
Hacia una epistemología latinoamericana y caribeña

Towards a Latin American and Caribbean Epistemology

Dra. Crisálida Villegas G.
Postdoctora en Ciencias de la Educación
Universidad Bicentennial Aragua, Venezuela
crisvillegas1@hotmail.com

Fecha de recepción: 18 de septiembre de 2019
Fecha de aceptación: 20 de octubre de 2019
Fecha de publicación: 1 de enero de 2020

Favor citar este artículo de la siguiente forma:
Villegas G, C. (2020). Hacia una epistemología latinoamericana y caribeña.
AULA, Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales, 66 (1), 9-20.

RESUMEN

El propósito del artículo es reflexionar acerca de una epistemología latinoamericana y caribeña, considerando que casi todo el pensamiento a lo largo de la historia se ha caracterizado por la hegemonía euronorteamericana. En tal sentido, se hizo una hermenéusis documental de algunas de las principales producciones que se han hecho desde y para la región. En primer lugar, para demostrar que a pesar de esta primacía se han realizado valiosos planteamientos, que tienen elementos comunes entre sí y con la postura de la autora, quien forma parte de una red de investigadores desde la cual se viene planteando una epistemología transcompleja, cuya característica fundamental es la complementariedad de ideas, autores, paradigmas, teorías y enfoques. Estos y otros elementos permiten comprender, explicar y transformar esta realidad compleja y diversa.

Palabras clave: América Latina, Caribe, complementariedad, epistemología, transcomplejidad.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the article is to reflect on a Latin American and Caribbean epistemology, considering that almost all thought throughout history has been characterized by Euro-American hegemony. In this sense, a documentary hermeneusis of some of the main productions that have been made from and for the region was made, in the first place to demonstrate that despite this primacy valuable approaches have been made, which have common elements with each other and with the author's position, which is part of a network of researchers from which it is, a trans-complex epistemology is proposed, whose fundamental characteristic is the complementarity of ideas, authors, paradigms, theories and approaches, among others, that allow us to understand, explain and transform this complex and diverse reality.

Keywords: Latin America, caribbean, complementarity, epistemology, transcomplexity.

Introduction

The article raises the possibility of a Latin American and Caribbean epistemology, for which it reflects on the question posed by Argentine epistemologist Walter Mignolo: How can we think with our own logic when the epistemological root of Latin American and Caribbean thought is Euro-American? It must be considered that the reality of the region is multi-cultural and polysemic, so that its approach requires diversity of approaches, as well as creativity.

Likewise, the subject of knowledge, i.e., Latin American, and Caribbean man, is diverse, historical and committed. It should be added that when we speak of the generation of knowledge, we think of science as a crossroads of diverse and sometimes conflicting paths. It refers to all possible ways of generating and disseminating cultural knowledge and social representations of these societies.

The generation of knowledge for and from the region is therefore a complex process that has its own particularities, based on its own dimensions and experiences, which therefore represents a new epistemic model for intervening in its realities, which implies considering local histories. Lima (2009) proposes the need for an indigenous theoretical-epistemological base as a condition for the development of their own technical-scientific and social production. From this point of view, Latin American and Caribbean knowledge must involve a constant openness towards the human, everyday life, and the memory of the peoples, considering solidarity, equity and justice schemes. In this respect, the author has been proposing an epistemology of solidarity that considers both new, unpublished ideas and the classical ones that have been put forward by Latin American thinkers.

Hence the purpose of the article to reflect on a Latin American and Caribbean epistemology, the result of a combination of documents and the experience of the author, who has been participating in a group of researchers on the subject matter. To this end, the article is structured in four parts: the lessons of the above, what is to come, what is proposed and for further reflection.

Proof of the Foregoing

In a broken road there are traces that bear witness to what was left behind, which is why it is necessary to think of Latin American and Caribbean epistemology from the past to envision what is to come. In this recent past, which is what was reviewed, approaches such as "postcolonialism" were found, which according to the Dictionary of Latin American Philosophy (2000) is used in three ways:

-In its temporal meaning, it appears as a historical period initiated in 1947, with the independence of Indies.

-In its discursive meaning, it refers to the literature produced in the occupied territories throughout the colonial period, as well as the contra-hegemonic discursive practices that managed to displace the knowledge used by Europe to legitimize its dominion.

-The epistemic meaning, which has to do with the so-called postcolonial theories that emerged during the 1980s in England and the United States.

