food sovereignty is politicized within the territories is necessary. The recognition of peasants as epistemic and political subjects must be necessary; otherwise,

[...] it is left out of the essence of the bodily experience of the world, of the ways in which diet and cuisine structure effective forms of intersubjectivity, the experience and destiny of this sovereignty would be reduced to a strategic conception of the geopolitics of economy and technology (Vargas, 2023, p. 58).

One More Case of Epistemic Extractivism

Food sovereignty is an alternative process for “the self-determination of peoples in the production, distribution, and consumption of food, [which] respects local knowledge and cultural practices” (López-Galeano & Alvarado-Salgado, 2025, p. 10). Its ontological principle is based on the knowledge and techniques developed and maintained through its own territorial strategies, not only by peasants but also by other rural communities, such as indigenous peoples and Afro-descendants (in the Colombian context, Afro-Colombians).

For this reason, recognizing the capacity of the peasantry for epistemic agency is necessary so that, from this way of seeing and perceiving the world and its relationship with food production, new commitments are generated to curb the negative consequences of neoliberal models of food production, which reproduce Westernized forms of knowledge that subordinate peasants, their ways of life, and Mother Earth herself (Dávalos, 2008).

Bearing in mind that, historically, peasant movements in Latin America have shown that food production is not only an economic practice but also a political strategy of resistance and world-building through experiences of self-management, recovery of seeds, and defense of the territory is also important.

Agroecology emerged in the 1980s as a critique of the green revolution, a practice “inappropriate for peasants and that used agrochemical technology with a high environmental impact” (Altieri, 2015, p. 7). Agroecology claims peasant epistemologies and welcomes traditional and scientific knowledge through participatory processes as a way of keeping knowledge alive and located within territories. This is key to rescuing peasant knowledge and increasing the ecological resilience of the territories (Altieri & Nicholls, 2013).

Agroecology, as a peasant epistemological framework (Serra & Simões do Carmo, 2012), seeks to address the environmental crisis, where conventional

disciplines have failed to generate strategies to reverse the damage caused by climate change. For this,

an epistemological opening capable of delving into peasant knowledge is necessary. These authors propose that agroecologists should assume a posture of recognizing that traditional communities contain important knowledge in relation to the agroecosystem, which science until then had not been able to incorporate. (Serra & Simões do Carmo, 2012, p. 713) [authors' translation].

Recognizing that peasants are carriers of knowledge is key. This is essential to strengthening alternative processes compared to how agri-food systems are managed today for food sovereignty and agroecology. This relates to the hegemony of modern scientific knowledge framed in the coloniality of knowledge, and also opens the horizon toward an epistemic plurality that rejects the homogeneous and responds to specific geographical, historical, and cultural conditions. This means valuing other ways of inhabiting, knowing, and relating to the territories and assuming that there is no single legitimate way to produce knowledge.

Intersection between Decolonial Methodologies and the Peasantry: A Path toward Food Sovereignty and Agroecology

Research processes should not refer to knowing and interpreting realities and experiences. They should allow the opening to the agency of the researcher and those who accompany the research path (Haber, 2011). Decolonial methodologies, as an alternative to organizing, rescuing, and reproducing peasant voices, allow prioritizing their knowledge, experiences, and ways of life as valid sources of knowledge. These challenge the hegemonic narratives that have historically made these communities invisible and violent, through processes and disciplines that encourage participation, horizontal dialogue, and the collective construction of knowledge, such as food sovereignty and agroecology.

From the recognition of the vernacular knowledge, "the intention to expand the understanding of the cosmos and its relationship with the corpus and praxis [...] opens the possibility of a more empathetic and reciprocal epistemological perspective" (Hernández-Mazas *et al.*, p. 200). Within the framework of decolonial methodologies, the peasantry is recognized as essential epistemic agents for food production and the conservation of renewable and non-renewable resources. Their knowledge, framed in agroecology and food

sovereignty, is key to recovering soils and biodiversity, restoring ecosystems (Aya-Rojas, 2024), and supporting local communities. Thus, socialization and participation play an important role in fostering ethical principles within the peasantry, which allow the recognition of identity processes associated with solidarity (Acuña-Rodríguez *et al.*, 2022).

The research in the territory of *Abya Yala* is considered by many to be a dehumanizing and colonizing process that has caused harm and pain to Mother Earth and living beings including humans (Ortiz *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, this argument includes the conventional techniques and instruments that have been responsible for reproducing means of the colonization of knowledge and power.

