Decolonization of Social Research Practice in Latin America. What can we learn for German Social Sciences?*

Anika Meckesheimer

"I am a female leader in a purépecha community and I defend my rights. I have learnt to speak up. We have our own way of speaking, our own feelings – we do not allow any more that our words be taken away."[1]

"It was the academic researchers who have started to shed light on our history. I wish to acknowledge the work they have done."[2]

"There are already many indigenous women who write their history. We do not want to hear our stories through the voices of others any more."[3]

1 Setting the terms of the debate

One of the central issues of the debate on decolonizing research is bringing into play the privileged position of Western[4] academy and academic researchers as far as knowledge claims are concerned. This involves the recognition, questioning and negotiation of geopolitical, sociopolitical and cultural hegemony in knowledge building practices (Mignolo 2000, Castro Gómez /Grosfoguel 2007). In my reading, the decolonial debate is about confronting patterns of social relationship which

---

*I wish to thank Elena Grillenzoni for her careful revision and her important suggestions to the first draft of this article.

[1]Purepecha leader during the Forum *"Mujeres Indígenas y Feminismo: del racismo, exclusiones y desencuentros a la construcción de nuevas miradas"*, organized during the *XI Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe* (Mexico City, march 14 – 19th 2009)"Indigenous women and Feminism: from racism, exclusion and dis-encounters towards a construction of new perspectives", 11th Feminist Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean in Mexico City in 2009, personal recording and transcription of the 3rd session).

[2]Another participant at the same Forum.

[3]Margarita Gutierrez, Tonalá, Chiapas, during the Forum *"Mujeres Indígenas y Feminismo* (2009), personal recording and transcription of the third sesión. Margarita Gutiérrez is a member of the network of indigenous researchers *Red Interdisciplinaria de Investigadores de los Pueblos Indios* (Red INIPIM A.C.) which was founded in 2006 (`http://www.rediinpim.org.mx/queesiinpim.php`)

[4]I continue to use the term West in order to give credit to the conceptual work of Edward Said on the invention of Orientalism as a colonizing practice (Said 1978). The process of "othering", the definition of other cultures functioned to define and solidify the West as subject of discourse and knowledge. This hegemonic position, along with practices of knowledge building, is being questioned in decolonial critique (Mohanty, 1986, 2003, Sousa Santos 2004, 2009, Walsh 2007).

were founded during the era of *colonization*, but continue as *coloniality* in the present, as relations of power and privileges which have not disappeared with the end of the colonial era in its macropolitical terms (Quijano 2000, Escobar 2005).

The Maori scholar Tuhiwai Smith, was one of the first authors who explicitly argued for a decolonization of research practice. She carefully portrays how research about indigenous people was inserted in the colonialist project (Smith 1999). In different disciplines of the social sciences, indigenous people were described, analyzed, and categorized. The colonial aim was dominance and exploitation.[5] My article focuses on the continuity of patterns of relationship in which one subject describes, analyzes, categorizes, and another subject is being described, analyzed, categorized – even though it may be for the sake of exploring the reasons of marginalization and injustice. In the following, I will highlight the Latin American debate on the decolonization of feminist research as an example of knowledge practices (Rappaport 2011) in which these patterns have been analyzed and new pathways have been opened by forms of academic cooperation which put the dialogue between different forms of knowledge at the center of the debate.

In the last two decades, representatives of social movements in Latin America[6] are increasingly challenging the privilege of producing knowledge about marginalized people, claiming to be the subjects of knowledge production themselves. There are claims that knowledge is being stolen[7], taken away furtively[8], traded for surplus value in other places[9], or there are refusals to be represented by the voices of others[10]. There are vindications, that knowledge be produced in a way, in a form and to an end, which directly serves the interest of the people involved in the research projects. On the other side, there are academic researchers who feel interpellated[11], who have started to take into account knowledge claims of social movements, and have started to question their own research practice in terms of basic epistemological criteria: Who produces knowledge? What is knowledge about social actors being produced for? How is it produced? Who speaks? In whose language is knowledge produced and presented? How and to what end are the results being presented? Where do questions of power and interest intermingle with academic knowledge

[5]On the one hand, Tuhiwai Smith refers to the work of Said (1978) when she explains how the production of knowledge about the indigenous people served to establish what she calls "positional superiority of Western science" (1999:59). On the other hand, she explains how the act of naming was a means of claiming ownership on the "discoveries" (p.80ff.), be they natural resources or indigenous knowledge found in the colonies which were then commodified as (cultural) property of the West (1999:73).

[6]In this article, I will refer to the EZLN, Ejercito Zapatista de la Liberación Nacional in Chiapas, México, the MST, Movement of the Landless in Brazil, and the organization of Purépecha People in Michoacán, Mexico.

[7]Mato (2000) referring to the refusal of the Wuayuu poet Ramón Paz Ipuanato to give an interview with the researcher with the words that his stories had already been stolen. The case referred to a publishing house who published two of his stories without recognizing his authorship. Mato resumes the argumentation " [. . .] the stories were his own creations, and did not belong to what anthropologists and other people who live in a written world conventionally call "oral tradition." The workshop participants rightly observed that the publishers had ignored the creative skills of a particular indigenous individual, an all too common practice that tends to deny indigenous people which apparently pertains only to White individuals: a creative talent." (2000:485).

[8]Cf. first epigraph, footnote 1.

[9]Hanna Laako (2013:6) quoting the EZLN, who refer to academic researchers as "coyotes of solidarity" who use their knowledge about the movement as political capital and behave in the same way as the coffee coyotes, in the sense of acting as intermediators of a merchandise (coffee or knowledge) which is being intercepted and sold by a higher price on the market (of coffee or knowledge production) (EZLN 2008). The work of Laako (2013) about her own cooperation with the EZLN movement is in itself an example of a researcher who allows herself to be questioned by this critique.

[10]Cf. third epigraph, footnote 3.

[11]Interpellate – transitive (in European legislatures) to question (a member of the government) on a point of government policy, often interrupting the business of the day (www.wordreference.com). Using the term "interpelar" referring to social research practice I wish to give credit to the Convivial Session of the Seminar "Creando prácticas de conocimiento desde El Género, las redes y los movimientos" which was realized in San Cristóbal de las Casas, México in January 2013, in which legal terminology was used within a discussion about epistemic justice (*"Relatoría de la session convivial del 28 y 29 de enero 2013"* internal document).

production about social movements?

I will talk about social research practices that I came acquainted with during my research experience in Mexico since 2002 and explore their relevance for research in German social sciences. Using the words of Daniel Mato (2000) I call these practices "studying with, and not only about social actors, or at least studying the hegemonic articulations of power." I will argue that studying *with*, and not only *about* social actors means a different way of relating to social actors in our research projects. My motivation in writing this article is to contribute to the debate on the relevance and feasibility of this kind of research in a German context. My own work focuses on the personal relationship between the academic researcher and the social actors and the epistemological implications of a more dialogical and horizontal research praxis (Meckesheimer 2011b). Nevertheless, while a great part of the ethical, epistemological and methodological choices in the accomplishment of social research has to be taken on a personal level, the academic researcher is inserted in an institutional and cultural framework which defines the scope of action in which research practices are to be carried out.