Postcolonial studies according to *Gómez, Saldarriaga, López & Zapata (2017)* sought to understand what the long history of colonialism consisted of, to also understand if those practices are still replicated and why. They constitute a form of analysis of colonialism, which has contributed to the binary vision of the world and with this to some subjects looking from their center to those others, those of the periphery, with practices that are not recognized as part of the construction of knowledge.

Its central guidelines originated with Edward Said (1978, 2013), who initiated a genealogy of European knowledge about the other, showing the links between human sciences and imperialism. However, Hulme (1996) highlights the fact that Latin American and specifically Caribbean authors were the true precursors of postcolonial theory: *Frantz Fanon*, *Aimé Césaire* and *Edouard Glissant* from Martinique; *Fernando Ortiz* and *Roberto Fernández Retamar* from Cuba, among others.

Although some thinkers disagree, postcolonialism usually defines itself by its postmodern condition, in the sense that it is defined by radical cultural plurality and by the challenging of the antagonistic and hierarchical categories of modernity. Postcolonialism, according to *Adriaensen* (1999), can be defined as a critical reflection on the hegemonic Western discourse: the representation of the (postcolonial) other by the colonial subject is questioned. According to Hall (2008) postcolonial thought allows:

.. ... to (re)signify and (re)elaborate the concept of liberation education since it assumes the after-colonial, going beyond modernism and postmodernism, as a closure of an event (colonialization) but beyond it in a temporal and critical dimension, in tension between the chronological and the epistemological (p.592).

The omnipresence is questioned in literature, historiography, and the media, among others, of a discourse based on a Eurocentric conception that denies the identity of the other to reaffirm its own. According to this author, this perspective is characterized by the elaboration of a counter-discourse not only against the English but also against the West in general. Other characteristics are being post-binary and post-romantic of colonial relations.

The authors of this approach argue that humanistic knowledge becomes the space from which the subordinate is discursively produced, and their interests are represented. In other

words, contrary to what it is believed that literature is the formative discourse of Latin American identity, according to authors such as Beverley (1994) it is also a form of domination of the authority of the literate culture.

In relation to postcolonialism in Latin America, one of its main representatives is the Argentine *Walter Dignolo* (1995), who refers to the epistemological turn made by theorists such as *Prebisch*, *Ribeiro*, *Zea*, *Kusch*, *Dussel* & *Gutiérrez*. He argues that the discourses of these authors are postcolonial because they break with the Eurocentric concept that only first-world countries are capable of producing knowledge.

According to *Dignolo* (ob cit) "The production of theoretical discourses for Latin America, about Latin America and from Latin America, manages ipso facto to delegitimize the colonialist project." (p.3). Postcolonial theories seek to decolonize Western knowledge and take seriously other types of non-Western knowledge, including literature, philosophy, and art, among many practices not known or valued in the same way as established knowledge. For this author it is more appropriate to speak of post-Western studies, as a critique of postmodernity for being a reorganization of the logic of coloniality.

In postcolonial approaches, according to *Catelli* (2012), a dialogue has been developing, plagued with methodological and conceptual challenges, with decolonial thought (*Anibal Quijano*, *Peru*; *Enrique Dussel*, *Argentina*; *Santiago Castro Gómez*, *Colombia*; *Ramón Grosfoguel*, *Puerto Rico*) that has included approaches from border (*Gloria Anzaldúa*, *Mexico*) and Caribbean (*Frantz Fanon*; *Edouard Glissant* and *Aimé Césaire*, *Martinique*) thought with subordinate studies (*Fernando Coronil*, *Venezuela*; *Alberto Moreiras* & *Gustavo Verdesio*, *Uruguay*), among others.

In this context, another posture developed is the so-called "other paradigm" according to *Dignolo* (2000) related to "the diversity of some critical forms of analytical thinking and future

projects based on histories and experiences marked by coloniality and modernity" (p.155).

It intends, according to Fernández, (2012) to serve as connector of how the disregard of the welfare values that the rest of the world has imposed on Latin America and the Caribbean is felt. Thus, according to the cited author, the other paradigm "is the critical and utopian thought that is articulated in all those places in which the imperial/colonial expansion denied the possibility of reason...and of thinking the future" (p.155). It is also an inherent demand since reductionist thinking cannot be accepted.

The hegemony of another paradigm will be, utopianly, the dominance of diversity as a universal project. This paradigm is marked by an epistemic principle that has marked all its histories: the colonial horizon of modernity.

Another position that is reviewed are the "decolonial theories" which, as an ideological wager, arise in response to the processes of coloniality consolidated before and after the dismantling of colonization. This is a characteristic that differentiates it from postcolonial theories, insofar as it is not located in a specific time (modernity) but questions the coloniality of power independent of a temporal frame of reference. According to *Mignolo* (2007), post coloniality was born entrapment with postmodernity.

