

DAS ONLINE-SUPPLEMENT DES FORSCHUNGSJOURNALS

FORSCHUNGSJOURNAL SOZIALE BEWEGUNGEN 36. Jg. Heft 2 | 2023

Angela María Sánchez Alfonso*

Development, suitability, debt: Living through the violence of agricultural land-use zoning in Colombia

Zusammenfassung: 2018 protestierten Kleinbauern der Region Ariari in Kolumbien gegen „Colombia Siembra“, eine von der kolumbianischen Regierung zwischen 2015 und 2018 umgesetzte Agrarentwicklungspolitik zur Steigerung der landwirtschaftlichen Produktivität. Im Rahmen dieser Politik wurden bürokratische Zonierungen auf der Grundlage der produktiven Eignung des Landes als Voraussetzung für den Zugang der Landwirte zu öffentlich finanzierter Unterstützung für Kredite verwendet. In diesem Beitrag werden Landnutzungsplanung, Verschuldung und landwirtschaftliche Entwicklung aus einer kritischen Perspektive politischer Interventionen untersucht. Auf der Grundlage einer situierten Analyse der Region Ariari in Kolumbien und der Erfahrungen der dort lebenden Klein- und Mittelbauern wird die Konstruktion der Landnutzung als gewaltsamer Prozess mit erheblichen Folgen für das Leben, das Land und die sozioökologischen Zusammenhänge herausgestellt.

Abstract: In 2018, peasant farmers of the Ariari region of Colombia protested against “Colombia Siembra,” an agricultural development policy implemented by the Colombian government between 2015 and 2018 to increase the country’s agricultural productivity. Within the framework of this policy, bureaucratic zonings based on the land’s productive suitability were used as conditions for farmers to access publicly

*Angela María Sánchez Alfonso, Center for interdisciplinary Peace and Conflict Studies (INTERACT), Freie Universität Berlin. Contact: a.sanchez.alfonso@fu-berlin.de

funded support for loans. This process had adverse repercussions on the living spaces of agricultural producers, as it perpetuated and sophisticated state policies that have resulted in their eternal indebtedness. This paper examines land-use planning, indebtedness, and agricultural development from a critical perspective of policy interventions affecting landscapes. Based on a situated analysis of the Ariari region in Colombia and the experience of the small- and medium-scale farmers who live there, this paper highlights the construction of land use as a violent process with major consequences on life, land, and socioecological relationalities.

1. Introduction

In 2015, the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture (MADR) launched Colombia Siembra, a 3-year policy aimed at promoting agricultural exports and guaranteeing the country's food security with an investment of 1.6 trillion pesos (ca. 210 million USD) (2016a; MADR 2015). Colombia Siembra appeared in the daily life of rural producers through credit subsidies, which were focused on crops the MADR decided were promising. Access was determined by land suitability zonings commissioned by the Unidad de Planificación Rural Agropecuaria (UPRA), a technocratic planning institution. The UPRA detailed zones for each of the prioritized crops and produced national suitability maps, which were translated into municipality "yes"/"no" charts that determined access to the subsidies.

In April 2018, 1.500 farmers from the Ariari region in eastern Colombia marched 147km, from Granada to Villavicencio, to protest "Colombia Quiebra"¹, as they renamed the policy. In the region, the program dispensed 2.114 million pesos (428.748 USD) in loan subsidies to small- and medium-scale credit solicitors to grow passion fruit, rice, and avocado, and to acquire farm machinery (FINAGRO 2020). The protesters alleged the government had induced them to increase their growing through credits with private banks, promising there was a plan to recover national agriculture and that farmers would get subsidies; in reality, there were no considerations for the demand for such production (Dignidad Agropecuaria Colombiana 2018). Because of the lack of commercialization or the irrisory prices offered, the farmers alleged they were left with no option but to "tractor, destroy and throw away the harvests" (Tribunal Administrativo del Meta 2019). They could not pay back their credits and foresaw the imminent threat of losing their land, which they had to use as collateral.

¹ While the name of the program calls Colombia to sow, the protesters replaced this with a reference to bankruptcy.

