

Territory and territoriality: Theories in confluence and refutation

Territorio y territorialidad: Teorías en confluencia y refutación

Luis A. Herrera Montero

Universidad de Cuenca-Ecuador

luis.herrera@ucuenca.edu.ec

Orcid code: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1699-9045>

Lucía Herrera Montero

Independent researcher

luciaherreram@gmail.com

Orcid code: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6346-0889>

Abstract

In Ecuador, themes regarding territory and territoriality are nowadays key theoretical and socio-political issues. Nonetheless, whilst they are already considered a priority in a number of institutional management and administration projects, their philosophical and socio-anthropological significance has not been sufficiently pondered. Government entities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been working on territorial planning for more than two decades; conversely, the theoretical production on the topics, with adequate scientific usefulness and practicality, is barely in its early stages of development. In such a context, the aim of this paper is to explore a number of epistemological approaches on the issues of territory and territoriality, employing hermeneutical, relational thinking and reflexivity methodologies. The overall picture and the outcomes of the study reveal both confluences and discrepancies between theories which have major epistemological relevance in social matters: marxism, poststructuralism, interculturality. As a general conclusion, it could be contended that while territory is mainly structural, territoriality refers to processes of societal transformation, metamorphosis and socio-natural tuning.

Keyword

Territory, territoriality, interculturality, practices, community and transformation.

Suggested citation: Herrera Montero, L.A., y Herrera Montero, L. (2020). Territory and territoriality: Theories in confluence and refutation. *Universitas*, 32, pp. 95-112.

Resumen

En Ecuador, las temáticas relativas a territorio y territorialidad constituyen, en los actuales momentos, importantes ejes de interés teórico y sociopolítico. No obstante, y a pesar de ser un asunto prioritario en la gestión y administración de proyectos de índole institucional, su relevancia en los ámbitos filosóficos y socio-antropológicos no ha sido suficientemente considerada. Diversas instancias de gobierno y organismos no gubernamentales (ONG) llevan más de dos décadas trabajando en torno al ordenamiento territorial. En cambio, la reflexión teórica, de utilidad científica, es incipiente y está apenas en sus primeras fases de desarrollo. En tal contexto, el objetivo del presente artículo es explorar contribuciones teóricas y enfoques epistémicos, utilizando para ello metodologías hermenéuticas, de pensamiento relacional y de reflexividad. Los contenidos expuestos como resultados dan cuenta de confluencias y discrepancias entre teorías que tienen mayor relevancia epistemológica en materia social: el marxismo, el posestructuralismo y la interculturalidad. En calidad de conclusión se puede sostener que mientras el territorio es principalmente estructural, la territorialidad refiere a procesos de transformación societal, de metamorfosis y sintonía socio-natural.

Palabras clave

Territorio, territorialidad, interculturalidad, prácticas, comunidad y transformación.

Introduction

Frequently, and this is the case in Ecuador, the approaches in relation to the territorial issue have been linked to the political management of territories. Hence, the analysis has focused primarily on practical, rather than theoretical, needs and their specificity has fundamentally been of technical nature. However, it should be noted that, as a result of this tendency towards practice, we have in Ecuador an important political-legal path that responds to processes of resistance to global capitalism, processes generated by social movements, mainly indigenous. It has thus been possible to institute various regulations, both at the constitutional level and specific laws.¹ However, in

1 In the 2008 Constitution there is a chapter focused on the Territorial Organization that establishes an arrangement by regions, provinces, cantons and rural parishes, and contemplates that, for environmental, ethnic-cultural and population reasons, special regimes may be constituted. The spirit

theoretical matters, the task is still pending; even, in terms of laws, despite the conquests, capitalism has ended up imposing itself in the institutional exercise, often reducing the proposals of social movements, based on plurinationality, interculturality, and good living, to suggestive paradigmatic rhetoric and utopias.

There is no denying that there are valuable contributions such as those of the Critical Geography Collective (2018)² and the contributions contained in the *other Territorialities compilation. Alternative visions of land and territory from Ecuador*, edited by Waldmüller and Altmann (2018). However, these reflections do not always warn that, given the overwhelming presence of capitalist globalization and control of life and intimacy (Deleuze, 1991), the political struggle of social movements must unfold beyond strictly local spheres. Regional, national and local processes cannot be understood as disjointed with globalization (Harvey, 2007), since the global presence of capitalism, mainly financial-extractivist, has planetary power. In this regard, Saskia Sassen (2007) shows that extractivism does not only imply the dispossession of natural resources but is also exercised on the diversity of human beings through intensive urbanization processes, the massification of technological capital and monopolistic financial accumulation.