They are critical theories that make it possible to put forward other opposing hegemonic discourses, which recognize new ways of understanding and comprehending the world in search of transformations of naturalized and strategically invisible power structures and relations. The purpose of decolonization is the demarcation of a whole series of binary categories with which dependency theories and liberation philosophies worked in the past to contribute to revitalize the tradition of critical theories.

They generate the possibility of constructing a different way of thinking based on the interpretation of the past, from a perspective that

reveals other intentions of historical phenomena. One of the pioneers of this approach is *Césaire* (2006). In this sense, it is a propositional posture to that of the epistemic, Eurocentric, and hegemonic construction, which according to *Mignolo* (2007) can only be achieved through a thought that exercises rebellion in the epistemic.

It is not a question of a single theory and a single point of view; among these, an important collaboration is feminist critique, represented among other thinkers by *Ochy Curiet* (Dominican Republic).

However, they all present general characteristics that contribute to the achievement of their objectives, such as: complementarity; they recognize the other way of thinking insofar as they question hegemonic epistemologies and propose other alternatives of knowledge. They deconstruct the coloniality of power, create other possibilities beyond the transformation proposed by decolonization and towards the construction of conditions of existence, knowledge, and power that allow the emergence of different societies.

To this end, Walsh (2005) proposes the concept of interculturality as the central axis of a critical thinking of and from another way. According to Liévano, Ballesteros & Velásquez (2015) the "intercultural approach" refers to a way of positioning oneself in the world, of looking at reality through the prism of diversity and the complexity that characterizes it. It also implies an ethical stance with respect to relations between people.

According to the etymological meaning of the prefix *inter*, intercultural implies exchange, interaction, and interdependence, which in turn leads to collaboration, joint construction of knowledge, communication and negotiation. In this sense, "it includes the range of interactions that occur within a culture, as well as between cultures, which are in continuous change in their dimensions of space and time..." (p.3).

The acceptance of the intercultural

paradigm as a view that contemplates and allows thinking about diversity as a human condition implies renouncing any epistemology that pretends to become the only way to build knowledge. In this sense, for these authors, intercultural epistemology is guided by an interpretative and participatory approach, defined by three principles that characterize a form of knowledge: (a) interest in the complexity of everyday life situations; (b) dialogic relationship as an expression of intersubjectivity; and (c) search for justice and equity through social emancipation.

Raúl Fornet-Betancourt (2001), Cuban, is one of the most prominent proponents of this approach that calls for an inter-cultural transformation of philosophy to overcome its deep impregnation by a universalism that leaves no room for the many forms of reason. This transformation is a decolonization of both philosophical concepts and forms towards a dialogical philosophizing, which involves the greatest possible number of voices, comprising all that is human.

On his end, Dussel (2009) proposes "transmodernity" which proposes what he calls an epistemic "pluriversity", where a situational and dialogic knowledge can be created, from diverse perspectives and the needs of each collective are recognized. According to Grosfoguel (2013) "transmodernity recognizes the need for a shared and common universal project against capitalism, patriarchy, imperialism and colonialism" (p.54).

In this sense, transmodernity proposes the construction of a different school of thought from interculturality as a practice of decolonization of the so-called universality of Western knowledge; for which the peripheral population, in opposition to these systems of oppression, has managed to resist through authentic epistemic bets.

From Latin America and the Caribbean, a different knowledge is built, tied to the

geographical and cultural conditions of a colonized territory, in the process of unlearning and relearning from its own authentic perspective, which allows to critically analyze what was imposed as knowledge, through each system of domination -capitalism, Eurocentrism.

Transmodernity is proposed as an alternative to modernity from an intercultural perspective that seeks the reconstructive dialogue of other knowledge and the strengthening of indigenous and Afro-descendant knowledge. With this term, the above-mentioned author proposes a territory in which binary and opposing identities can be overcome. She thinks of a type of modernity that can welcome other subjects and new knowledge created from these new subjectivities.

In this section, other epistemologies proposed by Latin American authors were also considered. Thus, *Hugo Zemelman* (Chile) proposes the epistemology of the "potential present", which is described with a summary prepared by the same author, in which he points out that this vision emphasizes the recovery of historicity at the level of the subject, since without it there is a dissociation between the subject and its context.