This article is written in light of the academic exchange during my fellowship at the BMBF Project "Universality and Acceptance Potential of Social Science Knowledge: On the Circulation of Knowledge between Europe and the Global South" which for me was an opportunity to engage with students and researchers in Germany about my learnings from Mexico. In regard to the research profile of the project, which mainly focuses on the circulation of knowledge within social sciences, my contribution focuses on the circulation of knowledge beyond the academy, especially knowledge in relation to social actors. In Mexico, I worked with local women's organizations in the field of women's rights and fundraising, and at the same time conducted two academic research projects on the challenges and possibilities of knowledge construction between social movements and the academy (Meckesheimer 2011a). Academic feminism has been characterized as a discipline which evolved by a constant oscillation between practical experience and theoretical reflection.[12] In turn, some of the members of the women's organizations I worked with held an academic degree, and maintained a steady dialogue with academic researchers. Formally, I participated in a Master and a PhD program in the discipline of Social Psychology of Groups and Institutions at the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Campus Xochimilco in Mexico City.[13] Both the discipline of Social Psychology of Groups and Institution and the context of women's movements favor an approach to knowledge construction, which is above all rooted in personal experience, and situatedness.[14]

My motivation for dedicating my academic work on the decolonizing of research praxis has a personal concern. It is rooted in an early research experience when I was in the position of a PhD student in an interdisciplinary research project.[15] My PhD project was on texts by indigenous women from Chiapas, Mexico about experiences of violence. The knowledge I was required to

[12] I owe this concise identification of academic feminism as a discipline which is marked by the transition of its protagonists between activism and academia to the contribution of Nelly Richards at the Forum *Giros teóricos (Theoretical turns)* UNAM, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, México D.F., February 20-22nd 2008). On the constitution of the feminist movement between theory and practical experience Marcos/Waller (2005).

[13] The basic requirement to participate in these research programs was to develop a research project which would be carried out together with a group or institution. The reflection of the interaction between the researcher and the social actors who participate in the research project was a substantial part of the research process (Meckesheimer/Bochar 2008).

[14] For the context of Social Psychology of Groups and Institution at the UAM-X Lourau 1998 and 1997, Manero Brito 1996, Devereux 1966, Breuer 2003, Meckesheimer/Bochar 2008. For the feminist standpoint theory Haraway 1989, Harding 1986 and 1993, Hernández 2008 and 2011; Waller y Marcos 2005; Navaz y Hernández 2008. For the consideration of the personal situatedness in decolonial research Leyva et al. Tomo I and II, SVI (2013).

[15] I consider that it is not relevant to indicate the name and the institution of this research project, as I want to point out a structural position of a PhD student in a larger academic research framework which I consider is not limited to a specific research project or research team.

produce by the academic research project was highly codified and theoretic, and, in addition, had to be published either in German, English or French, as the research results were directed towards the members of the research project. I felt responsible to produce some information that would respond to the expectations of the women who gave their personal texts and interviews to me. However, this concern was not shared by the interdisciplinary research project and I had to do this work in my free time, as well as a second journey to Mexico, in which I could communicate intermediate results with the women concerned by the issue I was investigating. Even though I was supported by the coordinator of my research team to take one month off in order to do this feedback, I had to do this on my own expense and had to make up time. Eventually, I broke with this research project because I was not able to bear the ethical dilemma it meant to me: On the one hand I could not stand taking those women's stories as material for scientific research without being able to return something to them. On the other hand I was not able to sustain the double agenda that a production of knowledge would have required in order to contribute to their cause. At that time, my abandonment seemed a personal failure to me. My research experience in academic frameworks which do not only allow, but support the development of decolonial research praxis (Bochar/Meckesheimer 2008) allowed me to consider that the academic framework I tried to realize my research in was not favorable for a decolonial research practice nor did it allow for a double agenda. It also made me see that it is often young researchers or researchers with a background in social struggle that take up academic research projects out of the idea that their research would contribute to the social causes with which they are involved. The institutional framework they find, however, often does not allow for consideration nor inclusion.

Asking what "we" can learn is a provocative starting point, as it requires an act of deliberate identification. My essay is a subjective reflection on ethical, epistemological and methodological implications of the attempt to decolonize one's own research praxis and seeks to engage in a constructive dialogue on what could be relevant and feasible in a German context. Here, it draws the attention to challenges for the construction of a decolonial research praxis within the German social sciences.

In the main part of the article, I will define the debate on the decolonization of research practice against what is commonly assumed as the postcolonial discourse. Against this background I describe knowledge practices which have been created as a result of reflexivity, as a consequence of postcolonial thought and, increasingly, in response to the demands of social movements. In consequence, I will explore the institutional aspect of research praxis and the limitations for choices of the researcher as well as possible lessons for the German research context. This is a theoretical challenge, as even if the question is discussed in terms of the relationship between the personal situatedness, epistemological choices and methodological consequences, the social structures in which research is realized are not easily translatable. On the one hand, Germany plays a different part in regard to colonial history and colonial structures, the academy has a different social history, which results in a different kind of relationship between social actors and investigators in social research. On the other hand social movements are organized in a different way in Latin America and in Germany. My argument is that even though the role of the university and the research cultures differ in the Latin American and the German context, as do the social movements, the epistemological choices are worth considering.

2 Decolonizing knowledge praxis in Latin America: learning to listen

Latin America has a long tradition of academic intellectuals who have put their academic work to the service of those parts of society that are most affected by the remains of colonialism. Already

in Participatory Action Research in the 1960s and Popular Education in the 1970s, intellectuals began to question the role of academics in knowledge production about marginalized populations and sought for forms of research which included people who are concerned by social issues. This inclusion or horizontal dialogue brought about a consideration of different forms of knowledge, forms of recording and transmission of knowledge and different forms of knowledge production. I wish to point out the concept of sentipensar (sensing/thinking)[16] which was introduced by Orlando Fals Borda as a method of scientific enquiry in social research as a result of his dialogue with a fishers' community in Colombia.[17] Even though this research paradigm has never acquired a hegemonic status, present day thinkers of decolonial research praxis talk about a genealogy of knowledge building practices (Hernández 2011a, Mora 2011, Rappaport 2011) as a background for current epistemological struggles in respect to the recognition of other forms of knowledge (Leyva 2013).

In *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) Paolo Freire placed the dialogue between the committed intellectual and "the oppressed" at the center of the knowledge building process arguing that dialogue is only possible if the intellectuals also open up to learning processes (1970:9). In 1995, Orlando Fals Borda resumes the learnings of trial and error in Participative Action Research as "life-experience and commitment combining academic knowledge with common people's wisdom and know-how" which is characterized by the following concise recommendations:

> "Do not monopolize your knowledge nor impose arrogantly your techniques, but respect and combine your skills with the knowledge of the researched or grassroots communities, taking them as full partners and co-researchers. Do not trust elitist versions of history and science which respond to dominant interests, but be receptive to counter-narratives and try to recapture them. Do not depend solely on your culture to interpret facts, but recover local values, traits, beliefs, and arts for action by and with the research organizations. Do not impose your own ponderous scientific style forcommunicating results, but diffuse and share what you have learned together with the people, in a manner that is wholly understandable and even literary and pleasant, for science should not be necessarily a mystery nor a monopoly of experts and intellectuals." (Fals Borda, 1995:s/n)

As will be seen in the following, many of these recommendations echo central concerns of the debate on the decolonialization of research practice, which in turn draws on postcolonial theory and the work of the research group modernity/coloniality (Escóbar 2002). In *Descolonizando el Feminismo* (2008), Aída Hernández and Súarez Navaz published a compilation of translated essays on the postcolonial challenges to social research in order to facilitate their reception in Latin America in spite of the language barrier (Hernández 2011b). In additional chapters, the authors define the debate on postcolonial challenges in the Latin American context. Súarez Navaz and Hernández refer to a concept of postcolonialism that

> "does not refer to the political and historical moment which some of the authors of this current write from, but to its epistemological proposal to decolonize knowledge and unveil the forms by which textual representations of those subjects – constructed as "the other" in different geographical and historical contexts – are converted in a form of discursive colonialism which does not account for a reality but constructs it." (2008:16, translation AM).

---

[16]Translation cf. Laura Rendón (2009)

[17]In an interview with Rafael Bassi Labarrera and David Britton Fals Borda comments extensively on the concept sentipensar, which would later be taken up to characterize his work (Moncayo 2009) and forms of knowledge production which include indigenous participants as subjects of knowledge building processes on categories like gender (Méndez Torres et. al. 2013).