The problem, in the specific case of Ecuador, lies in how to consolidate counter-hegemonic processes and promote theoretical perspectives for the strengthening of political reflection under the principles of plurinationality, good living, decentralization and democratic participation in the social management of the territory. The indigenous movements in the 90s of the 20th century, after a process that began in the 70s, had the opportunity to develop innovative institutional arrangements through electoral triumphs and reelections; however, their sustainability strategies were weak. The management capacity of the institutional structures was diluted in a series of functional logics to the capitalist system, and the incidence in the new generations en-

of institutional functioning is inspired by the strengthening of administrative decentralization processes; those that are called local governments in Ecuador, under the constitutional parameters, Decentralized Autonomous Governments are instituted. This constitutional framework subsequently generated the specific legal frameworks: the Organic Code of Territorial Organization, the Organic Land Use and Land Management Law and the Organic Law of Ancestral Lands and Territories.

2 A group that has worked on alternative geographies for the counter-hegemonic struggle regarding racism, colonialism and patriarchal feminicide.

ded up being a challenge with setbacks due to the undeniable hegemonic exercise of global capitalism.

In this context, it is not our intention to propose a manifesto for the application of strategies. Our goal is to undertake a theoretical approach that reinforces the complex nature of the territorial issue. To do this, we began our reflection by retaking the contributions of Martínez (2012), who addresses the structured-structuring condition of the territory based on the concepts of *habitus* and *field* proposed by Bourdieu. The reflection on social transformation leads us, on the other hand, to recognize the importance of post-structural epistemic contributions and, in particular, of the concept of the *rhizome* of Deleuze and Guatarri (2007), a concept that characterizes tissues, where the structural destructures itself in exit points, also causing complex processes of territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. In this regard, the reflections of Houtart and Herrera (2018) offer us useful references for theoretical analysis in our country. On the other hand, we recognize and recover the valuable reflection that arises from the experiences and practices of political struggle of social movements in Ecuador; This reflection revolves fundamentally around the concept of territoriality and is based on contents focused on the social transformation of spatialities configured and structured by centuries of capital/colonial domination (Zeas et al., 2004).³ Regarding the territoriality concept, we recognize the quality of epistemic support of the works of Prada (2008) and Saquet (2015).

The purpose is to draw an epistemic route between these perspectives in order to facilitate the philosophical understanding of praxis as a complex need for interconnected multiplicities: we prioritize Latin American production regarding territoriality, but without denying the validity of dialogue with theoretical productions of the West. For Bourdieu and Wacquant (2008) such a proposal should lead to the construction of theory; which implies emphatically challenging the fracture between research theory and practice. On the other hand, we also do not intend to fall into dual perspectives that oppose the West-Indigenism, global-local and theory-practice. The theoretical is essential to analyze the practical, from an epistemic approach that integrates different frameworks of counterhegemonic interpretation.

Thus, in methodological terms, our contribution not only proposes routes of epistemic political dialogue, but also an exercise in transdisciplinarity

3 Publication of the indigenous movement while CODENPE existed.

between popular political culture, Bourdieu's sociological thinking and rhizomatic post-structural philosophy. Morin (1999) underlines this concept of trans-disciplinarity to explain perspectives that exceed the disciplinary specificity of the dominant academy of modernity, but also to overcome interdisciplinary approaches, which do not recognize epistemes outside the academic and scientific production fields.

With transdisciplinarity it is not intended to ignore science but to put it in dialogue, both among its specialties, and with social knowledge of different backgrounds and trajectories. In this sense, our methodology was cartographic, but referred to a cartography that does not involve practical field-work, but a strictly theoretical approach to the territory and territoriality. In the words of Deleuze and Guattari (2007), the book itself is a map, so it has been possible for us to map without resorting to geographical or georeference areas. The analysis we do is a map of epistemic articulation between *habitus*, rhizome and intercultural territoriality.