The present potential, according to Zemelman (2010), "is the contextual counterpart of the need to want to be a subject, otherwise it would become a prison that models the subject as a simple reflection of the circumstances" (p.2). Hence, it is urgent to consider the problem of necessity as an expression of the man-context dialogue. According to the author, it implies recovering critical humanism, conceived as "the will to build spaces of autonomy in which the challenge to recognize oneself as a subject takes place, which is originated in the awareness of needs" (p.3), not as simple deficiencies - economic, social, or cultural- possible or not to satisfy, but as the primordial need to be subjects that are expressed in the urgency of the world. It raises the relation of what is human and its

conformation by the socio-historical circumstantial context.

These radical needs are in themselves plural because they are the root cause of the recovery of the utopian subject, as a way of freeing oneself from the ordering and subjective parameters, since, according to Heller (1996), man seeks to "give life to his own option at the limit of his potential" (p.79). That is why these needs do contain the possibility of influencing society from plurality.

Thus, one is or is not an intellectual, a thinker, a researcher of man in society, a possibility that must be analyzed from the perspective of the spaces that society offers, sometimes reduced to real loopholes for the realization of the subject, which implies what is thought, what is constructed as knowledge of reality and, therefore, what is researched. All this requires a memory that nourishes the utopian vision, for only in this way can the consciousness of history emerge as a process that builds the present. For this, the subject must be able to unveil the potential, not as an abstract discourse, but as an epistemic way of constructing reality; consequently, to manage time as an expression of the need of existing-being, as well as the notion of the future as a horizon and not as a contingent purpose.

From the above, it follows the need to open thinking so that according to Zemelman (ob cit) "the first relationship with reality must be the astonishment, which opens us to the surrounding challenges" (p.130). Hence, the method, with its capacity to transform reality into a signifier, responds to a way of thinking from the perspective of empowerment and its concretion in particular constructions.

This tension is methodologically resolved in what Zemelman defines as conjuncture analysis, i.e. analysis of the moment, but in the perspective of its development. It consists in tracing the constitutive of processes from roots often excluded from other forms of analysis; the

challenge is to account for what emerges without reducing it to social fields that have already been signified.

Another option reviewed is the "evolutionary epistemology" according to the vision of *Gonzalo Munévar* (Colombia), a basic premise being that the process of adaptation of living organisms leads to a better representation of the environment, which implies recognizing that there is a real external environment, which at least in some of its characteristics is independent, to which it is necessary to adapt. The form of this epistemology in *Munévar* is called "evolutionary relativism".

According to *Munévar* (2008) there is no reality but realities that instead of being an external ontological benchmark that imposes itself, become the interaction between a subject, its culture, or a species with its world. What is real is the interaction, not what is outside, so we should not speak of science, but of sciences. Relativism is plausible, without this being the end of science or of any human knowledge.

In this sense, from the point of view of evolutionary epistemology, science is merely human knowledge. That is, adapted to man's biological and cultural way of perceiving the world. Reality is not only the things that are outside, but also the interaction of man as a species and culture with the world. For Diéguez (2003) "The real will not be what is there but how we relate to what is there" (p.90).

In this regard, Pacho O'Donnell (1997) quoted by Monterroza (2011) points out that theories of knowledge should not separate epistemology from ontology, but should speak of onto-epistemology in which there is no separation between the things that are known - reality- and how they are known (subject-reality relationship).

Therefore, there is not only one way of thinking and according to *Munévar* (1981) "...our ways of thinking depend, to a great extent, on our particular and contingent biological

nature" (p.1). The postulate of Munevar's vision of evolutionary epistemology (ob cit) is that perception, intelligence, and scientific knowledge are the result of a special type of interaction between a biological organism and its environment. For this author, philosophy and science are complementary.

The evolutionary or radical epistemology proposed by this author differs from Palma (2005), also Latin American, for whom evolutionary epistemology is nothing more than a metaphor of the theory of biological evolution and hence is based on and depends on a certain isomorphism between this and the development of knowledge.

What lies ahead

Modern times bring upon us a complexity in which traditional epistemological approaches do not seem enough to understand, explain, and transform reality. It is in this scenario that alternatives such as the epistemology of complementarity or *transcomplexity*, which does not discard anything that remains, can offer other paths to produce knowledge.

Hence, in the opinion of this writer, a Latin American and Caribbean epistemological perspective necessarily implies the transdisciplinary, which refers to a vision that transcends disciplines. According to *Hirni* and *Wiesmann* (2003) it is based on the global engagement, in the sense of systemic cooperation, of the different disciplines and people involved. It also involves team research by professionals and local actors in everyday life, in a process of reflexive creativity.