This reference to postcolonial thought reflects the seminal work of Edward Said in *Orientalism* (1978) where he analyzed "the Orient" as a "fantastical, real material-discursive construct of 'the West' that shaped the real and imagined existences of those subjected to the fantasy, set many of the terms for subsequent theoretical development, including the notion that, in turn, this "othering" process used the Orient to create, define, and solidify the "West'" (Quayes 2008:133). On the one hand, the identity of the Other is defined from an external view, which in turn was inscribed in the colonial project. On the other hand, the West is constituted as the agent and producer of knowledge about the Other, and knowledge in general. This differentiation of the subject and object of knowledge has been discussed in the debate on the multiple interrelationships of modernity and coloniality (Mignolo 2000, Castro Gómez/Grosfoguel 2007). It has also been analyzed by Boaventura Sousa Santos in his critique of western academic thought as lazy reason (Boaventura Sousa Santos 2004, 2009).

The working group modernity/coloniality (Escobar 2002) distinguishes different dimensions of coloniality which continue to shape social relationships in Latin American societies: the coloniality of power, the coloniality of knowledge, and the coloniality of being. Coloniality of power for example, can be defined as a "global hegemonic model of power in place since the Conquest that articulates race and labor, space and peoples, according to the needs of capital and to the benefit of white European peoples." (Escóbar 2002:5). The coloniality of knowledge consists in the expansion and dominance of the eurocentric knowledge paradigm as the only perspective of knowledge which completely discards the intellectual production of indigenous and Black people. This has even lead to assumptions which doubt their intellectual capacity (Walsh 2007:104).

The modernity/coloniality group draws on previous analytical work such as ,for example, *The Lettered City* by Angel Rama (1984). Rama analyzed how the access to literacy as the hegemonically defined form of knowledge functioned as a self-definition and self- legitimation of the colonial and criollo elites which put the capacity to write and read literature on a par with the capacity of exercising political power during the colonial era and the nation states after the formal independence. The manifestation and records of other cultures is completely discredited. As early as 1951, Frantz Fanon analyzed in *Black Skin, White Masks* how Black people in the Antilles had to master the French language if they wanted to earn some recognition within the postcolonial system, even though this meant a devaluation of their own culture and language. This situation, has been called "coloniality of being, a situation in which one culture is imposed and those who belong to the suppressed culture respond to the imposition", even if this means a denial and degradation of the other forms of being (Escóbar 2002:6).

Castro Gómez (2005; 2009) has argued that in order to understand coloniality it is important to "narrate a sort of experience which is not displayed in the rationality of social institutions, above all in the economy, but in the microphysics of power, from which subjectivities and modes of valuation are produced" (in Hernández González et al. 2012:190). I firmly believe that there is a great epistemological potential that lies precisely in this inscription and embodiment in experience. In the following I will elaborate on the importance of a reflection and systematization of research experience and knowledge practices which deliberately try to analyze the colonial structures that appear in the research setting.

In their compilation, Suárez Navaz and Hernández define the decolonization of feminist practice as a debate and ethical endeavor in which established forms of knowledge production are being criticized in order to unveil colonial structures which continue to dominate the cooperation between women in different cultural, social and geographical contexts (Suárez Navaz/Hernández 2008:34; also Mohanty 1986:19; Hernández 2008:75). This relational and process oriented aspect is an important criteria in order to distinguish decolonialization of knowledge practices from postcolonial critique. The simple questions stated above would then be asked in relation to our own research praxis: Who produces knowledge? What is knowledge about social actors being

produced for? How is it produced? Who speaks? In whose language is knowledge produced and presented? How and to what end are the results being presented? Where do questions of power and interest intermingle with academic knowledge production about social movements?

In her famous essay "Can the subaltern speak?" (1988) Gayatri Spivak challenged the habit of committed intellectuals who try to represent the people who cannot speak the dominant languages of postcolonial settings. She carefully argues, that speaking for the other can also be motivated by power, desire and interest.[18] In a sharp analysis she shows how language and a dominant cultural perspective cannot account for the experience of the Other. She points out a "program for the benevolent *Western* intellectual" (292) in which she recommends that it is time to renounce to the position and attitude to speak for the others, and to start to speak to them (295). For the benevolent intellectual this implies giving up the privilege to be in the position of the one who defines and speaks for the other. This, in the words of Spivak entails a process of unlearning (295).

Up to this moment, the Spivak's essay has been referred to as a central reference in postcolonial discourse. From the moment in which the challenges are accepted in regard to identifying one's own intellectual praxis, I would speak of a decolonization of research praxis. In *Subalternity and Representation* (1999), John Beverley resumes the argument of Gayatri Spivak concisely: If the subaltern could speak – that is speak in a way that really mattered to us – then it wouldn't be subaltern" (Beverley 1999:1). Subalternity is not an ontological identity, but is the position of not being heard. In 1996, Spivak reiterates "So, 'the subaltern cannot speak', means that even when the subaltern makes an effort to the death to speak, she is not able to be heard, and speaking and hearing complete the speech act" (Spivak 1996:292).

In this light I want to focus on the quotations in the epigraph. The three quotes are contributions of indigenous women leaders from different parts of Latin America who spoke at the Forum "Indigenous women and Feminism: from racism, exclusion and disencounters towards a construction of new perspectives" which was held during the 11th Feminist Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean in Mexico City in 2009.[19] It is worth highlighting that feminist institutionalized intellectuals decided to include this Forum within the Latin American Meeting, and to invite indigenous women to speak for themselves and speak with other feminists about race relationships.

This is a groundbreaking decision in terms of the epistemological challenges named above. I wish to analyze this decision as an epistemological choice which I want to point out as a change in the relationship between indigenous women and the "typical feminists" who would be localized in a rather urban setting.[20] When the debate at the Forum acquired a dimension of conflict, and the discussion required more time as scheduled, the speaker who was announced in the program, the feminist anthropologist and activist Aída Hernández renounced to her speaking time with the words: "my institutional position will allow me to speak about my version at any time. It is more important to listen to the voices of those who usually don't speak in a forum like this."[21]

This example does not refer to a typical context in which an academic researcher interacts with participants of a social movement in order to collect material which will be scientifically analyzed later on.[22] However it serves to explain several aspects of an emerging ethics, epistemology and

---

[18]The original title for Gayatri Spivaks seminal article "Can the subaltern speak?" was to be "Power, desire and interest." (Spivak 1988:271).

[19]The Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe is held every second year and has become an important institution since the first meeting in 1989 (`http://www.12encuentrofeminista.org/`).

[20]About the different strands of women's movement for the case of Mexico cf. Gisela Espinosa Damián (2009) *Cuatro vertientes del feminismo en México.* México: UAM-X.

[21]Aída Hernández on the third day of the Forum "Mujeres Indígenas y Feminismo: del racismo, exclusiones y desencuentros a la construcción de nuevas miradas" (cf. footnote 1)

[22]For a critique of the location of analysis cf. Mohanty (2003) below.

methodology of a different way of knowledge construction. The academic researcher I quoted is at the same time an activist[23] and the indigenous women are leaders of a movement with some degree of institutionalization or are researchers themselves. The aim of the knowledge production at the Feminist Encounter does not serve to an academic end in the first place, nor are the organizers of the event predominantly academic. Nevertheless, the academic researcher forms part of the broader feminist movement which gathers every two years in a different Latin American country in order to do conceptual work on the basis of encounter and exchange about the embodied day to day experience of gender realities.

What the indigenous representatives had to say is not comfortable. "We do not allow any more that our words be taken away." "We do not want to hear our stories through the voices of others anymore." These statements are a refusal to what researchers have come to do many times before. They do not say 'researchers out'. One of the speakers even gave a recognition of the work academic researchers started to do recuperating the history of indigenous women. But what are the academic researchers to do, if they shall not continue to do what researchers usually do, that is explore other people's realities and create knowledge about it?