The text is a journey through structural circuits, post-structural exit points and re-articulations in intercultural postulates, as an integrative delineation of multiplicities. Obviously, the analogy of the book as a map can be reproduced in relation to articles, and this is what we try in this text.

In terms of the procedure, it was useful to reflect in a relational and differential way simultaneously. All the texts, from the conceptions that we have prioritized, have as their axis the power relations and the need to transform social reality, mainly from resistances that promote new structures or multiplicities that draw lines of difference or new articulations through ethical and intercultural agreements and practices to share power.

Territory and territoriality: conceptual routes

The territory is defined, in the first instance, by its population, based on confluences and disputes. It involves populations that are built and transformed within a geographical space and that interact, moved by diverse needs, both biological and social. In the sociocultural field, the territory cannot be understood as a defined perimeter on a plane or as a site with an address and under a specific property, whether private or collective. The territory is fundamentally diversity of spaces and settlements, whose fundamental characteristic is the rich mobility of its actors. Although it is important to map

territories for planning processes, as indeed happens in modernity, it is not possible to replace, with these maps, the territorial presence of the diverse cultures that inhabit them, and whose privileged route of expression is in the multiplicity of their practices.

Nor can we ignore the fact that the territory, in its condition of existence and concretion, makes sense in its materiality. This does not, of course, validate materialistic mechanistic conceptions that conceive the existence of reality exclusively in terms of sensitive verification; but neither privilege rationality as a priority dimension of the real. Without ignoring the physical materiality of any territory, the conceptual path that we present here conceives, both territory and territoriality, on the basis of a space/spatiality that responds to social interactions: it exists because of its actors and their interrelations, which are multiple in nature, that are specified in terms of differences and that simultaneously promote encounters and disagreements (Massey, 2005). They are, therefore, entities open to becoming. Hence the need to understand that the social relations that characterize a territory are explained by power relations because they are political spaces, which have led to the imposition of dynamics of violent expropriation of territories and the submission of populations that have lost control over that which was once their cultural identity scenario.

With regard to the notion of territory, Luciano Martínez (2012), taking up Bourdieu's ideas, points out that, when talking about the social construction of the territory, the "relational" dimension of the actors who deploy specific strategies according to interests related to their location in the social field. In *Practical Reason* (1991), Bourdieu proposes the concept of *habitus* to account for articulations and contradictions that direct social behaviors within what he, in turn, calls the social field. As a structured and structuring entity, the *habitus* is constituted as a multiplicity of systemic practices. They do not imply, therefore, the reconciliation of two principles that generally appear as antithetical: structure and action. We believe that Bourdieu does not assume dichotomous positions that tend to synthesize these opposite principles. It is also important to understand that in his proposal neither field nor *habitus* are reduced to abstract structures.

On the contrary, they are located as guiding and generating entities of practical meaning, that is, of action and of relationship and, therefore, of reality. From a historical perspective, the social field is constituted as a space in dispute, this is one of conflict and competition: a field is constituted by

forces, and by struggles to transform or maintain the relations of forces that exist at a given time (Bourdieu, 2002). But the behaviors and actions that are carried out within a field do not respond to universal laws or to the rationality of the involved actors, but to predispositions for action and schemes of perception and assessment of social reality, typical of *habitus* that comes into play. The *habitus* is constituted as a set of dispositions, within which experiences are perpetuated or transposed. If the social habitus is homologous to the individual, the practices of domination span both the class as a whole and its individuals. The essence of *habitus* is, therefore, to make everlasting the ways of being, speaking, walking, feeling, thinking; maintain submission to the social order (Nordmann, 2010). As a process, in the *habitus* past, present and future are woven (Wacquant, 2008).

In this line of reflection, we would like to go beyond the analogy that Martínez establishes between the territory and the social field, proposed by Bourdieu as a field in dispute, conflict, and competition. In this sense, we would like to relate the notion of territory with that of habitus, since the territory exceeds the scope of the spatial to become a structured and structuring practice, which defines both the possibilities of action and the - physical, social and symbolic - fields in which the action is concretized, it is materialized; that is, it becomes reality. Bourdieu's Marxist contribution allows us to avoid naive and voluntary positions framed in the legitimate desire for societal transformation. Destructuring territories, imposed by the hegemonic order and incorporated by social actors, is an extremely complex practice, which goes beyond its simple understanding and explanation. Overcoming the global capitalist order and establishing a new civilizational system is not a simple task. The proposals for de-structuring have been persistently refunctionalized and articulated within the capital-labor logic, and the socialisms, far from instituting an alternative order, ended up canceling that same logic at the *glocal* level. It is a fact that globalization exercises a clear hegemony in the territorial structuring of the planet. In this sense, the habitus, and in its structured and structuring condition tends to unify the multiplicity of the real.