According to Garcia (2006), "*Transdisciplinarity*" is also understood as a process of self-education and research geared to the real complexity of each context. It implies a process of intercultural dialogue, which requires the revaluation of people's knowledge and wisdom on the research topic, implying consensus and agreements.

The transdisciplinary approach seeks to break down disciplinary boundaries, to articulate science and knowledge to solve the problem of society in a more comprehensive and participatory manner. In this order of ideas, the epistemologies of transdisciplinarity and complexity are placed in this section.

The "epistemology of transdisciplinarity" can be assumed as a comprehensive approach according to Cuban thinkers such as Martínez, Ortiz and González (2007) who propose some principles for the development of work according to this approach. These are: willingness of researchers to cooperate, apart from a flexible and changing mentality; broad profile preserving its dialectic with specialization; collectivism, culture of dialogue based on constructivist criticism and willingness to consensus, among other ethical values.

Likewise, it is based on the creation of terminology and epistemological foundations that generate a community of language and common research objectives; the creation of a methodology that enables the interrelation of the various disciplines involved in scientific work and appropriate institutional frameworks to facilitate cooperative work.

In this regard, the Venezuelan Martínez (2009) points out that in this new paradigm all well-established knowledge, whether it comes from quantum physics, neuroscience, parapsychology, or any other cognitive source, must have a place, location, and systematization as partial truth.

For its part, the "epistemology of complexity" according to León & García (2016) is defined by breaking with the idea of separation of subject and object, since they are intertwined in the process of knowledge, it leads to the linking of scientific knowledge and the science of man, to lead from thinking of the simple to the complex, from unity in multiplicity, from the principle of simple explanation to that of complex explanation, which considers the contradictions

and oppositions, which does not dissociate or separate the physical, biological, cultural, historical, economic, and social components.

What is being proposed

The different positions of Latin American authors reviewed and the author's experience as one of the proponents of trans-complex thinking, have contributed to the formation of a complementary perspective for the study of Latin American and Caribbean reality, called "transcomplex epistemology".

In the trans, a new epistemological field is recognized, it is a "beyond" that generates another territory. The contents of those spaces that are traversed are affected. By saying trans, the perspective of the subject and its relationship with reality is changed, a field of existence of something complex is generated. It has to do with the possibility of penetrating the limits and transforming their contents, of overcoming the binaries, the opposites, the fixed, localized or created by the disciplines. In this process of overcoming the limits and their contents, the transdisciplinary, the transmodern and the transcomplex, among others, are created (University of Berlin).

The aim of transcomplex epistemology is to develop an epistemological framework that can be useful for the explanation, interpretation, and transformation of this diverse and complex region. It is intended to show how theory and practice in a recursive process delineate some basic principles to be considered. Likewise, the conception of a complex subject capable of being an observer and observing itself.

Hence, when characterizing transcomplex epistemology, its main configurative element is the principle of complementarity, a philosophical approach introduced by the physicist Bohr (1958) referring to Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, fundamental in quantum mechanics and according to which a full knowledge of reality cannot be attained.

Complementarity admits that unidimensionality is complemented by other dimensions, the objective by the subjective, regularity by chance, determinism by impossibility. Analysis is complemented by synthesis. Induction with deduction, adduction and analogy. Complementarity admits that the world of thought influences the real world, as the real world influences the world of thought.

According to Strobl (2007) the principle of complementarity reaches an increasingly transcendental significance for the sciences, in two ways: (a) objective, which crosses all sciences and confers to scientific reality its internal unity and (b) subjective, which creates a new style of thinking, very flexible, meditative and conciliatory, requiring dialogue and teamwork.

For Martinez (2005), the principle of complementarity implies integrating into a coherent whole the contributions of different people, philosophies, methods and disciplines. According to the author, the elements supporting the principle of complementarity are: (a) the complexity of the object, which must be approached with multiple methodical alternatives, and (b) the selectivity of perception, referring to the human possibility of conceptualizing a specific reality differently, according to a particular vision mediated by social representations and cultural values.

In this sense, it is important to consider with Leal (2005) that the construction of knowledge shifts from perspective to perspective and thus attempts to carry out a reorganization of knowledge, inseparable from a fundamental reflection. It considers any knowledge, whether epistemic or extra-epistemic, any presumption of knowledge, including error, illusion, ignorance.

It is based on a notion of reality that is diverse, indeterminate, complex, unpredictable, created and/or virtual. In other words, it is multidimensional, multilayered, relational, reticular, global, under construction (Villegas, 2009). It assumes the different levels of reality as a space of possible approximation. According to Fraca (2006), reality is found in the spirit and this in turn is found. Such is the characteristic of Latin America and the Caribbean.