The farmers protested again four months later, calling on the government to provide the financial relief it had promised. Later, in 2019, they filed a judicial process to compel the national authorities to fulfill their commitments (see Tribunal Administrativo del Meta 2019). To date, state provisions of relief have been scarce. Because of defaulting, many farmers are facing judicial processes, and some have lost land.

As a form of social protest, the farmers called the project “Colombia Quiebra” to express the acute indebtedness in which small- and medium-scale farmers have come to live because of state-supported agricultural development interventions that promote normative ideals of productivity in agriculture. Colombia Siembra was one of those interventions: it influenced farmers’ priorities and practices and reduced subsistence needs for small- and medium-scale agriculture. Administered through a technocratic bureaucracy, the program prescribed specific land-use suitability and led producers to resort to credits and promises of further state financial aid.

This article offers a study of Colombia Siembra, sheds light on the normative constructions of land use with which technocratic agricultural development policies operate, and emphasizes how such policies result in a violent process. In this case, the conceptions of *suitable* land use promoted large-scale, capital, chemically intensive agricultural production. Based on assumptions of development and an ideal of productivity, land-use zoning results in violence in rural environments by creating ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ understandings of suitability, which are later tied to conditional access to credit. This process takes place at the interaction of law and society: it is enabled, encouraged, and extended by regulatory arrangements committed to a neoliberal order.

I argue that concentrating on geographical dimensions of development policies—such as the one that Colombia Siembra created—enriches the understanding of the role of law, specifically through land-use zoning and indebtedness, violence in socioeconomic and societal structures. I draw on an analysis of policy and legal documents and three months of field research in the Ariari region of Colombia, where, in 2021, I conducted semi-structured interviews with small- and medium-scale farmers².

This article is divided into four parts. First, I delve into the motivations and goals in the creation of Colombia Siembra’s and the role of zoning. Second, I articulate the link between zoning and indebtedness and detail the effects of the perpetuation of debt on farmers. Third, I elaborate on the spatial effects of land suitability as defined, (re)produced, and modified through the power of the regulatory state, its laws,

² I’m grateful to AGAMETA & Comité para la Defensa del Territorio, el Agua y la Vida del Ariari for me making it possible for me to reach farmers.

and its developmental agenda. Fourth, I articulate the material effects of indebtedness and zoning as violence in the Ariari region of Colombia.

2. The know-it-all bureaucracy: “Leave it to us. We will tell you what’s best”

Agriculture in Colombia has been characterized by the parallel existence of two modes of production: (a) small- and medium-scale agriculture and (b) large-scale agriculture (Machado C. 1999; Fajardo M. 2014). Small- and medium-scale agriculture has been historically associated with peasant agriculture because it is performed by a family or community that derives its main source of income from agriculture. Farmers in the Ariari described an activity grounded on the use of creole seeds and materials, the transitory rhythms of the harvesting, the resonance with water flow, and the oral transmission of intergenerational knowledge and practices. Because of the land-tenure structure, the socioeconomic systems, and capital concentration, small- and medium-scale farmers do not usually have high levels of access to new technologies and techniques. Large-scale agriculture, on the other hand, is associated with elite landowners, intensive monocultures, technology, and exports.

Colombia Siembra’s primary objective was to promote “the sow of one million new hectares of crops that lead to an inclusive, sustainable and competitive development of the Colombian countryside” (MADR 2016b). It was based on the premise that national agriculture was failing to take advantage of promising opportunities for international trade and the globalization of food supplies. The problem addressed was the low productivity levels of small- and medium-scale agriculture, low planning and technical capacities, and the poor infrastructure of the country.

The orderly increase of production would be achieved through the leverage of capital investment by the means of credit subsidies, offering a solution for low levels of productivity and missing growth opportunities. The incentivized crops would be those the Ministry judged to have the largest potential for market demand: corn, soybeans, forestry, silvopasture, rice, barley, oil palm, cocoa, and fruit³. The development potential for each was quantified into hectares, which gave a quantitative goal to the policy, though among the policy documents and regulations, there is no evidence for such diagnosis, the attributed causes, and the feasibility of the solutions proposed.