The challenge is to re-define and to negotiate the form of relationship between researchers and the people whose life reality is being researched. In the closing statement of the XI Feminist Meeting, the debate is resumed: "We denounce: that we, the indigenous women are objects of research and that up to the moment we are not being recognized, neither as a collective nor as individuals."[24] At the same time, the statement concludes proposing guidelines for new forms of cooperation: "[r]ecognizing the urgent necessity to construct, among all women, indigenous, rural, feminist, lesbian and of all other movements, structural changes in our national societies which every day deprive us, kill us systematically[25] and uniform us as if we were all the same, which pulverize and minimize our power to struggle and change the system of domination, exclusion and patriarchy we live in."[26] "In order to achieve this", Martha Gutiérrez said during her forum intervention "we need the humility of both sides."[27]

At this point I want to frame the search for creating different forms of relationships in knowledge building processes within a more general debate on decolonization of knowledge building. In his critique of Western Science, Sousa Santos argued for a need of an epistemology of the South (Sousa Santos 2004; 2009), which consists precisely of the dialogue[28] between representatives of Western reason, and social movements from different parts of the world and in a translation between different realms of experience (2004:35ff., 2005). The comprehensive epistemological critique and the solutions Sousa Santos points out have been used as a conceptual reference by several Latin American researchers who have set out to do a kind of research which tries not to repeat the same patterns by which Western reason has always implicitly performed and perpetuated its hegemonic position (Hernández 2011; Leyva 2011; Jiménez/Köhler 2012). As well as other critics of Western reason mentioned above, Sousa Santos analyzes the claims, and also the costs of being the only valuable form of reason. The disqualification of other forms of knowledge by what Sousa Santos calls abyssal thought (Sousa Santos 2007) results in a lazy reason, which is not capable to

---

[23] Hernández 2008, 2011

[24] "Declaración de las Mujeres Indígenas. XI Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe Tenochtitlán – México", 19th March 2009, p. 2 (http://www.cimac.org.mx/cedoc/encuentros_feministas_internacionales/18_xi_encuentrofeministalatinoamericanoydelcaribe_mexico2009/18_1_declaracionmujeresindigenas.PDF).

[25] This referes to the Latin American debate on *feminicidio*, violent murders because of gendered violence (cf. Fregoso/Bejarano/Lagarde 2011).

[26] "Declaración de las Mujeres Indígenas. XI Encuentro Feminista Latinoamericano y del Caribe Tenochtitlán – México", 19th March 2009, p. 1

[27] Cf. Footnote 3

[28] Sousa Santos proposes five ecologies, strategies of dialogue in which other kinds of experience are taken into account: the ecology of knowledges, the ecology of temporalities, the ecology of recognition, the ecology of transcale (global and the local scale), and the ecology of different logics of productivity (cf. Sousa Santos 2004:19ff.).

confront the social issues of our present time (2004). In the words of Sousa Santos, what is needed is a sociology of emergences, practices and forms of dialogue and cultural translations which are yet to emerge (2004:25ff.). The argument of Sousa Santos is particularly relevant to this article, as his analysis does not only take up the debate on decolonization from a point of view of a European scholar, but argues for a process of rethinking Western thought in general. In the following, I will point out some emergent practices in different aspects of academic work with social actors. Here, I can only describe a few exemplary cases. First, I will describe another example of a reshaping of the relationship between academic feminists and indigenous intellectuals on an institutional level. This reshaping, or reinvention however calls for a self-reflective academic praxis in order to identify the motivations and interests which are being brought into play by both sides. Secondly, I will indicate some examples of academic approaches that sought to do research together with social actors on the level of individual research projects. I chose approaches which in turn led to the creation of academic spaces of reflexivity and thus, a certain form of institutionalization of decolonial research praxis.

The forum at the Feminist Meeting is not an isolated episode for the decision to listen to indigenous voices on an institutional level. Regarding the academic exchange with researchers with an indigenous background I wish to name the Ford Fellowship Program for Indigenous graduates which has been developed and organized together with the renowned Center for Resarch and Superior Education in Social Anthropology CIESAS.[29] The program facilitated the academic training of a generation of academic researchers who reunite the double perspective of indigenous socialization and academic training.[30] The indigenous researchers have founded a network and are regularly invited to conferences on environmental and social issues concerning the indigenous population. In order to characterize the academic context it is worthwhile saying that CIESAS provides a framework in which the work of the indigenous researchers is institutionally supported.[31] One group of the academic feminist movement in Cuernavaca (in the south of Mexico City) in turn founded the Network Decolonial Feminisms. In 2011. the network organized a conference circle "Rethinking Gender from Within. Dialogues and Reflections with men and women from Original Peoples"[32]. In this conference circle, only the introductory session was held by Sylvia Marcos as representative of the group of academic feminists and then the podium was opened to the indigenous researchers so that they could present their perception and analysis of gender in different social issues. Certainly, the aspect of academic training is an important factor in this setting. The indigenous researchers are not subaltern people in a proper sense who do not have a voice in academic discourse. As these indigenous researchers have acquired the language of academic discourse they can join the discourse in which the rules of the game are being negotiated. However, this invitation and the disposition of listening to what they might have to say is another example of an emergent attitude and praxis in which the forum is ceded to indigenous voices in order to allow the academic work to be questioned by perspectives which have not been taken into account.

The importance of questioning the roles and habits of social researchers have been formulated both from within and from without academy. On the one hand, theoretical elaborations which

[29]http://ciesas.edu.mx/

[30]In Mexico, the alumni of this program have founded the network INIPIIM, Red de Investigadores Indígenas de los Pueblos Indios (Interdisciplinary Network of Researchers of the Indigenous Peoples) http://www.investigadoresindigenas.org.mx/index.phpaccessed 10th Oct. 2013.)

[31]Cf. the support of the Journal for alumni of the IFP *Aquí estamos* with a special issue on indigenous women intellectuals (*Aquí estamos. Mujeres indígenas profesionistas en marcha.* Vol. 9, July-Dec. 2008) (http://ford.ciesas.edu.mx/downloads/Revista9.pdf) 10th Oct. 2013.)

[32]Cf. Network "Feminismos descoloniales" at the Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias/Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México in Cuernavaca (http://www.educrim.org/drupal612/?q=node/118 access Oct 10th 2013

are categorized as postcolonial or decolonial theory have highlighted the importance to question the established roles of research and the researcher. The systematic unlearning of privilege which Spivak put at the center of her program for the benevolent intellectual can only be achieved by seeking to change the form of relating to women in a subaltern position (Spivak 1988:295). This means that the position of the researcher and also the question of methodological procedure cannot remain unquestioned (1988:296). Again, on the background of being a maori researcher, Tuhiwai Smith has argued that relationships between non-indigenous researchers and indigenous people have to be negotiated (1999:175). This negotiation above all requires time and patience (ibid). And it comprises the negotiation for what kind of knowledge will be produced by whom and who will gain from it (173). Here, Smith has listed different strategies which vary in the degree of opening up to negotiation and dialogue on the issue of role models, power, desire and interest in research (177).

On the other hand, movements like the Movimento Sem Terra in Brazil and the Zapatista movement in Mexico, which have a long movement history and have developed their own knowledge practices about their sociopolitical analysis and strategies have challenged the role of academic researchers as legitimate experts of movement history (Barbosa 2012, Leyva 2008, Laako 2013). Increasingly, there are demands of the social movements to be taken into account as subjects in the knowledge building process. This has epistemological and methodological implications that have increasingly been considered in research projects, in which both the researcher and the social actors involved are to negotiate the conditions and aims of the research project. I consider this an epistemological shift in comparison to a research setting in which social actors are only invited or allowed to participate in a research project which has already been conceived in an academic setting and by an academic researcher (Meckesheimer 2011)[33]. The thematic priorities, the aim of the research project, the methodology, time frames, modes of financing, the effort being taken and the presentation of the outcomes are now to be developed and negotiated from two different subject positions (Leyva 2008, Castellanos 2012, Fajardo 2012).