In this sense, it is worth referring to the Dominican philosopher Merejo (2015), who asks if it is possible to philosophize about society, culture, ethics currently, forgetting the virtual of cyberspace complexity. In this regard, he states that if those who study reality do not analyze the interrelationship between the virtual and the real, part of the reflections of these times is not really understood. Hence, he assumes reality as what exists, what is given in the framework of potential experience or what is perceived by the subject independent of his consciousness, in terms of existing things, concrete and experienced with the appearance of virtual reality. This is because, since we do not know what exactly is real, imprecision is one of its essential characteristics.

Virtual reality resorts to three processes: immersion, interaction, imagination, in a territory that is cyberspace and a material platform such as the Internet. The virtual world introduces new types of spaces and new ways of living in those spaces into the life experience. It has also been changing lifestyles, because they are hyperconnected networks and have repercussions on neurons, forging cyberculture.

In this sense, the author points out that it is in the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary context that one can situate the process of construction that is lived in the digital world, which comprises the computational networks and their social relations (subject, discourse, culture, education, economy, and politics). Hence, the proposed transcomplex epistemology

must consider in a process of complementarity the cybercultural and techno-scientific complexity; as well as the myth, the intuitive, the imagination, the spirituality, to understand the process of construction and transformation that Latin America and the Caribbean are living.

In the transcomplex epistemological perspective, the subject-reality relationship, according to Rodriguez (2008) is recursive; hence it propitiates and engages the dialogue between subjective reflection and objective knowledge, trying not to sacrifice objectivity or reflection. Knowledge is the product of a coming-and-going, the diversity of reality, non-linearity, uncertainty, and the idea of complementarity appear. Knowledge is assumed as a construction in movement.

It assumes reflexivity, for which reality is only defined in its relation to the subject, who is part of the universe he knows and as such, is unfinished, determined, and indeterminate at the same time, signifies and is signified by others. This epistemology overcomes the subject-object disjunctions to the point that *Fraca* (ob cit) states that "both seem to be conceptualized as a fabric... In which one does not seem to see a clear existence of one without the other" (p.88). In this sense, some of its proponents use the term "ontoepistemic", as Munevar (ob cit) states.

Emphasis is placed on the relational moment, of interaction, of joint co-production of reality. The daily experiential intersubjectivity in the process of positioning that has been called dynamic objectivity or kaleidoscopic subjectivity with *Najmanovich*, but that can only be reached in an approximate way (Villegas, 2009, 2011, 2018). Thus, he considers the production of knowledge from the emotional-intuitive basis next to the rational logic; all at the same time in unity, and multiplicity.

It assumes that the researcher is an active subject that involves his complex intellectual processes committed to the development of knowledge about subjectivity. In this conception

the qualitative, quantitative, and dialectical complement each other, in search of a method of its own, which according to *Najmanovich* (2005) is to build different itineraries according to the problems that arise in each research.

Something to ponder

I want to start this space with a quote from Soto (2017) who says:

"No theories or methodologies of their own have been created. They continue to repeat and apply those.....from Europe and the United States and this constitutes a great paradox: we claim to be critical, but we repeat and reproduce epistemological approaches that emerged in the colonizing countries that, in part, served to legitimize their actions and not to understand the Latin American reality. Undoubtedly, the epistemology of the South and post-colonial approaches represents a great hope (p.37).

I hope that the article serves as a basis to show that much has been done. It remains to put it into action and to finish understanding that there is no reason to have a single way of thinking, on the contrary, we must be diverse as is the Latin American and Caribbean reality".

In this sense, the epistemological twist instigated by Walter Mignolo (2007) promotes a cross-border thinking with the aim of transcending modern epistemology and interpretation, the distinction between subject and object and creating a kind of dialogue between forms of knowledge to sever ties with the colonality of power -interrelation between modern forms of exploitation and domination-, of knowledge -role of epistemology and the generative tasks of knowledge production- and of being -lived experience of colonization and its impact on language- historically established. The epistemological decolonization to which the author alludes represents the basis for

intellectual emancipation.

From this point of view, the transcomplex epistemology is an alternative for overcoming the reductionist, simplifying and colonizing vision of knowledge. For this to be so, it will have to include the irrational and antirational, the disorder, the paradox, the virtual, as well as the search for the meaning of life from a viewpoint that complements reason, intuition and imagination, as well as the contributions of the ideas presented in the different epistemologies reviewed and others in a process of complementarity.