Colombia Siembra was grounded in a wide institutional arrangement that coordinated the bureaucratic agricultural expertise (financial, geographic, technic, scientific, political) towards achieving

³ Meaning avocado, mango, pineapple, passionfruit.

the goals. A constellation of reglementary acts and policy documents were released to manage technicalities and mechanisms, such as the flow of the money between the ministry's budget and public creditors, requirements for accessing the benefits, and conditions in which subsidies would be granted. Under the centralized direction of the MADR, twelve agencies and two interinstitutional bodies were directly involved in Colombia Siembra.

The UPRA was commissioned to zone the country's territory, according to its suitability. Its role was to "read" the land and reveal "correct" uses for agricultural production. For this, the UPRA prepared a novel methodology and created 17 land suitability zoning maps for the selected crops focused (and some more⁴). The maps were to be employed as "recommendation[s] to advance in addressing the productive planning needs" of the country (MADR 2016b).

Unlike existing methodologies, which followed the FAO's guidelines, the UPRA's zoning methodology included social, economic, and environmental factors that related to agricultural suitability (2016, 2018a, 2018b, 2019). The criteria for suitable geographical areas were based on the *aggregation* and *interpretation* of lands' physical, biological, human, and institutional characteristics that added or subtracted value. A range of criteria defined by the UPRA was grouped into three main components—physical, socioeconomic, and socioecosystemic—and were assigned weighted scores by "decision-makers" in private meetings with large associations, historically controlled by elite large-scale producers. The rest of the work relied mostly on secondary sources, and fieldwork is barely mentioned in the methodological records.

According to the UPRA, the socioeconomic component was the core of its novel proposal. Among this component, suitability was equated to competitiveness because of its paramount importance for the growth and development of agriculture. *Competitiveness*—understood as the capacity for producing goods of the highest quality and lowest price—was the condition for "viability of products in the market" and guaranteed "sustainable opportunities for all rural inhabitants." (UPRA 2016, 2018a, 2018b, 2019). Thus, competitiveness was the unit of measure for suitability. Every municipality was assigned a Competitiveness Index that condensed its economic indicators, the price and size of its plots, the availability of infrastructure and logistics, the labor market, security conditions, the institutional presence of the state, and living conditions.

Following the methodology, land was classified into five categories of suitability: high, medium, low, very low, and unsuitable; plus, some areas were restricted from classification and placed under

⁴ Later on, the UPRA published nine more zonings.

technical or legal exclusion or conditioning. The outcomes were spatialized in cartographies of land agricultural suitability per prioritized crop and later simplified in yes/no charts per municipality and crop.

The characterization of land in the zonings demonstrates the value of large-scale agricultural activity, dependent on big capital swings, highly integrated into market dynamics, and surrounded by an attractive environment for external investment, in large and cheap plots, as the ideal for production. Meanwhile, small- and medium-scale agriculture were not valued or even included in factors of competitiveness or production. Existing agricultural efforts in a given area were not considered, and the participation of local farmers in the methodology was almost nil. Local populations constituted a criterion of suitability because of their value as an available workforce that lives well enough as to effectively “integrate into a productive process”.

Ultimately, zoning was a planning tool of land management focused on imagining landscapes of productivity for agriculture, given the unproductive situation that the Ministry diagnosed. Rather than planning for the lived countryside, the policy was a tool to communicate to capital agents where to put their money and how to take action. Normative narratives of promising futures were used to construct an exclusionary suitability of land use that departed from and arrived at the correctness and desirability of attractive large-scale industrial and intensive agriculture.

3. Creating landscapes of productivity: A suitable use of land and the perpetuation of indebtedness

Colombia Siembra offered two financial credit subsidies—a special line of credit (LEC) and an incentive for rural capitalization (ICR—for which farmers could apply. According to the policy design, a solicitor had to propose a suitable zone to access the credit subsidies for the program (MADR 2016b). The UPRA’s yes/no charts indicated the qualification for a loan to an officer: financing could be granted *if* the application matched a “yes” municipality for the given crop (FINAGRO 2016, 2017; 2018).