And yet, reality is presented at the same time unstructured and unstructuring, according to complex metamorphosis processes; that is, deep processes of integral transformation in one incessant becoming (Braidotti, 2005). Reality emerges, becomes a process and has a clearly ontological condition and openness and expansion, not only of the human but of any vital existence that

transits it. Within this logic that places the vital as the axis of territorial construction lies the proposal of the rhizome-root of Deleuze and Guattari (2007).

The authors argue that the rhizome is explained as non-structure, and is opposed to arboreal conformations. With this they do not argue the absence of structures, but rather underline their incessant decomposition in deterritorialization processes. In this line of reflection, the territory results from a constant and inexhaustible movement of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. It is a fabric that is made up of exit points and mutations, where relationships are uninhabited and re-inhabited as much as they are deterritorialized and reterritorialized. We know that the original human communities lived between tissues and exit points, in an intimate relationship with the processes of nature. The territories were structured and unstructured by their nomadic status. Mobility qualified natural and social survival, which also required a constant deterritorialization, but not as an absolute, since the settlement of a new territory always involved reterritorialization processes.

On the other hand, territorializing a space invariably implies compromise and dispute with other species; hence, coexistence is carried out in communion and tension, simultaneously. Rosi Braidotti (2009), based on her Deleuze readings, understands territorialization as differences in mobility, which produce in transit emerging subjectivizations, as a power of multiplicities in motion, that territorialize, deterritorialize and reterritorialize in their trajectories.

In sedentary societies, although their territorial survival was assumed to be limited, mobility persisted, not only in spaces specific to the social group but through expansions of imperial domination to other social groups. Thus, even in full sedentary life, the subjects are nomads and, therefore, live territorialization-de-territorialization-re-territorialization processes (Deleuze & Guattari, 2007). The rhizome proposals are not discourse for the “must be” or the utopian prospect of a new world. The rhizome can also establish perverse or ignominious results. Domination, in this case, can also be rhizome, but not from perennial conditions, but also from incessant destructuring. Thus, territories determined by a logic of domination end up being chaotic by that same logic.

Towards an intercultural territoriality

The current process of territorial globalization has placed the society-nature relationship in a dangerous imbalance because of the imposition of

logic that fractures the weighted process of development of the human species as part of the natural world. Capitalist modernity has generated an oversizing of social aspects, emphasizing the reduction of nature to a category of mere bearer of use values and raw materials for industrial-post-industrial and scientific-technical production; consolidating on a global scale the supposed supremacy of the human being over all other types of existence, and also placing a great diversity of species - even our own - at risk of extinction. If we take into account irrefutable social evidence, contemporary civilization is in crisis, whether due to the excessive and monopolistic use of natural resources, by the almost irreversible global warming or by the presence of devastating wars and the substantial expenditure on weapons of mass destruction. Given this excessive and polluting predominance of the social over the natural, and in the face of the situation of civilizational and territorial crisis that we face, initiatives arise that propose to conceive and materialize territories through proposals for territoriality or alternative territorialities.

The very notion of territoriality places us directly in non-anthropocentric conceptions of the territory (Waldmüller & Altmann, 2018), starting even from the realization that the place, as such, exists before the human presence on the planet: it is not strange a territorial conformation that precedes us and the symbolic aspects, typical of our species, have expression in their materiality and are part of a vital environment that surpasses us. The materiality of human territoriality makes sense in very diverse social productions: cities, roads, means of transport, machines, handicrafts, books, paintings, songs, and a vast number of others impossible to enumerate. Hence, the concept of territoriality articulates the abstract and the concrete, without dual interpretations, but on the contrary in richly interwoven and merged interrelations.