Achieving all this implies transcending to this epistemological posture, deeply self-reflective, which proposes the hybridity of critical conscience and ethical-aesthetic commitment, which implies the formation of transgressive subjectivities that go into action with a plurality of collective projects, with proposals of realistic, plural, and critical utopias.

The transcomplex epistemology, finally, invites to an understanding of the world in all its complexity, for which it poses some challenges: to articulate culture, philosophy, science, and nature; as well as to maximize the search for alternative concepts through transdisciplinary dialogues where, from the different visions of the members of the research team and through a process of inter-collaboration, possibilities are given for new productions of reality.

Referencias

- Adriaensen, B. (1999). *Poscolonialismo Postmoderno en América Latina: la posibilidad de una crítica radicalmente heterogénea*. Disponible en www.academia.edu. Bohr, N. (1958). *Física atómica y conocimiento humano*. Argentina: Aguilar.
- Beverly, J. (1994). *Writing in Reverse: On the Project of the Latin American Subaltern Studies group*. Disposition 46.
- Catelli, L. (2012). *Los estudios coloniales, el pensamiento decolonial: un diálogo pendiente*. V Congreso Internacional de Letras.
- Diéguez, A. (2003). ¿Qué es la Epistemología Evolucionista? *Ciencia en Prospectiva. Telescope* 1 (3).
- Diccionario de Filosofía Latinoamericana*. (2000). Disponible: http://www.cialc.unam.mx/pensamiento_y_cultura/BVL.htm.
- Dussel, E. (2009). *Política de la liberación arquitectónica*. Vol III. Madrid: Trotta.
- Fernández, C. (2012). *Pensar lo nuestro: Algunos aportes desde Rodolfo Kusch al pensamiento poscolonial. Términos claves de la teoría poscolonial latinoamericana: despliegues, matices, definiciones*. Rosario, Argentina: UNR Editora.
- Fraca, L. (2006). *La Ciberlingua: Una variedad compleja de Lengua en Internet*. Caracas, Venezuela: UPEL-IPC-IVILLAB.
- Fornel-Betancourt, R. (2001). *Transformación intercultural de la Filosofía. Ejercicios teóricos y prácticos de la filosofía intercultural desde Latinoamérica en el contexto de la globalización*. Bilbao: Descleé de Brouwer.
- García, M. (2006). *Un nuevo desafío en la investigación: Enfoque transdisciplinario en comunicación y desarrollo. Razón y palabra* 49. Disponible: www.razonypalabra.org.mx/antiores/n49/mgarcia.html.
- Gómez, M; Saldarriaga, D; López, M & Zapata, L (2017). Estudios coloniales y poscoloniales. Posturas acerca de la modernidad/colonialidad y el eurocentrismo. *Revista Ratio Juris* 12 (24), 27-60. Unaula.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2006). La descolonización de la economía política y los estudios poscoloniales. Transmodernidad, pensamiento fronterizo y colonialidad global. *Tabula Rasa* 4, 17-48. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Hall, S. (2008). *¿Cuándo fue lo postcolonial? VV.AA. Estudios poscoloniales. Ensayo fundamental*. Madrid: traficantes de sueños
- Héller, A. (1996). *Una revisión de la Teoría de las Necesidades*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Hulme, P. (1996). La teoría poscolonial y representación de la cultura en las Américas. *Casa de las Américas*, 202.
- Hurni, H & Niesmann, Y. (2003). *Investigación transdisciplinar en el contexto del desarrollo: ¿formula vacía o necesidad?* Suiza CDMS-IGUB.
- Kusch, E. (2000). *Geocultura del hombre americano. Tomo III*. Rosario, Argentina: Fundación Roos.
- Leal, J. (2005). *La autonomía del sujeto investigador y la metodología de la investigación*. Venezuela: ULA
- León, R y García, C. (2016). *Epistemología de la Complejidad*. Disponible: <http://riuda.jimdo.com>.
- Liévano, M; Ballesteros, B & Velásquez, B. (2015). *La construcción del conocimiento desde el enfoque intercultural. Diálogo Andino. Revista de Historia, Geografía y Cultura Andina* 47, 15-25. Arica, Chile: Universidad de Tarapacá. Disponible: <http://www.re-dalyc.org/articulo.oa...>
- Lima, B. (2009). *América Latina. Afirmando la necesidad de una base teórico-epistemológica autóctona*. Disponible: www.alterinfos.org...
- Martínez, M. (2005). *El paradigma emergente. Hacia una nueva teoría de la racionalidad científica*. México: Trillas.
- . (2009). Hacia una epistemología de la complejidad y transdisciplinariedad. *Revista Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana* 14 (46). Disp: produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/utopia/...
- Martínez, F; Ortiz, E & González, A. (2007). *Hacia una epistemología de la transdisciplinariedad. II Taller Transdisciplinario sobre el enfoque de la complejidad*. Camagüey, Ciba: ISCMFCJF.
- Merejo, A. (2010). *Filosofía Compleja y Ciberespacial. Filosofía Dominicana: pasado y presente. Tomo III*. República Dominicana: Archivo General de la Nación Vol XCV.
- . (2015). El Cibermando Global en la República Dominicana. *Eikasía. Revista de Filosofía*, 421-445.
- Mignolo, W (1995). Occidentalización, Imperialismo, Globalización: Herencias coloniales y teorías poscoloniales. *Revista iberoamericana* 170-171.
- . (2000). *Historia locales/Diseños globales: Colonialidad, conocimientos subalternos y pensamientos fronterizos*. Madrid: Akal.
- . (2007). *La Idea de América Latina. La Herida Decolonial y la Opción Decolonial*. Barcelona: Gedisa
- Monterroza Ríos, A. (2011). *Relativismo Evolutivo, Una Alternativa Epistemológica. Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad. Trilogía 7*. Colombia: Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano.
- Minevar, G. (1981). Naturalismo Prescriptivo: Epistemología. *Revista de Filosofía Universidad Complutense*. 31-42.