The observation, the survey, the interview, and the multiple techniques that emerge from the sciences with scientific criteria to try to appropriate the knowledge of the other carry the certainty that, well applied, they free us from deceptive appearances. But we know that it is nothing more than a desire, a “metaphysical comfort” [...], the fantasy of seeing, like God, without being observed (Corona, 2019, p. 73).

Decolonial methodologies seek to deconstruct the traditional ways in which research is carried out, including dialogues of the knowledge and communal contemplation, for the generation of knowledge horizontally and from below, with communities. In the case of the *knowledge dialogue*,

[...] it is not just that the knowledge that comes from one discipline can be articulated with the knowledge from another, so generating new fields of knowledge in the university. This is just one aspect to which the assimilation of complex thought would probably lead us and of which there are already certain traces, although still emerging. But the other aspect, the most difficult one, that does not show signs of life, has to do with the possibility that different cultural forms of knowledge can coexist in the same university space. We would say, then, that while the first consequence of the paradigm of complex thinking would be the transdisciplinary flexibilization of knowledge, the second would be the transculturization of knowledge (Castro-Gómez, 2007, p. 87).

The integration of knowledge allows the creation of new fields of knowledge and the possibility of different cultural forms of knowledge emerging so that they coexist and dialogue within the same space. This would mean combining disciplines, as well as recognizing and valuing diverse cultural perspectives, such as non-Western peasant knowledge traditions, as an integral part of university knowledge.

In this way, the dialogue of the multiplural knowledge seeks to break the colonial academic and scientific hierarchies. In this exercise, listening to "the other forms or ways of interpreting existence and having elements to analyze and question the principles and beliefs of one's own culture to open up to a more enriching and encompassing vision of reality" (Gueijman, 2018, p. 214). In this case, with the participation of different actors and the peasant community and with different perspectives, new knowledge can be created and appropriated to help address different problems within a territory. This allows the development of a horizontal dialogue that seeks to decolonize the colonized (Rivas *et al.*, 2020).

This exercise seeks to validate and recognize each word, each semantic sense resulting from the daily experience that develops within the communities, to collectively identify what affects or harms them and to create means that can solve their problems through the generation of community knowledge that responds to their felt and real needs. Keeping in mind that this form of dialogue is generated in spaces of respect to recognize otherness, where all participants have the same role is important.

"Communal contemplation" is defined by Ortiz and Arias (2019) as:

The feeling-listening-living-observing decolonial is a collective listening-perceiving-observing in which the decolonial mediator is not the only one who consults but allows himself to be observed by observing. It is a cooperative contemplation, in which each and every one of the decolonial actors contemplates the other and contemplates itself (p. 157).

"Communal contemplation" responds to the need to break the ways in which knowledge is perceived and constructed today, from a logic that gives priority to the discourses of science and academia and that silences the voices of communities and instrumentalizes their resources, knowledge, and experiences. It also seeks to build knowledge in community, listening to and respecting ways of feeling and perceiving realities. A challenge seeks to break with colonial/Eurocentric/hegemonic approaches that place the researcher as a simple observer, apart and distant from the discourses of the studied communities, and that reproduce mechanisms of subordination. "It is not just the mediator observing everyone, but they are observing the mediator and observing each other. The "researcher" is "investigated." It is not the "researcher" observing, analyzing, and interpreting what "others" do" (Ortiz, 2022, p. 23). Thus, the verticality of traditional

knowledge is transformed toward a horizontal and reciprocal conception, where research processes become scenarios of participation, collaboration, listening, and collective action.

Communal contemplation is articulated with food sovereignty by recognizing that the production and care of food are material processes, as well as collective experiences of knowledge and political action in community.

This methodological approach, through dialogue and contemplation, seeks to overcome the "coloniality of the knowledge," which has privileged Western epistemologies over other forms of knowledge. Decolonial commits to recognizing the alternative and political processes that develop within food sovereignty as a way of resistance (and re-existence) toward the way in which food is produced today within the neoliberal context (López-Galeano & Alvarado-Salgado, 2025). These proposals make visible the knowledge that, for years, peasant communities have promoted, incorporating life practices such as planting and plant care allowing decolonizing hegemonic thinking (Arcia-Grajales *et al.*, 2025), minimizing the damage caused to Mother Earth due to agroneoliberal food production, and developing processes with greater energy efficiency in food systems to reduce the carbon footprint. They also recognize that the choice of food is also a political principle (García, 2019) and promote the consumption of products sown *in situ* and the use of organic supplies made in the territories themselves.