In this regard, Saquet (2015) proposes a significant interconnection between three important domains of the territories and human territorialities: sociability, animality, and spirituality, “highlighting the first dimension while still considering the others” (p. 17). In the Ecuadorian case, the theoretical formulation of territoriality is mainly the product of the joint work of various groups belonging to the indigenous movement. Territoriality, it is affirmed in the text prepared by CODENPE (Development Council of Nationalities and Peoples of Ecuador), integrates synergistically five dimensions: “socio-cultural, ecological-territorial, spatial physical, economic-productive and political-administrative” (Zeas et al., 2004, p. 13). In the CODENPE text, a

reflection on spirituality is also offered, which gives a perspective of totality to the proposal of territoriality and governance for the indigenous peoples of Ecuador. Spirituality conceives in synergy the culture-nature relationship, through a worldview that closely links the spiritual with the sacred, and where the four substantial elements (water, fire, air, and earth) constitute axes of the ritual processes. From understanding life as spirituality, the indigenous peoples of Ecuador have built philosophies of praxis, which articulate cosmos, community, and individual, facilitating the preservation of their identities as peoples and, currently, as nationalities. In this way, it has been possible that their ancestral knowledge, their community family organization, and principles of solidarity-reciprocity survive.

In the context of the proposal of the Ecuadorian indigenous movement, the concept of territoriality cannot ignore community perspectives on the construction of the territory that arise from the legacies of collective resistance to the onslaught of capitalist modernity. Territoriality is, therefore, deeply linked to the ability to maintain practices of peoples that have resisted the colonizing territorial system (Prada, 2008). Thus, although we have insisted on the differentiation of the concepts of territory and territoriality, they do not constitute antagonistic concepts in any way. In fact, we could say that territoriality includes the territory: it is territory with resistance and transformation contents, and, therefore, implies processes in constant movement and metamorphosis. Affirming territoriality implies assuming concretions of societal change in the territory; alter structures that direct internalized practices of domination, in common sense, and staged in territories in terms of social ordering and hierarchies.

Territoriality implies, consequently, uninhabiting and re-inhabiting territories. From the societal transformation that it entails, its meaning is counter-order, counter-hegemony, counter-*habitus*, as long as it defines structuring conformations under capitalist logic. The act of uninhabiting and reinhabiting implies other consciences and capacities to act and perform changes in the territories, from logics of societal participation, which implies actions of cooperation, solidarity, and union (Saquet, 2015). In line with this, the indigenous communities of America are not defined on the basis of structures of reproduction of an order of domination, and their presence, although very weakened, is antagonistic regarding subjectivizations of individualism and capitalist privatization. However, it is important not to overlook that the community is located in fields, understood as spatiality in

dispute, in conflict with capitalist territorial hegemony. Undoubtedly, in these fields of conflict, communities are in a state of deep vulnerability and, in certain cases, even at risk. Therefore, they cannot limit themselves to seeking changes that adhere to their internal condition; they must generate processes of alliance and diverse reproduction in the contemporary world, and enroll in broader proposals and manifestos of emancipatory and post-capitalist political struggle (Houtart & Herrera, 2018). Hence the absolute relevance of concretizing processes that settle in intercultural relations.

However, the notion of community is not exclusive to indigenous peoples. Already in ancient Greece, Aristotle (2000) defines the common in direct relation to citizens and their habitat. At that time, the community corresponded to a unitary perspective, and did not oppose the fact of possessing riches and honors, nor of marking hierarchies as a condition of citizenship - from which barbarian-foreigners, women, children and, obviously, slaves were excluded -. Today, the notion of community refers to new meanings. Francois Houtart (2013) defines it as a set of processes that are directed towards the common good of humanity, based on the recovery of communism, as an egalitarian society, without predominance of class privileges. Houtart, however, does not exclude plural perspectives - as common goods of humanity, in legitimate recognition of resistance and political diversity - but considers a post-capitalist stance that implies the universal right to the common good as a political struggle with unitary perspectives a priority.

Alfonso Torres (2013), on the other hand, combines the holistic overview of the community concept with emerging subjectivation processes. In his proposal he rescues the contributions of Esposito and Nancy, and, in this sense, also emphasizes plural approaches to the concept. In his analysis, a community can be produced through multiple associations, framed in community action from relationships of solidarity and reciprocity.