The research project "Globalization, Justice and Indigenous Rights"[34] at the CIESAS Centre in Mexiko City inquires about different cultural conceptions of justice according to the cosmovision of different cultures throughout Latin America which are opposed to the national legal constitutions which where instituted in the process of the independence processes in the 19th century and are based on European legal philosophy. The exploration of the respective conceptions of justice is realized in careful research processes together with indigenous groups. The research team holds a permanent seminar on the epistemological and methodological implications, which has given way to a first systematization of a research praxis which seeks at any moment to regard the implications of research on the groups who participate in the research processes (Blackwell et al. 2008). It takes into account that "our 'research subjects' (which means that of the indigenous peoples) constantly theorize their own social processes and this analysis, even though different compared to the academic analysis is equivalent in terms of legitimacy and validity" (Blackwell et al. 2009:16). The representatives of indigenous communities are addressed as interlocutors and their interests and demands concerning knowledge building processes about their life realities are taken into account (ibid.).

These interests and demands however frequently imply a commitment to questions of social justice or communitarian issues and projects (Blackwell et al. 2009). Daniel Mato (2000) has elaborated on the implications of the demands that can arise when the researcher decides to

---

[33]The expression epistemological shift is inspired by an expression used by Shu Mei Shih (2005:233) and the Forum "Giros teóricos" (theoretical turns) held at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma Metropolitana in Mexico City, February 20-22nd 2008). Shu Mei Shih (2005:233) describes a situation in which the center conceptualization is being shifted due to a process of signification which is carried out between feminists of different cultural backgrounds.
[34]http://www.ciesas.edu.mx/Investigacion/globalizacion_sierra.pdf

listen and to respond to the questions of interest of the respective social actors in knowledge building processes. Analyzing different examples of his own research praxis, Mato shows that the tight institutional framework makes any negotiation of the research topic and any additional social commitment extremely difficult (2000:481). Doing research with, and not only about social actors is a very ambitious goal, as it involves shifting the epistemological center (Shih 2005:233) which is conventionally set in the academic perspective. It means a questioning of the division of labor in charge, which privileges the academic project at the expense of other intellectual activities which challenge the research questions, the limits of the discipline, theoretical interest and methodological choices. Mato admits that doing research with, and not only about, social actors has hardly been possible in his own work experience (488). Instead, what can and should at least be done is "studying the hegemonic relations of power" that currently make the construction of different relationships very difficult.

The two volumes *Conocimientos y prácticas políticas: reflexiones desde nuestras prácticas de conocimiento situado* [Knowledges and political praxis: reflections from our situated knowledge praxis] (Leyva et. al. 2011) contain 27 chapters which systematize research experiences by distinguished researchers which have been realized together with social actors throughout Latin America. These research experiences are characterized by different degrees to which the people concerned by social issues have been invited to participate in the conception of the research projects. Each chapter offers a rich theoretical foundation. Perhaps the most radical form of cooperation and co-responsibility is the approach of "investigación co-labor" in which the social actors participate in all stages of the research project. Xóchitl Leyva and Shannon Speed (2008) offer a first theorization of this epistemological and methodological approach, which is frequently taken up as a reference throughout the two volumes. Axel Köhler comments on the difficulty of a co-theoretization, in which again, the division of labour between academic and non-academic participants is attempting to be avoided, and both sides contribute "material" and systematizations, contextualizations and analysis of these data (Köhler 2011: 383). A later essay written together with the indigenous video producer José Alfredo Jiménez provides an account of this process of co-labor and co-theoretization from both sides (Jiménez/Köhler 2012). However, it is pointed out that only in rare cases research on the basis of the principle of co-labor is possible. The main reason is that academic researchers and social movements usually have different work rhythms and priorities that are difficult to negotiate given the often tight agendas of the academy and the social movements.[35] Among the merits of the two volumes I wish to highlight are the analysis of the epistemological and methodological choices and also of the institutional constraints that limit the possibilities of dialogical research praxis. The theoretical elaboration of these individual decisions which have been taken in research processes which were open to the dialogue with social actors offer important stepping stones for further research projects.

Following the example of the two volumes *Prácticas de conocimiento*, in 2011 the professor Xochitl Leyva from the CIESAS in Chiapas called for the international virtual seminar "Constructing Practices of knowledge from gender, social movements and networks."[36] The seminar united a group of international, mostly M.A. or PhD students who had been realizing their research projects in cooperation with social movements. The seminar took place as an activity of the "Transnational Network Other Knowledges" (RETOS Red Transnacional Otros Saberes)[37] and was dedicated to the analysis of each participant's research praxis in regard to epistemological and methodological choices. The seminar turned into a working group that is currently writing

---

[35]Examples for research projects which were realized according to this approach and analyze the difficulties are Castellanos (2013) and Jiménez/Köhler (2012).

[36]http://encuentroredtoschiapas.jkopkutik.org/index.php/es/actividades/seminario-sobregenero-movimientos-y-redes access Oct 10th 2013.

[37]http://encuentroredtoschiapas.jkopkutik.org/index.php/es/ access Oct 10th 2013.

a systematization of the fruitful exchange of personal research experience. A recurrent theme was that the realization of a decolonial research praxis in a conventional academic framework frequently resulted in frictions with the academic environments which were not supportive of decolonial research approaches. The special contribution of this group is that it presents perspectives from young researchers who opted for a decolonization of their research praxis before having achieved the corresponding academic title. Throughout this essay I have argued that decolonization presents many challenges to the established forms of doing research in Western hegemonic academy. Institutionally, the situation of a student or junior researcher is a particularly difficult place, from which to question the established order. The contribution of the working group is to elaborate their voices and perspectives which are not easily taken into account in institutional planning processes.

3 Conclusions: What can we learn for German Social Sciences?

Asking what can be learned for German social sciences implies the question of cultural translatability of social experience. This is a theoretical and practical problem that has been dealt with in different moments of postcolonial discourse. In the beginning of the essay I mentioned that neither the academic framework nor the social reality and social actors can be easily compared. I have pointed out that the question can possibly be answered on a subjective level, by projective identification with researchers' choices and experiences in different cultural contexts. In his critique of lazy reason, Sousa Santos proposes a conception of translation as a form of cultural learning. Sousa Santos refers to a translation both in regard to knowledges and to practices (2004:41). Drawing on the work of Raymundo Panikkar[38], Santos proposes a diatopical hermeneutics (2002:47) as a concept that acknowledges for standpoints that are rooted in different cultures and worldviews and still makes an interpretative approach possible. In regard to my initial question, the concept of diatopical hermeneutics is a suitable concept for cross-cultural learning, as it focuses on the comprehension process of the subject who seeks to understand. Sousa Santos has put a special focus on the importance of translation or mutual learning in regard to social practices (2004:41ff; 2005), which, according to him, are always forms of knowledge put into praxis (ibid.). The act of translation realized by representatives of social groups, who then carry out a process of selection and adaption of what can be learned from other cultures (2004:50ff).

Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez (2006) provides a careful philosophical reflection on the translatability of social experience. Based on her work on gender and migrant workers in Germany she asks if her own experience as a researcher with a migrant background can be compared to the experience with Latin American migrants who do domestic work in Germany. She draws on the thought of Walter Benjamin[39] and on Derrida, arguing that "a good translation is not necessarily the one that repeats the idea of the original by creating a copy of it but the one that stems from a failed translation of the original" (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2006:s/n). The translation cannot be regarded as a copy of the original meaning, but introduces new aspects, that Derrida has called supplement.[40] Also, Gutiérrez Rodriguez emphasizes that translation always comprises moments of non-communication and non- translatability (ibid.).

---

[38]For the concept of diatopical hermeneutics in Panikkar "What is Comparative Philosophy Comparing?" in G. J. Larson and E. Deutsch, eds., *Interpreting Across Religious Boundaries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988)

[39]Here, Gutiérrez Rodríguez (2006:s/n, Footnote 55) refers to Walter Benjamin, "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers." In: Ders., *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. IV.1, ed. Tillmann Rexroth, Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp 1972, p. 12.