Thus, association processes in which horizontal and organic relationships prevail are important. And so, from the common (identity), collaborative actions are generated for the promotion and development of food sovereignty.

In the case of agroecology, decolonial methodologies, based on the dialogues of knowledge (Sotiru, 2023), promote the generation of knowledge between academia and communities from a perspective that breaks with the observer-observed notion and with the subject-object dichotomy (Moreno & Corral, 2019). This is materialized in the development of spaces that encourage the contemplation and active participation of community members, where memory, orality, and listening become relevant, among other non-hegemonic methodological practices (Rivera, 2012), aimed at the recovery of undervalued epistemes expropriated by traditional science.

Food sovereignty and agroecology, as commitments toward the transformation of neoliberal food systems, are not separate from each other. They promote local food production, protect resources—seeds, water, and soil—and seek social, cultural, and epistemic justice. This convergence denotes a participatory construction in the generation of knowledge, where peasant communities are active protagonists in the creation of knowledge that reflects their realities and needs. To join these perspectives, a holistic vision is strengthened that seeks

to improve food production and distribution, as well as generate principles of self-management in communities, so that, they own their food systems, and a more sustainable and equitable future is guaranteed by understanding that knowledge promotes agency.

Discussion

The discussion of the approaches developed in this paper allow for understanding that decolonial methodologies constitute a critical way to question the coloniality of knowledge and, at the same time, recognize the epistemic role of the peasantry in the construction of food sovereignty and agroecology. The role that dialogue partners take within decolonial methodologies arises from a sentimental positioning, guided by the need to be and share with the other, recognizing it as an alternative and as an actor with capacities for the transformation and change of rural contexts, mainly of neoliberal agri-food systems. This demands the expansion of subjectivities and agency capacities, framed in the processes of food sovereignty and agroecology, to give way to solidarity between peasant communities and Mother Earth. In this way, alternatives are established to the current ways of food production and the relationships that are woven around them, which are subalternized by the modes of coloniality in the Latin American peasant territories.

Likewise, recognizing that the agency processes of peasant communities promote active participation and the development of practices that lead to the care of Mother Earth and criticism toward coloniality, in generating political and social subjects that advocate equality, the defense of life, conscious eating, and freedom is important. These wagers are developed in spaces that encourage communal contemplation and the dialogue of knowledge to deterritorialize conventional and hegemonic practices that invisibilize vernacular knowledge and the proposals of the peasantry as an epistemic subject. In this way, it seeks to deconstruct dominant narratives and discourses, recognizing the importance of horizontal research and experiences as means for the construction of knowledge.

The relationship between several decolonial methodologies and the peasantry as an epistemic subject is articulated from the critique of the coloniality of the knowledge and doing, which extracts the knowledge created by the peasants thanks to their relationship with Mother Earth and with the other in an exercise of otherness. It also creates from the perspective of the implementation of non-hegemonic proposals associated to food production, such as food sovereignty

and agroecology, and from the denunciation of the mechanisms of invalidation that reduce their knowledge to myths, beliefs, or traditions and that thus perpetuate the invisibility of peasant knowledge.

Decolonial methodologies are fundamental to claiming the forms of peasant knowledge, rooted in the dialogue of knowledge and communal contemplation. These are alternates to Westernized epistemologies, where the transformative potential that allows the development of processes such as food sovereignty and agroecology is highlighted, which are enriched thanks to the experiences and knowledge of the peasantry – and other rural agents such as indigenous people and Afro-Colombians. In this way, energy, environmental, economic, and social sustainability are achieved in food production processes, from the care of resources and the promotion of the consumption of food produced *in situ*, the generation of inputs from the handling of organic material, among other living practices in farmers and their communities.

Finally, the need to maintain the development of new decolonial methodologies that recognize the construction of knowledge with social actors, based on listening to their needs and commitment to change, recognizing their capacity for agency, self-management, critical thinking, and transformation is highlighted.

Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to reflect on the relationship between decolonial methodologies and the peasantry as an epistemic subject, highlighting its transformative potential from a critical perspective in the face of colonialism. It was shown that these methodologies, by questioning the vertical relationship between observer and observed, make recognizing the peasantry as a legitimate producer of knowledge and not only as a passive receiver of external knowledge possible. In this sense, the incorporation of decolonial methodologies makes broadening the horizons of knowledge production toward horizontal, participatory and situated practices possible, which strengthens peasant agency and claims its historically subalternized epistemes. This approach democratizes science, and

also opens paths of resistance (and re-existence) in agro-capitalist models. Finally, future research is proposed to delve into concrete experiences of rural communities —peasant, indigenous and Afro-descendant— to continue building comparatively epistemic and methodological alternatives in a decolonial key that strengthens food sovereignty and Good Living in Latin America.

References

- Acuña-Rodríguez, O., Acuña-Rodríguez, B., Albesiano-Fernández, L., Pinzón-Camargo, L., & Cobo-Mejía, E. (2022). Identidad y familia campesina en torno a la producción de queso en el municipio de Paipa (Colombia). *Mundo Agrario*, 22(51), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.24215/15155994e177>
- Altieri, M. & Nicholls, C. (2013). Agroecología y resiliencia al cambio climático: principios y consideraciones metodológicas. *Agroecología*, 8(1), 7-20. <https://revistas.um.es/agroecologia/article/view/182921>
- Altieri, M. (2015). Breve reseña sobre los orígenes y evolución de la agroecología en América Latina. *Agroecología*, 10(2), 7-8. <https://revistas.um.es/agroecologia/article/download/300771/216191>
- Arcia-Grajales, J., Gallego-Cortés, C. & Muñoz-Montaña, J. (2025). La autoridad de las plantas en la educación propia indígena. *Revista de Antropología y Sociología: Virajes*, 27(1), 73-97. <https://doi.org/10.17151/rasv.2025.27.1.4>
- Arroyo-Ortega, A. & Alvarado-Salgado, S. (2016). Conocimiento en colabor: Reflexiones y posibilidades para la construcción de paz. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, 14(25), 121-148. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/4761/476151468003/476151468003.pdf>
- Avalo, A. (2023). Los pueblos y naciones indígenas como parte del «objeto-sujeto» de estudio de la ciencia política. *Anfora*, 30(54), 41-57. <https://doi.org/10.30854/anf.v30.n54.2023.846>
- Aya-Rojas, S. (2024). Crisis socioecológica del sistema agroalimentario: aproximaciones al desafío de la restauración agroecológica. *Revista Controversia*, (222), 17-46. <https://doi.org/10.54118/controver.vi222.1312>

- Castro-Gómez, S. (2007). Decolonizar la Universidad. La hybris del punto cero y el diálogo entre saberes. En: Castro-Gómez, S. y Ramón, G. (Eds.). *El Giro Decolonial, Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo* (pp. 79-91). Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Corona, B. (2019). *Producción horizontal del conocimiento*. Bielefeld University Press.
- Dávalos, P. (2008). Reflexiones sobre el sumak kawsay (el buen vivir) y las teorías del desarrollo. *Boletín* (103), 1-7. <https://red.pucp.edu.pe/ridei/wp-content/uploads/biblioteca/100602.pdf>
- Dussel, E. (2001). *Hacia una filosofía política crítica*. Desclée
- Friedmann, H. (2005). From Colonialism to Green Capitalism: Social Movements and Emergence of Food Regimes. In: F.H., Buttel & P. McMichael. (Eds), *New Directions in the Sociology of Global Development* (pp. 227-264). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Friedmann, H. (2016). Commentary: Food Regime Analysis and Agrarian Questions: Widening the Conversation. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 43(3), 671-692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2016.1146254>
- García, J. (2019). El acto político de comer. *Soberanía alimentaria, biodiversidad y culturas*, (34), 49-51. https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/sobali/sobali_a2019m3n34/sobali_a2019m3n34p25.pdf
- Grosfoguel, R. (2016). Del extractivismo económico al extractivismo epistémico y ontológico. *Revista Internacional de Comunicación y Desarrollo*, 1(4), 33-45. <https://revistas.usc.gal/index.php/ricd/article/view/3295>
- Gueijman, P. (2018). Hacia una ontología del escuchar. Fundamento del diálogo intercultural. *Cultura-hombre-sociedad*, 28(1), 207-233. <https://cuhsu.uct.cl/index.php/CUHSO/article/view/470/490>
- Haber, A. (2011). Nometodología payanesa: Notas de metodología indisciplinada. *Revista Chilena de Antropología*, 23(1), 9-49. https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/bitstream/handle/11336/191621/CONICET_Digital_Nro.44bf191f-554e-4f9b-87f2-bef109b8726b_B.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