Under a similar epistemic stance, Roberto Esposito (2012) considers that the most widespread use of the community concept tends to associate the idea of one's own, whether from the ethnic identity or from the common ownership of a given territory. Esposito, however, proposes a way of interpretation that differs from this dominant use: from his argument, the commons refers to the public, so that it differs from any type of domain or property. The common would be precisely that which is not owned. Esposito defines the community on the basis of relations of reciprocity and not possession-ownership-domain. The public is understood, then, as a *donum* or

gift, what is given to the other. Strictly speaking, the common is more related to the fact of detachment and not of accumulating. The community, therefore, assumes provisions of gratitude and commitment to the other as long as there is a debt acquired for what has been received; a relationship that differs from the commercial activity of selling and buying.

Raúl Prada (2008) takes up Esposito's approaches to highlight the centrality of the gift and of giving, of exchange and reciprocity, in the constitution of the community. As indicated in its text, the community is interesting not only as a social institution but above all as an ethical substrate and as a reference for society in the current context of the global expansion of capitalism (p. 32). The gift, based on extravagance and generosity, opposes the value of the capitalist economy and becomes the fundamental axis of the framework that constitutes the community. In this context, Prada emphasizes the historical thickness of the community: semantic displacements, the change of meaning of inherited reminiscences, are explained only in terms of new historical contexts. Hence, Prada is interested in "working on a form of present in which dynamic and bustling forms of community emerge, resistant and rebellious, that rescue the collective principle against the principle of individuation, prevalent throughout modernity" (p. 37).

In line with the above, Prada conceives *ayllu* as a territoriality, an Andean archipelago, "which combines both the union of territories through alliances, and the use of multi-ethnic residential areas, occupied by different *ayllus*" (p. 42). The territoriality of *ayllu* cannot be understood without referring it to its initial matrix, to its pre-Columbian archaic architecture, from where it is erected and has always been erected as a form of social organization of resistance to the state conformation of the territory. In *ayllu*, Prada argues, the earth is space and, at the same time, memory and vitality. We could say, in short, that the territoriality of the Andean *ayllu* contains what the colonizing domain looked down upon, all that complex wealth of diversities articulated in the peoples, between peoples and of these with nature.

On the basis of the above, it is important to note that in the indigenous world communities have been and are always plural and heterogeneous. There was never a single and/or unified community, much less a homogeneous community. Nancy (2000), in her line of post-structural argumentation, analyzes the inoperative community to affirm the importance of singularity - which does not imply any instance of individualization. Nancy argues that "singularity never possesses the nature, or structure, of indivi-

duality” (2000, p. 18). The community, unlike the individual, is singular and indivisible: it is what makes bodies, voices, and scriptures communicate. In her perspective, an exclusive and exclusionary future horizon, such as that which communism promotes, ignores the value of singularity; the community, on the contrary, always involves the plural encounter of singularities.

In Latin America, these contemporary approaches to what constitutes the community have a preponderant weight in the fact that any future project that tends to the construction of “other” communities can only be built on the basis of the unity of the diverse and the diversification of the singular units (Herrera & Torres, 2017), prioritizing the vital and highlighting the issue within proposals and manifestos of emancipatory and post-capitalist political struggle (Houtart & Herrera, 2018). In advocating territoriality all those demands and proposals that project social transformations, based on principles of social equality, the inclusion of differences and dissent, ethical indispensableness in the formulation of political praxis are incorporated. It is an indisputable fact that, in the contemporary neoliberal context, the situation of coloniality and neocoloniality that our countries have suffered places women, children, young people, elderly, as well as other ethnicities, cultures, and peoples affected by global capitalist domination in even more vulnerability and disadvantages. In such a condition of impairment, territoriality is distinguished from the proposals whose axis constitutes the territory because it privileges the challenge of those classist, colonial and oligarchic territorial ordinances (Wilson & Bayón 2017), manifestly exclusive and denigrating, that accentuate situations of marginality, poverty and extreme poverty. It must be clear, therefore, that territoriality cannot be constructed without taking political practice into account from intercultural approaches.