[40]Rodríguez (2006:s/n, Footnoote 18) refers to Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, Paris: Éditions de Minuit 1972, p. 54.

Doing research that is concerned with the issue of decoloniality means something different from a German and from a Latin American standpoint. In the light of the approaches on translatability, the cultural and sociopolitical differences have to be taken into account. In the last few years, the topic of decoloniality has been a subject of many conferences and seminars throughout German Universities. However, decoloniality has predominantly been approached in terms of an analysis of the international debate. A questioning of the established research methodology is only emerging. At the University of Freiburg, the Research Project Southeast Asian Studies has sought a dialogue with social researchers from Southeast Asia in order to learn from qualitative research methodologies that include working with social actors.[41] In Coimbra, Portugal, the research project "Alice – strange mirrors, unsuspected lessons" is a large scale research project aimed at systematizing the experience of researchers working together with social actors in different countries inside and outside Europe. However, the project has only started in 2012, and results are yet to be determined.

Social issues and social movements are not the same in Europe and Latin America. I consider one of the main differences for a decolonial research practice is, that marginalized social groups in Germany are currently not organized in a way that would have brought about a critique to the way social research is being carried out. This, however, is being contrasted by the work of the Decoloniality Network Europe[42] which unites activist groups concerned with racism and discrimination in different European countries as well academic researchers who practice decolonial research in European academic institutions. The network is currently working on a Charter of a Decolonial Research Ethics in which central concerns guidelines of a decolonial research practice are expressed from the perspective of a dialogue between researchers and activist groups.[43] Again, the question of researcher reflexivity, the analysis of epistemological privilege, in the sense of what is defined as knowledge, and who participates in knowledge construction, the interests of the people involved in knowledge building projects and eventually, the problem of the conflict of different agendas are addressed in this Charter. Both the research project Alice and the Charter of Decolonial Research Ethics will be important references for the decolonization of research practice in Europe, and also in Germany.

But how can these concerns be responded to in our research praxis in German social sciences? Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez relates to feminist and postcolonial methodology and epistemology in the USA in the 1980s and 1990s as a period when the relationship between the subject and object of research has been critically analyzed. She also points to projects like Precarias a la Deriva[44] in Spain and the Colectivo Situaciones[45] in Argentina as references of political projects which though being situated outside academic knowledge production relate to academic debates (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2006 s/n Footnote).

On the basis of my personal experience, I have observed that it is frequently younger researchers who have studied postcolonial theory or have heard about the discourse on decolonizing of hegemonic knowledge practices, who set out to realize a decolonial research project together with a group of social actors which they find affected by or concerned with a social problematic that draws their attention. The systematization of the experiences of the International Virtual

---

[41]Cf. the Research Project "Grounding Area Studies in Social Practice" at the Universtity of Freiburg (`http://www.southeastasianstudies.uni-freiburg.de/`)

[42]`http://decolonialityeurope.wix.com/decoloniality`

[43]A preliminary overview on the concepts treated in the Charter was presented by the coordinator of the Decoloniality Network Europe Julia Suárez Krabbe during her speech „Social Research, Power and the University. The Decoloniality Network Europe and the (Im)possibilities of Doing Research with Social Movements." at the Universität Freiburg on June 25th 2013.

[44]Gutiérrez Rodríguez refers to Precarias a la Deriva (2003) *A la Deriva por los circuitos de la precariedad femenina.* Traficantes de Sueños: Madrid.

[45]Cf. Colectivo Situaciones (2003) "On the militant researcher." In: *Transversal* 09/2003. `http://eipcp.net/transversal/0406/colectivosituaciones/en`

Seminar on knowledge building practices has shown that in many cases the students who have taken the decision to realize their M.A. or PhD research in a dialogical praxis are confronted with institutional settings which do not support the epistemological basis or do not allow to realize the research process in a dialogical way because of the time structure of the curriculum.[46]

My Fellowship at the BMBF Project "Universality and Acceptance Potential of Social Science Knowledge: On the Circulation of Knowledge between Europe and the Global South" provided the institutional support to organize a workshop on the methodological implications of a decolonization of research practice with PhD students[47] and to teach a seminar on horizontal research approaches in Latin America.[48] Both experiences confirmed, that students who aim at designing a dialogical research praxis, in which the social actors are involved in the research process, and shall be able to access the results, find limitations in their institutional framework, which above all does not provide the time for such extra responsibilities. Instead of encouraging a dialogical research praxis, the institution often presents an obstacle to the endeavor of decolonizing research praxis. Frequently, the young researchers in their qualification processes have to justify their slow advance in academic productivity, when the negotiations with the social actors consume time which is not foreseen in the established understandings of doing research.[49] This situation does not only appear in research projects with an explicitly decolonial endeavor, but also in research projects on social issues within Europe, in which young researchers try do research with, and for, and not only about social actors who are affected by those issues. I consider that the experience of Latin American researchers who have set out to turn the philosophical critique of coloniality into emerging approaches of knowledge practices is an important reference which can help to justify the epistemological and methodological choices of the individual researchers and to build a solid theoretical framework.

However, the institutional position of graduate and PhD students is a difficult location from which to venture on a research praxis which per definition poses a challenge to hegemonic research practices (Grillenzoni/Meckesheimer 2013). On this background, I consider it important, that the institutional implications of such an endeavor have to be considered from different locations inside the academic institution. An important contribution to the question of feasibility of decolonial research is the essay "Under Western Eyes Revisited" (2003). In this text, Chandra Mohanty looks back to the debate which was generated by her famous essay from 1986. In the introduction, she situates herself as a professor of women's studies saying, that her perspective of being "under" had turned much more into an "inside" the US academy (Mohanty 2003:499). Among many other careful considerations, she uses her perspective as a university teacher in order to look at the pedagogical models that American programs of Women's Studies provide for students in order to achieve an internationalization of the educational experience. She identifies three models: a "Feminist as a tourist- model" (518), a "Feminist as an explorer model" (519), and a "feminist solidarity or comparative feminist studies model" (521) as curricular frameworks which facilitate that students can get in contact with women in other cultures. She characterizes those pedagogical models by the categories of time and the gaze as factors of relationships which are being established. On the basis of her experience in the evaluation of Women's Studies programs, Mohanty indicates that the majority of curricular programs correspond to the first two models in the sense that brief research trips are made into the "other" cultures, to gather material which is then taken home, analyzed and integrated into research projects which were conceived according

---

[46]Preliminary elaborations are published at the website http://encuentroredtoschiapas.jkopkutik.org/index.php/es/actividades/seminario-sobregenero-movimientos-y-redes

[47]http://www.gesellschaftswissen.uni-freiburg.de/taetigkeit/ws-je/ws-decolimplic

[48]http://www.gesellschaftswissen.uni-freiburg.de/taetigkeit/lehre/ss2013-2

[49]I wish to thank Veronika Wöhrer for the reference to the PhD of Patricia Maguirre (1987) who in the 1980s described a parallel experience in the United States when she conducted her research on the basis of a feminist approach to Participative Action Research.

to the departments' theoretical preferences. This favors a form of cultural encounter which does not allow that stereotypical assumptions about the Other women are being put into question. As was discussed in the modernity/coloniality debate, Mohanty identifies a modernist paradigm (519) in the sense that the researcher is conceived as the exploring subject while the Other women are the ones concerned by social problems. She criticizes that these approaches do not allow for exploring which kind of power structure is being exercised in this kind of encounter. Also, these models tend to focus on social issues in Third World countries, while questions of racism and social privilege in the US are not considered. The third model, "feminist as a solidarity or comparative feminist studies model" (521f.) in turn facilitates an articulation of the global and the local experiences and creates space for a reflection of the researchers' own implication in power structures and personal interest. It favors a perspective in which the Other women are not merely seen as victims or population concerned with a social problem, but one in which the researcher's own implication with social privilege is being analyzed as well. This didactical framework allows for building relationships in which mutual learning can take place. In fact, this approach echoes many of the concerns that have been voiced as issues of a decolonialization of research praxis. In a comparative or solidarity model, the researchers should bring their own situatedness and interests into play, and should consider the people involved in their research project as interlocutors whose interests regarding the knowledge building are taken into account. Mohanty's analysis is more complex than I can summarize at the end of this article. In the context of my argument I wish to point out the importance of her observations on the academic framework from her perspective as an academic teacher.