The zoning–credit bonding was new to the country’s agricultural policies. Before Colombia Siembra, only a general list of eligible crops was provided to the officers for dispensing subsidies, but no indication was provided about the localization of those crops. Although this was not the first land-use zoning in Colombia⁵, this program was the first to target *all* types of land for *all* uses. The policy was oriented towards the chosen areas, and crop development was to be promoted accordingly, guaranteeing

⁵ Some efforts were made in the early decade of the 90s and again in 2000 and 2001.

efficiency and productivity in land use, which would ultimately enhance the country's competitiveness and produce development.

Colombia Siembra was part of a protracted amalgam of credit-based agricultural development programs that have been successively implemented by the state, before and after Colombia Siembra, tracing back to at least 2007. A policy guideline that has resulted in an increasing dependence of small- and medium-scale producers on credit to cover their production costs and in the parallel concentration of state financing on big producers who receive the major allocation (CNCA 2021).

Like other development programs, Colombia Siembra's idea was that social and technological parameters of small-scale agriculture must be modernized, so that they can efficiently contribute to local, national, and global markets (Mcmichael 2013; Taylor 2013; Li 2010). Specialized production is meant to increase productivity and profit by using advanced farming technologies and techniques, which can be financed via credit (Ruiz L. 2018). The approval of Colombia Siembra doubled the state's agricultural credit budget (CNCA 2021) but paired it with the spatialization of suitability and agricultural expertise: it offered a credit-based solution to unproductivity enhanced with zoning-based agriculture.

However, although indebtedness facilitates farmers' liquidity to meet the costs of agricultural activity, it constitutes a binary power relationship between producers and banks or agro-input dealers, with small- and medium-scale farmers having little power. Situations where farmers resort to debt to sow and submit to unilaterally imposed terms shape the behavior of farmers and determine the possibilities for their survival. It is a political relationship that forges a bond based on capital with strong disciplinary effects.

Small and medium farmers in the Ariari perceive almost complete dependence on indebtedness to meet the costs of their activities. As the farmers explained, to obtain the resources they lack, they navigate debt: they cover labor and land rental with bank credit, while they turn to agro-inputs dealers' loans to acquire fertilizers, seeds, and chemical inputs and to access mill and storage centers to store harvests not sold immediately; target micro-credit or informal lenders when in a rush of immediate resources; and cover fuel and some labor costs with their own resources.

To repay their loans, farmers must achieve production levels, maximize profit, cut costs, and ensure the flow of capital that allows them to meet payment installments. Predefined credit terms encourage conversions to permanent crops, adoptions of monoculture, and dependence on chemicals and technology Li (Li 2007; Mcmichael 2013; Ruiz L. 2018). As a result, in the face of noncompliance, farmers adopt farming practices and behaviors that require dependence to meet market expectations and yield rates.

Indebtedness disciplinary mandates are very much real to farmers: it is felt, lived, and navigated. The farmers in Ariari perceive indebtedness as a relationship of intimidation and a protracted experience of distress. They highlighted how differentiation, based on their ability to pay, is palpable and how they then overexploit and saturate the land with chemicals. The repayment terms frequently oblige them to have permanent liquidity, even though that may vary with harvest cycles. They recounted the constant pressure from collectors, who call them at all times of day, about the risk of not selling their crops or not covering the production costs with their sales and threaten them with the loss of their farms and homes. They even recalled suicides of fellow farmers.

Credit-based development solutions, such as the ones on which Colombia Siembra relied, situate farmers as subjects of indebtedness for productivity and economic growth. The state finds this situation conducive to development, achieved by constraining farmers and requiring them to meet productivity requirements and adopt market attitudes. The UPRA's methodology reflects bureaucratic constructions with small and medium farmers as the antithesis of productivity, these farmers are then left with few options: they must change their modes of production or perish. As a result, productivity connects to the means of credit, continuing a cycle of perennial indebtedness for farmers. Landscapes⁶ are produced, configured, and managed by indebtedness and the standards of productivity it entails: what, who, and how to use land is spatialized according to a normative construction of suitability in the use of land.

4. State arrangements for development: Policy for spatial order amid productivity

Colombia Siembra increased indebtedness among farmers and constituted the scales, temporalities, and rhythms of indebtedness as factors of land-use configurations. It sophisticated the operation of what had been indistinct indebtedness mandates by demarcating "insiders" and "outsiders" of suitability and generating normative constructions of land and its use. Agriculture's lived landscape was rendered malleable by bureaucratic experts' conceptions of space (Lefebvre 1991). Similar to what legal geography scholars have argued, law—the language of the state—has the capacity to carrying on spatial-ordering projects that produce realities of exclusion by constructing and manipulating landscapes, which then produce and reconfigure the lived realities of human and nonhuman beings.