Regarding Ecuador, as territoriality is a construction shared by the peoples and nationalities that make up the indigenous movement of CONAIE (Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador), it has close links with the issue of interculturality, which favors decolonization processes from a plurality of variables. Only within an intercultural logic, territoriality articulates material praxis with symbolic praxis and offers the opportunity to update ancestral legacies and project them into the future. Political decolonization requires epistemic decolonization, and vice versa, and a territoriality proposal without decolonization of territory would be out of place. Consequently, territoriality must imply that diversity of peoples that respond to community logic, but without excluding those who, for one rea-

son or another, have had to reproduce the logic of capitalist individualism. Interculturality, as cultural diversities sharing power and living respectfully with nature, becomes an inescapable need in the construction of territorialities; It also constitutes a powerful recovery of the rhizome, as alternative tissues and exit points to degradation and capitalist crisis. Territoriality can be understood as a dignifying process of territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization.

Fidel Tubino (2004), who defines interculturality as a practice and not as a theory, proposes its application in a new civilizational pact that privileges action based on ethics. Unlike Tubino, we consider that the intercultural proposal, in addition to being practical, is theoretical. We even think that, in our country, the theoretical component is possibly the most obvious shortcoming in the actions of political movements with clear manifests and projects of societal transformation. However, our proposal does not consist of deploying a theoretical academicism detached from the processes of struggle. On the contrary, we propose a theoretical task that is not only strictly linked to these processes but also arises as a product of them. Theoretical practice (theory as a constitutive part of the practice) is essential for the increasingly complex development of political practice.

An additional component, which is a priority in an intercultural proposal and which, however, tends to be overlooked, lies in the diversity of beings and actors that integrate territoriality, beyond its human component. Fornet-Betancourt (2009) contributions on interculturality are relevant in this case. As he explains, the sociocultural cannot be disconnected from the natural: living in harmony with nature is part of an intercultural proposal that detracts from any anthropocentric vision of coexistence and coexistence with otherness, Fornet-Betancourt proposes a broad subjectivation that is built in relation to vital diversity, and not only social. Prada reinforces this statement by conceiving that living beings are also subjects and, therefore, the very fact of living, and not only the fact of knowing, already implies subjectivation. In summary, interculturality as a respectful and affirmative coexistence between different peoples, in an organization by communities or, in any case, by experiences of imposed individuality, requires conceiving and making their reality from other consciousnesses of being; this from territoriality projects or alternative territorialities.

Conclusions

Throughout this text, the importance of theoretical contributions that address the complexity of the territorial issue and allow the strengthening of struggle processes based on principles of equity, justice, respect for ethnic-cultural differences and harmonious coexistence between society and nature has been recognized. We have followed a route of various authors and perspectives that have allowed us, in the first instance, to establish a clear difference between the concepts of territory and territoriality. Without necessarily being antagonistic, since both understand each other about the materiality of space/spatiality that responds to social interactions, the first is explained in terms of power relations that have led to the imposition of expropriation dynamics, the submission of some populations by others.

In this sense, the territory is primarily materiality that implies the reproduction of class structures. The concept of habitus takes up sense and relevance, with which Bourdieu builds a theoretical bridge for a more comprehensive understanding of domination as a social complexity. Hence, reality is understood as structured and structuring territory on various scales. This aspect is often neglected in political reflection, preventing the identification of core issues regarding global capitalist hegemony. From the habitus, the territory becomes a complex and systemic reality; a scenario that involves interdependent and contradictory processes, and that has dynamically characterized the exercises of colonial power of capitalism in Latin America.

To address the issue of territoriality we started from the fact that capitalist colonial domination is not unwavering, despite its characteristics as complex structural processes. For this, it was essential to understand territorial dynamics also from the perspective of praxis in the sense of emancipation and social transformation, which led us to recognize the importance of post-structural epistemic contributions and, in particular, of the concept of rhizome of Deleuze's and Guatarri. From the notion of rhizome we understand territorial complexity as instances where the structured/structuring is also unstructured in exit points and mutations. Plurality, the multiplicity of the real, understood as rhizome, is constructed and reconstructed in a constant and inexhaustible movement of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Hence, domination can also be rhizomatic, but not from perennial conditions, but also from incessant destructuring.