- Hernández-Mazas, A., Méndez-García, E. y Fuente-Carrasco, M. (2025). Saberes vernáculos del agua: una vía para la comprensión del cosmos en Teotitlán del Valle, Oaxaca, México. *Revista de Antropología y Sociología: Virajes*, 27(1), 193-223. <https://doi.org/10.17151/rasv.2025.27.1.8>
- Horta-Cmhorta, C. (2019). La colonialidad del poder y la alteridad en la política de Educación Superior en Colombia (1992-2018). *Eccos Revista Científica*, (49), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.5585/EccoS.n49.13333>
- Lara, J. (2015). Pensamiento decolonial como instrumento transgresor de la globalización. *Analéctica*, 1(10), 25-31. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3911830>
- López-Galeano, C. & Alvarado-Salgado, S. (2025). La soberanía alimentaria como una propuesta para ser liderada por niños, niñas y jóvenes con identidades campesinas y neocampesinas. *Horizontes Territoriales*, 5(9), 1-17. <https://www.horizontesterritoriales.unach.mx/index.php/Revista/article/view/98>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: Contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. En Castro-Gómez, S. y Grosfoguel, R. (Eds.), *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 127-167). Siglo del Hombre Editores
- McMichael, P. (2016). *Regímenes alimentarios y cuestiones agrarias*. Icaria.
- Mendoza-Zapata, R. (2022). *Sipas/Wayna. Ser "joven" quechua en el Perú*. Fondo Editorial.
- Mignolo, W. (2006). *La opción descolonial: El pachakuti conceptual de nuestro tiempo*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. https://conceptos.sociales.unam.mx/conceptos_final/411trabajo.pdf
- Mignolo, W. (2010). *Desobediencia epistémica: Retórica de la modernidad, lógica de la colonialidad y gramática de la descolonialidad*. Ediciones del Signo.
- Moreno, M. & Corral, G. (2019). Metodologías inductivas interculturales para una pedagogía decolonial. *Sinéctica*, (52), 1-20. [https://doi.org/10.31391/s2007-7033\(2019\)0052-003](https://doi.org/10.31391/s2007-7033(2019)0052-003)

- Ortiz, A., Arias, M. & Pedrozo, Z. (2018). Metodología “otra” en la investigación social, humana y educativa. El hacer decolonial como proceso decolonizante. *FAIA*, 7(30), 172-200. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/6575303.pdf>
- Ortiz, A. & Arias, M. (2019). Hacer decolonial: desobedecer a la metodología de investigación. *Hallazgos*, 16(31), 147-166. <https://doi.org/10.15332/s1794-3841.2019.0031.06>
- Ortiz, A. (2022). Decolonizar las ciencias sociales: altersofía y hacer decolonial. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 27(98), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6615732>
- Quijano, A. (2014a). Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social. En Gentili, P. (Ed.), *Cuestiones y horizontes. De la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder* (pp. 285-330). CLACSO.
- Quijano, A. (2014b). *Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina*. CLACSO. <https://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/se/20140507042402/eje3-8.pdf>
- Rivas, J., Márquez-García, M., Leite, A. & Cortés, P. (2020). Narrativa y educación con perspectiva decolonial. *Márgenes*, 1(3), 46-62. <https://doi.org/10.24310/mgnmar.v1i3.9495>
- Rivera, S. (2012). Experiencias de montaje creativo: de la historia oral a la imagen en movimiento ¿Quién escribe la historia oral? *Chasqui*, (120), 14-18. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/160/16057414004.pdf>
- Serra, R. & Simões do Carmo, M. (2012). Agroecología e sua epistemología. *Interciencia*, 37(9), 711-716. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/339/33925502010.pdf>
- Sotiru, M. (2023). Agroecología como respuesta territorial en clave decolonial: aproximaciones desde el cinturón hortícola platense. *Antrópica*, 9(18), 263-283. <https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/223782>

- Spyer, T. & Rocha, R. (2021). Um giro decolonial à metodologia científica: apontamentos epistemológicos para metodologias desde e para a América Latina. *Revista Espirales*, 5(1), 174-193. <https://revistas.unila.edu.br/espiales/article/view/2686/2472>
- Vargas, G. (2023). La episteme campesina y la soberanía alimentaria —El cuidado y la cuaternidad. Notas para una ¿epistemología campesina? —. *En Líneas Generales*, (10), 47-61. <https://revistas.ulima.edu.pe/index.php/enlineasgenerales/article/view/6941/6777>