⁶ My understanding of landscape derives mainly from Ingold (2000). The concept here refers to the interrelationship, coproduction, and reproduction of agricultural practices, materials and signifiers in an embedded network of ecologies.

As a result of the bonding zoning and credit, Colombia Siembra's spatial intervention was reflected in the increase of sown hectares and overproduction tons, more importantly, in the changes in materials, manners, attitudes, and practices that affect how land and agriculture are experienced through debt and default. A framework of compartmentalized provisions and standards made it possible for the state to set the conditions for industrial agriculture. They engineered a normative spatialization of the land, its uses, and the possibilities of inhabiting it. Through small rules, the institutionality was arranged and articulated towards promoting development and enforcing suitability.

Dividing land into clearly individualized areas and assigning them a fixed decision about promising crops, the zoning required imagining landscapes of productivity, modifying the realities of farmers. As with other deployments of technocratic activity, the transformative power of zoning lies in its potential to localize and control social practices in the name of expertise and objectivity (Valverde 2009). The zonings were enforced through administrative regulations and financial constraints; they were an exercise of power that administered human behaviors, phenomena, and relations through delimitations and control over the space (Blomley 2011; Olarte O. forthcoming).

As a state endeavor, Colombia Siembra rendered the country legible and malleable in connecting credit access and zoning (Scott 1998; Jay 2011), triggering a two-folded intervention: first, on the modes of agriculture and second, on the land-tenure structure. Medium and small farmers have been driven into a game of productivity that already excludes them and have been urged to assume practices that will not allow them to thrive: they either persist in trying to overcome their "backwardness" through credit or vacate their land in favor of those who can farm it in a more "suitable" manner (be it the banks, the best bidder, or the capital holders). As a result, agriculture becomes an intensive activity, and land ownership and land-use concentration are boosted. Regarding the latter, in the experience of Ariari farmers, those who come to buy their lands or bid for them are big-scale producers and corporations that install large agribusiness such as monocultures of palm or rice, and/or extensive breeding.

5. "Now we are afraid of sowing". The violence of zoning and perpetual indebtedness

Colombia Siembra's spatial interventions contributed to an ongoing process of "delayed destruction dispersed across time and space" (Nixon 2013) of rural communities and of the dispossession of the lands they inhabit. In the name of suitability, the policy sophisticated indebtedness mandates, localizing and precisely delimiting areas of enhanced spatialized productivity that could be unfolded on imagined landscapes, later enforced by the means of narrow access to credit. This practice triggered a violent

intervention that has reinforced geometries of power in favor of intensive and industrialized agriculture, codified in the binary of suitability and unsuitability.

In working to modernize the countryside, achieve a globalized economy of promising export crops (and other raw materials), and guarantee food security, economic and social policies in Colombia—as well as across the Global South—have moved towards an industrial mode of agricultural production and the proletarianization of rural populations (Fajardo M. 2018). Together with a wide range of means, institutional violence (re)produces rural bodies, lands, and relationships as less valuable and as incapable of keeping up the pace of progress. Rural vocations are disappearing through a cycle of indebtedness and default, impeding people from living their lives in dignity, making their life decisions, and meeting their basic needs.

In contrast to physical violence, institutional violence of this sort is long-term and has destructive socioecological consequences over life, land, and relationalities. There is not an individualizable perpetrator; instead, it is embedded in socioeconomic structures, which are dominated by profitability, a discourse of development, and the assumptions that everyone should be productive and that land should be exploited for human benefit. Such violence is exerted over agricultural modes of production, particularly the small- and medium-scale production, historically associated with peasant agriculture, a kind of agriculture rooted in the use of creole seeds and materials, the transitory rhythms of the harvestings, and orally transmitted intergenerational knowledge.