In a recent speech on research methodology on invitation of the research program Alice the Colombian lawyer and human rights activist César Rodríguez Garavito enumerated many of the institutional challenges that activist researchers have to face (Garavito 2012). In his contribution he clearly stated that activist researchers correspond to a double agenda, a fact which is mostly not being recognized, whether on the side of the academy or on the side of the social movement. This puts the researcher in a series of dilemmas which threaten the project of action research. The dilemmas or risks, Rodríguez Garavito points out, concern the different agenda in terms of the use of time, different expectations regarding the outcome of the research process, the tension between different expectations regarding a distanced analytical perspective and political commitment to the concerns of the movement. Finally, as the confrontation of those dilemmas are currently faced by the researcher, the researcher suffers the risk of exhaustion, and, in consequence the abandonment of one of the two agendas.

As long as the epistemological and methodological implications of an engaged form of research are not recognized by the university as institution, the burden of constructing new types of relationships in knowledge building processes lies on the shoulders of individual researchers. I consider that if a decolonization of research praxis is to be taken seriously within research institutions in Germany or elsewhere, it is necessary to rethink the institutional conditions in which research has to be carried out. It is in this regard, that the statements of Mohanty and Rodríguez Garavito are important contributions that can help to identify and recognize institutional settings that turn the attempt to decolonize research praxis into an absurd adventure which, in the words of Rodríguez Garavito, sometimes resembles Don Quixote's fight against the windmills.

Epistemological struggle has a lot to do with recognition of different forms of seeing and thinking. As a professor of social anthropology, Xochitl Leyva has stressed that in many occasions students who attempt to realize decolonial research projects in an academic framework which is not prepared for it, are leading not only structural, but also epistemic struggles (Leyva 2013). I consider it worthwhile to listen to the experiences of the younger researchers and take advantage of their perceptions, which can be closer to social actors than some of the disciplinary or institutional rules of their home departments, universities or research teams allow for. Finally,

I wish to highlight academic spaces of reflective research practices which have been created by academic teachers and researchers like Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Tuider[50] and Prof. Dr. Cornelia Giebeler[51], who have come into contact with horizontal research practices in their own research experiences in Mexico. When students find the opportunity to participate in seminars on reflective research methodologies and are provided with counseling which favors the construction of solid and mutually responsible relationships in their research settings, decolonization of research praxis is more likely to be established in the German social sciences.

References

Beverley, John (1999) *Subalternity and Representation. Arguments in Cultural Theory.* Durham and London: Duke UP.

Blackwell, Maylei / Hernández Castillo, Rosalva Aída/Herrera, Juan/MacLeod, Morna/Ramírez, Reyna/ Sierra, María Teresa/Sieder, Rachel/ Speed, Shannon (2009) "Cruces de fronteras, identidades indígenas, género y justicia en las Américas" In: *Desacatos 31 Reividicaciones étnicas, género y justicia.* México D.F.: CIESAS, 13-35.

Bochar, Jacqueline/Meckesheimer, Anika (2008) "A Master Program as institutional framework for developing unconventional ways of doing research: The Maestría in Social Psychology of Groups and Institutions at de Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Xochimilco in Mexico City." ISA Forum of Sociology "Sociological Research and Public Debate." Barcelona, September 5.th -8th. 2008.

Castellanos, Noemí (2013) "Una investigación en co-labor y una experiencia de economía en colectivo con horizonte descolonial", In: Obra colegiada del SVI. México, Seminario Virtual Internacional (SVI) "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes." (forthcoming).

Castro Gómez, Santiago (2009) *Tejidos Oníricos. Movilidad, capitalismo y biopolítica en Bogotá* (1910-1930). Bogotá: Universidad Javeriana.

Castro Gómez (2005) *La hybris del punto cero. Ciencia, raza e ilustración en la Nueva Granada* (1750-1816). Bogotá: Universidad Javeriana.

Castro Gómez, Santiago/Grosfoguel, Ramón (eds.) (2007) *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global.* Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Ediciones.

Duarte Bastián, Àngela Ixkic/Berrío Palomo, Lina (2011) "Saberes en diálogo: mujeres indígenas y académicas en la construcción del conocimiento." In: Leyva et. al. (coord.), Vol. II, 80-118.

EZLN (2008): "Palabras del Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos a la Caravana Nacional e Internacional de Observación y Solidaridad con las comunidades zapatistas" `http://enlacezapatista.ezln.org.mx/2008/08/02/platica-del-sci-marcos-y-el-tte-coronel-` `#Marcos` (access: Oct. 10th 2013).

Escóbar, Arturo (2002) "Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise": The Latin American modernity/ coloniality Research Program. "Revised from a version presented at

[50]Cf. The Seminar „Horizontales (er-) Forschen mit sozial Handelnden" taught at Kassel University during Winter term 2011/2012. `http://www.uni-kassel.de/fb05/fachgruppen/soziologie/soziologie-der-diversitaet/` `prof-dr-elisabeth-tuider.html`

[51]Cf. Cornelia Giebeler (2013) "Forschung in fremden Lebenswelten" during the Kassel Summer School „Methoden empirischer Sozialforschung, Oct 14th, 2013. `http://www.uni-kassel.de/fb05/fachgruppen/soziologie/` `methoden-empirischer-sozialforschung/kss/programm.html`

the Tercer Congreso Internacional de Latinoamericanistas en Europa, Amsterdam, July 3-6, 2002. In CEISAL, ed. *Cruzando Fronteras en America Latina. Amsterdam:* CEDLA, 2002. `http://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/text/eng/Worlds_and_Knowledges_Otherwise.doc` (access: Oct. 10th 2013).

Escóbar, Arturo (2005) *Más allá del tercer mundo. Globalización y diferencia.* Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia /Universidad de Cauca.

Fajardo, Andrea (2013) "tejiendo mi camino hacia la decolonialidad" In: *Obra colegiada SVI.* Seminario Virtual Internacional (SVI) "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes" de la RETOS, forthcoming.

Fals Borda, O. (1995) "Research for social justice: Some North-South convergences", Plenary Address at the Southern Sociological Society Meeting, Atlanta, April 8. `http://comm-org.wisc.edu/si/falsborda.htm` (access: Oct. 10th 2013).

Freire, Paulo (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum 2007. Fregoso, Rosa-Linda/ Bejarano, Cynthia / Lagarde, Marcela (coord.) (2011) Feminicidio en América Latina. Mexico: UNAM: Colección diversidad feminista

Gross, Melanie (2007) "Feministische postkoloniale Positionen." Feministisches Institut Hamburg `http://www.feministisches-institut.de/postkolonial/` (access: Oct. 10th 2013).

Grillenzoni, Elena / Meckesheimer, Anika (2013) "Nosotras, las peores de todas: entre dobles y triples lealtades en la investigación comprometida." In: Obra colegiada del SVI. México, Seminario Virtual Internacional (SVI) "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes." (forthcoming).

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación (2006) "Translating Positionality. On Post-Colonial Conjunctures and Transversal Understanding." In: *Transversal*, 06/2006.

Haraway, Donna J. (1991). "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective" Capítulo 9 En: *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: the Reinvention of Nature.* New York: Routledge, 183-201.

Harding, Sandra (1986) "From Feminist Empiricism to Feminist Standpoint Epistemologies." En: *The Sciene Queston in Feminism*: Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

Harding, Sandra (1993) "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity?" In: Feminist Theory. *A Philosophical Anthology.* Malden, M.A: Blackwell Publishing 2005, 218-235.