- . (2008). Enfoque biológico de la ciencia. *Eidos. Revista de Filosofía* 7, 110-127. Barranquilla, Colombia: Universidad del Valle.
- Najmanovich, D. (2005). *El Juego de los Vínculos. Subjetividad y redes: Figuras en mutación. Colección Sin Fronteras*. Argentina: Biblos
- Palma, H. (2005). El desarrollo de la ciencia a través de las metáforas: Un Programa de Investigación en Estudio sobre la Ciencia. *Revista Iberoamericana de Ciencia, Tecnología y Sociedad*. Versión on-line 2 (6). Buenos Aires.
- Rodríguez, M. (2008). *Dimensiones Cognitivas de las Competencias Investigativas*. Maracay (material mimeografiado).
- Said, E. (1978, 2013). *Orientalismo*. España: Penguin Random House.
- Soto, V. (2017). El concepto de matriz de pensamiento. Una propuesta epistemológica decolonial para el escenario actual latinoamericano. *Iconos Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 57. Disponible: <http://www.redalyc.org>
- Strobel, N. (2007). *El Principio de la Complementariedad y su significación científica-filosófica*. España: Universidad de Navarra.
- Villegas, C. (2009). *Una aproximación a la concepción de la investigación transcompleja*. Disponible: <http://crisalidavillegasblogspot.com>.
- . (2011). *Epistemología Latinoamericana*. Barinas: UPEL-RIEAC.
- Villegas, C & Schavino, N. (2018). *Teorías epistemológicas y educativas latinoamericanas revisitadas desde la transcomplejidad*. Alemania: EAE.
- Zemelman, H. (2010). *Aspectos básicos de la propuesta de la conciencia histórica (o del presente potencial)*. México: IPECAL



Crisálida Villegas González

Professor of Biology and Chemistry. Master in Andragogy. PhD in Educational Sciences. Postdoctorate in Educational Sciences and Latin American Education; Postdoctorate in Research and Transcomplex Research. Director of the Editorial Fund of the Universidad Bicentenario Aragua, Venezuela. President of REDIT. Associate President for Venezuela of CESPE. Author of several books, among them: "Transcomplex Perspectives on Technoscience, Society and Innovation" (2019); "Epistemological and Educational Theories Revisited from Transcomplexity" (2018) co-authored with N. Schavino. Co-authorship of collective books and journal articles. PPII accredited researcher, long tenure level.

Profesora de Biología y Química. Magister en Andragogía. Doctora en Ciencias de la Educación. Postdoctora en Ciencias de la Educación y Educación Latinoamericana; Postdoctora en Investigación e Investigación Transcompleja. Directora del Fondo Editorial de la Universidad Bicentenario Aragua, Venezuela. Presidenta de la REDIT. Presidente Adjunta para Venezuela de CESPE. Autora de varios libros, entre estos: Perspectivas Transcompleja de la Tecnociencia, Sociedad e Innovación (2019); Teorías Epistemológicas y Educativas Revisitadas desde la Transcomplejidad (2018) en coautoría con N. Schavino. Coautoría de libros colectivos y artículos en revistas. Investigadora acreditada PPII, nivel larga trayectoria.