The violence becomes visible in the use of land, practices of production, and palpable changes in the landscapes that turn alternation and patches of plants into organized rows of organized rows. As represented Nixon's concept of slow violence enunciates, small- and middle-scale farmers and their ways of living and being in the world are the casualties of such slow violence (2013). Colombia Siembra prescribed suitable areas, productive subjects, and ways of living and being through a rationality that constructed suitable and unsuitable uses of land and tied them to ideals of productivity.

As small- and medium-scale farmers lose access to land and resources, they lose autonomy in practicing agriculture, and for many, they have stopped farming. Because of rising production costs and low commercialization prices, default is increasingly frequent, so lands have been taken away by the banks and highest bidders. Farmers increasingly plant in rented lands, either because they have lost most of theirs or because they do not want to risk (more) loss. When they decide to stop farming, some lease their remaining land to pay their credits, while they seek other pursuits, among which are working for large-scale agricultural organizations, or for the mining and oil companies, which have a strong presence in the

region. Farming, they note, is being left in the hands of those who can meet the needs of banks and agribusinesses.

6. Conclusion

This is a story of exclusion and detachment. The state's regulatory arrangements include a violent spatial ordering that has led to the destruction of small- and medium-scale farmers through claims of unsuitability and lack of productivity. Such violence is exerted over time, and its effects are perceived gradually, as farmers fall into successive defaults, lose their land, and become dependent on indebtedness to subsist. Colombia Siembra added to ongoing poor conditions for thriving rural communities.

Colombia Siembra's agricultural bureaucracy codified, excluded, enabled, and specified the location of agricultural activity by promoting credit and linking it to land-use suitability zoning. A "correct" use of land was methodologically constructed through apparently objective characteristics of productivity and land, grounded upon value assessments of projects of society. Certain forms of life are excluded precisely because they are undesirable for progress; they must keep the pace of development or move elsewhere.

Definitions of productivity determine how, what, and when to cultivate and are decided in spheres of expertise and under the imperative need for economic growth. The mobilization of a project to define what land is meant to be requires imagining a competitive subject and disciplining people and lands. Small- and medium-sized agriculture is not suitable because its ways of using the land are the opposite of large-scale intensive monocultures of cash crops. The configuration of an agricultural space tied in such a way expels, marginalizes, and marks undesirable uses that do not match exactly, but "use" is never only *use*; it is a matter of life itself.

As in the Ariari, exclusionary definitions of suitability of land and its consolidation through indebtedness can strip small and medium farmers of their autonomy; their agriculture can be deterritorialized, removed, and stigmatized. Furthermore, indebtedness conditioned (and enhanced) by suitability leads to a world where conditions for sustaining some ways of living and being in the world become increasingly and slowly degraded. As a result, indebtedness and default deepen rural people's vulnerability to an already acute socioeconomic inequality; its flows, times, rhythms, and sensations lead to removal and inflict agony.

The importance of paying attention to the spatial dimensions of development policies such as Colombia Siembra lies in the understanding of how life is ordered, created, and destroyed according to promises and ideals. Zoning, particularly, takes advantage of land's *passive* characteristics to project social

and economic orders of society packed with value scales. As happened with Colombia Siembra, such capacity is problematic as far as it has the potential to displace the threats to productivity and the obstacles to suitability, detaching land from social and political processes and sedimenting exclusions.