Hernández, Aída (2008a) "Feminismos Poscoloniales: Reflexiones desde el Sur del Río Bravo." In: Suárez Navaz/Hernández (ed.) (2008), 68-111.

Hernández, Aída (2011a) "Hacia una antropología socialmente comprometida desde una perspectiva dialógica y feminista. " En: Leyva et. al. (2011).

Hernández, Aída (2011b) "Diálogos Sur-Sur: Feminismos, Poscolonialismos y Estudios de la Subalternidad." Paper presented at the Conference El poder en la sociedad: reacercamiento desde perspectivas interdisciplinarias. Mexico City: UNAM 29th sept. 2011.

Hernández González, Fernando; Rodríguez Mora, Tania (2012) "Genealogía de las herencias coloniales. Entrevista a Santiago Castro-Gómez. " In: *Andamios. Revista de Investigación Social*, vol. 9, núm. 20, septiembre-diciembre, 2012. México: UNAM, pp. 187-199.

Jiménez Pérez, José Alfredo / Köhler, Axel (2012) "Producción videográfica y escrita en co-labor. Un camino donde se encuentran y comparten conocimientos." In: Ingrid Kummels (ed.) *Espacios mediáticos: Cultura y Representación en México.* Berlín, Alemania: Editorial Tranvía.

Köhler, Axel (2011) "Acerca de nuestras experiencias de co-teorización." En: Leyva et. al., Vol. II, 370-407.

Laako Hanna (2013) "En las Fronteras (de pensamiento) con el Movimiento Zapatista". In: Obra Colegiada del SVI. México, Seminario Virtual Internacional (SVI) "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes" de la RETOS (forthcoming)

Leyva, Xochitl/Speed, Shannon (2008): "Hacia la investigación descolonizada: nuestra experiencia de co-labor", in: Leyva, Xochitl/Burguete, Araceli/Speed, Shannon (Coords.): *Gobernar (en) la diversidad: experiencias indígenas desde América Latina. Hacia la investigación de co-labor.* México: CIESAS, FLACSO-Ecuador y FLACSO-Guatemala, pp. 65-107.

Leyva, Xochitl (2011) "¿Academia versus activismo? Repensarnos desde y para la práctica teórico-política." In: Leyva et. Al. (coord..) (2011) Vol. II, 591-629.

Leyva et. al. (coord..) (2011) Conocimientos y prácticas políticas: reflexiones desde nuestras prácticas de conocimiento situado (Vol. I and II). México: Ciesas/ UNI-CACH.

Leyva Solano, Xochitl (2013) "¿Y/osotras? ¿Mi/Nuestras Luchas Epistémicas?" In: Obra Colegiada del SVI. México, Seminario Virtual Internacional (SVI) "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes" de la RETOS (forthcoming).

Lourau, René (1989) *Diario de investigación. Materiales para una teoría de la implicación.* Guadalajara: Editorial Universidad de Guadalajara.

Lourau, René (1997) Libertad de movimientos. Una introducción al análisis institucional. México: Eudeba.

Maguire, Patricia (1987) Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach. Amherst: University of Massachusetts

Manero Brito, Roberto (1996) "El análisis de las implicaciones" En: Foro departamental de educación y comunicación 1995: Psicología. México DF: UAM-X, CSH, Depto. de Educación y Comunicación.

Marcos, Silvia/ Waller Marguerite (2005) *Diálogo y Diferencia. Retos feministas a la globalización.* (Traducción México: UNAM/CIIECH 2008).

Mato, Daniel (2000) „Studying with the Subaltern, not only *about* the Subaltern Social Groups, or, at Least, Studying the Hegemonic Articulations of Power." In: *Nepantla: Views from South 1.3* Duke University Press, 479-503.

Meckesheimer, Anika (2011) *Para cuidar la autonomía en espacios autónomos. Una propuesta de herramientas para la reflexión grupal. Aprendiendo de organizaciones feministas en San Cristóbal de las Casas, Chiapas.* Tesis de Maestría. Mexico City: UAM-X.

Meckesheimer, Anika (2011b) *Dialogando entre diferentes órdenes de saberes. Reflexiones sobre la dimensión relacional entre investigadoras y las mujeres de la*

Coordinación de Mujeres de la Diócesis de San Cristóbal de las Casas en Chiapas. México. PhD Thesis, draft versión, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Unidad Xochimilco, Mexico City.

Méndez Torres, Georgina/Intzim, Juan/Marcos, Sylvia /Osorio Hernández (eds.) (2013) *Senti-pensar el género. Perspectivas desde los pueblos originarios.* Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Benito Juárez de Oaxaca.

Mignolo, Walter (2000) *Historias locales/diseños globales. Colonialidad, conocimientos subalternos y pensamiento fronterizo.* Madrid: Akal.

Mohanty, Chandra T. (1986). „Under Western Eyes – Feminist Scholarship and colonialDiscourses. In: Back, Les/ Solomos, John (Hg.) *Theories of race and racism : a reader.* London : Routledge, 2001, 302-323.

Mohanty, Chandra (2003) "Under Western Eyes Revisited: Feminist Solidarity Through Anti-Capitalist Struggle." En: Suarez Navaz/ Hernández (2008), 407-463.

Moncayo, Victor Manuel (ed.) (2009) *Fals Borda, Orlando, 1925-2008. Una sociología sentipensante para América Latina.* Bogotá : Siglo del Hombre Editores / CLACSO.

Pinheiro Barbosa, Lia (2011) "Diálogos en Movimiento: reflexiones acerca de la *praxis* educativopedagógica, la producción de saberes y la génesis de una otra *episteme* y cultura política en el Movimiento de los Sin Tierra – MST." Paper presented at the Seminario (Virtual) Internacional "Creación de Prácticas de Conocimiento desde el Género, los Movimientos y las Redes" November 14th 2011, `http://www.encuentroredtoschiapas.jkopkutik.org`.

Quijano, Aníbal (2000) "Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina." In: Lander, Edward (ed.) *La colonialidad del saber. Eurocentrismo y ciencias socials. Perspectivas latinoamericanas.* Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 201-246.

Rama, Ángel (1984) *The Lettered City.* Durham: Duke UP 1996. Joanne Rappaport (2011) "Más allá de la observación participante: la etnografía colaborativa como innovación teórica". En: Leyva et. Al. (2011), 327-369.

Rodríguez Garavito, César (2012) " Investigación-acción 2.0. Un nuevo mapa para los investigadores- activistas en un mundo multimedia." Lecture at the Catedra Boaventura de Sousa Santos de Ciências Sociais, Coimbra 11th Dec 2012. `http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M9zJF9VDb6k`

Edward Said (1978) *Orientalism.* London: Penguin.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2004) "A Critique of Lazy Reason: Against the Waste of Experience." In: Wallerstein, Immanuel (org.) *The Modern World-System in the Longue Durée.* London: Paradigm Publishers, 157-197.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2005), "The Future of the World Social Forum: The Work of Translation", *Development*, 48, 2, 15-22.

Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2009) *Una epistemología del Sur. La reinvención del conocimiento y la emancipación social.* México: CLACSO y Siglo XXI.

Shih, Shu-Mei (2005) "Hacia una ética de los encuentros transnacionales o '¿Cuándo una mujer china es considerada una feminista?'" In: Marcos/Waller 2005, 57-98.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988) "Can the subaltern speak?" In: Nelson, Cary/ Grossberg, Lawrence (Hg.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.* Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 271-317.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1996) "Bonding In Difference, interview with Alfred Arteaga (1993/4)." In: Donna Landry / Gerald MacLean (eds.): *Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.* New York.

Walsh, Catherine (2007) "Son posibles unas ciencias socials/culturales otras? Reflexiones en torno a las epistemologías decoloniales" In: *Nómadas* No. 26. Abril 2007, 102-112.