Literature

- Blomley, Nicholas* 2011: Cuts, Flows, and the Geographies of Property. In: *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 7(2), 203–216.
- CNCA* 2021: Propuesta de Resolución por la cual se reglamenta el control de los gastos o inversiones del destino del crédito agropecuario y rural. Bogotá. https://www.finagro.com.co/sites/default/files/j_t_control_de_inversiones_v_1_9_21_2_.pdf
- Dignidad Agropecuaria Colombiana* 2018: El Ariari Agropecuario, ¡Protesta!, April 7, 2018. Granada. <https://dignidadagropecuaria.org/el-ariari-agropecuario-protesta/>
- Fajardo M., Darío* 2014: Las guerras de la agricultura colombiana, 1980-2010. Bogotá: ILSA, Instituto latinoamericano para una sociedad y un derecho alternativos.
- Fajardo M., Darío* 2018: Agricultura, campesinos y alimentos (1980-2010). (Universidad Externado de Colombia: Ph.D. dissertation). Bogotá.
- FINAGRO* 2016: Circular Reglamentaria P-11 de 2016. Instructivo Técnico Incentivo al Seguro Agropecuario. Bogotá. https://www.finagro.com.co/sites/default/files/circular_p-11_de_2016.pdf [February 6, 2023].
- FINAGRO* 2017: Manual de servicios v. 17.10. Bogotá. <https://www.finagro.com.co/sites/default/files/documents/2017-07/Manual%20de%20Servicios%20v17.10.pdf> [February 6, 2023].
- FINAGRO* 2018: Manual de servicios v. 18.10. Bogotá. <https://www.finagro.com.co/sites/default/files/documents/2018-03/Manual%20de%20Servicios%20v18.10.pdf> [February 6, 2023].
- FINAGRO* 2020: Colocación Nacional Colombia Siembra (Information collected through right of petition). Bogotá.
- Ingold, Tim* 2000: *The Perception of the Environment. Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jay, Martin* 2011: Scopic Regimes of Modernity Revisited. In: Heywood, Ian/ Sandywell, Barry (Hg.): *The Handbook of Visual Culture*. New York, London, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 102-112.
- Lefebvre, Henri* 1991: *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Li, Tania M.* 2007: *The Will to Improve. Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Li, Tania M.* 2010: To Make Live or Let Die? Rural Dispossession and the Protection of Surplus Populations. In: *Antipode*, 41, 66-93.
- Machado C., Absalón* 1999: La cuestión agraria y el desarrollo agropecuario. In: *Cuadernos de Economía*, 18(31), 237-279.
- MADR* 2015: "Uno de los pilares del plan "Colombia Siembra" es sembrar lo que toca donde toca: MinAgricultura". www.minagricultura.gov.co/noticias/Paginas/Uno-de-los-pilares-del-plan-Colombia-Siembr-es-sembrar-lo-que-toca,-donde-toca-MinAgricultura.aspx [February 6, 2023].

- MADR* 2016a: Colombia Siembra. www.minagricultura.gov.co/Colombia-Siembra/Paginas/default.aspx [February 6, 2023].
- MADR* 2016b: Estrategia Colombia Siembra. Documento Estratégico. Bogotá. https://www.minagricultura.gov.co/Documents/Estrategia_Colombia_Siembra.pdf [February 6, 2023].
- McMichael, Philip* 2013: Value-chain Agriculture and Debt Relations: contradictory outcomes. In: *Third World Quarterly*, 34(4), 671–690.
- Nixon, Rob* 2013: *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Cambridge (Mass.), London: Harvard University Press.
- Olarte O., Carolina* forthc.: Never mind extraction, ownership belongs to 'us': A spatial critique to subsoil public property in Colombia". In: *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*.
- Ruiz L., Miguel A.* 2018: Agroecology: one of the "tools" for degrowth. In: *Scientia Et Technica*, 23(4), 599–605.
- Scott, James C.* 1998: *Seeing like a state. How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tribunal Administrativo del Meta* June 28 2019. Exp.: 50001233300020190020400 [MP Carlos Enrique Ardila Obando].
- Taylor, Marcus* 2013: Liquid Debts: credit, groundwater and the social ecology of agrarian distress in Andhra Pradesh, India. In: *Third World Quarterly*, 34(4), 691-709.
- UPRA* 2016: Zonificación de aptitud para el cultivo comercial de palma de aceite en Colombia, a escala 1:100.000. Bogotá: UPRA.
- UPRA* 2018a: Cultivo comercial de cacao: Identificación de zonas aptas en Colombia, a escala 1:100.000. Bogotá: UPRA.
- UPRA* 2018b: Cultivo comercial de maíz tecnificado de clima cálido: identificación de zonas aptas en Colombia, a escala 1:100.000. Bogotá: UPRA.
- UPRA* 2019: Cultivo comercial de arroz secano mecanizado. Identificación de zonas aptas en Colombia, escala 1:100.000. Bogotá: UPRA.
- Valverde, Mariana* 2009: Jurisdiction and Scale: Legal 'Technicalities' as Resources for Theory. In: *Social & Legal Studies*, 18(2), 139-157.