It is then that the notion of territoriality acquires relevance as a proposal for societal transformation, where class and colonial domination does not fit. It supposes deterritorialization and reterritorialization, but always from the alternative; promoting multiplicities as relationships that become processes of equity and emancipation, dignified tissues and exit points. Territoriality is aligned in the areas of resistance, based on territorial processes created from communities. Hence, the proposal of intercultural territoriality acquires special importance as it is articulated to social movements and philosophies that integrate elements of popular experience. Also, in territoriality, anthropocentric positions lose meaning and territorial organization becomes relevant as sequences and disputes from nature: the priority axis of order and counter-order is strictly life. In summary, territoriality is the renovating alternative of the social as a constant emancipation, that is, with territories in strict intercultural vocation of respect for the different; where the struggles for decolonization are relentlessly recreated, in tune not only with visions and social perspectives but with clear connections with nature; that is to say in a continuous metamorphosis of the sociocultural in the sociovital.

Finally, in methodological terms, we draw a map between territory and territoriality, between the reality we live in and by the reality that one wishes to live. We proposed a route between epistemic contributions such as *habitus*, rhizome, and interculturality. In this exercise, it was possible to demonstrate aspects of confluences, but also refutations. The work was a theoretical mapping from structural aspects, post-structural processes, and statements of intercultural political reunion.

References

- Aristóteles (2000). *Política*. Barcelona: S.L.U/ Espasa libros.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *El sentido práctico*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Campo de poder, campo intelectual*. Tucumán: Montessor.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2008). *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.
- Braidotti, R. (2005). *Metamorfosis. Hacia una teoría materialista del devenir*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, S.A
- Braidotti, R. (2009). *Transposiciones. Sobre la ética nómada*. Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa.

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2007). *Mil mesetas; capitalismo y esquizofrenia*. Valencia: Pre-textos.
- Esposito, R. (2012). *Communitas. Origen y destino de la comunidad*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.
- Fornet Betancourt, R. (2009). *Interculturalidad en procesos de subjetivación*. México D.F: Coordinación General de Educación Intercultural y Bilingüe Barranca del Muerto.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *Espacios del capital hacia una geografía crítica*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal.
- Herrera, L. & Torres, K. (2017). Interculturalidad. Diálogos teórico prácticos para la gestión del cantón Cuenca, Ecuador. *Revista Realis*, 7(2), 5-30.
- Houtart, F. (2013). *De los bienes comunes al bien común de la humanidad*. Panamá: Ruth Casa Editorial.
- Houtart, F., & Herrera, L. (2018). Ley de tierras rurales y territorios ancestrales del Ecuador y las nociones de territorio y territorialidad. En Johannes Waldmüller y Phillip Altmann (Ed.), *Territorialidades otras. Visiones alternativas de la tierra y del territorio desde el Ecuador* (pp. 83-107). Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Ediciones La Tierra.
- Massey, D. (2005). *La filosofía y la política de la espacialidad: algunas consideraciones*. En Leonor Arfuch (coord.), *Pensar este tiempo: espacios, afectos, pertenencias* (pp. 101-128). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Martínez, L. (2012). Apuntes para pensar el territorio desde una dimensión social. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 48(1). Recuperado de: <https://bit.ly/2uIjlPI>
- Morin, E. (1999). *7 saberes necesarios para la educación del futuro*. París: UNESCO.
- Nancy, J. (2000). *La comunidad inoperante*. Santiago de Chile: Universidad Arcis.
- Nordmann, C. (2010). *Bourdieu/Rancière. La política entre sociología y filosofía*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Prada, R. (2008). *Subversiones indígenas*. La Paz: CLACSO/ Muela del diablo.
- Saquet, M. (2015). *Por una geografía de las territorialidades y de las temporalidades. Una concepción multidimensional orientada a la cooperación y desarrollo territorial*. La Plata: Universidad Nacional de La Plata, 1ª edición en castellano.
- Sassen, S. (2007). *Sociología de la globalización*. Buenos Aires: Katz.
- Torres, A. (2013). *El retorno a la comunidad. Problemas, debates y desafíos de vivir juntos*. Bogotá: ARFO.

- Tubino, F. (2004). *Del interculturalismo funcional al interculturalismo crítico*. En Mario Samaniego y Carmen Garbarini (Comps.), *Rostros y fronteras de la identidad* (pp. 151-165). Temuco: Universidad Católica de Temuco.
- Wacquant, L. (2008). *Hacia una praxeología social: la estructura y la lógica de la sociología de Bourdieu*. En Pierre Bourdieu y Loïc Wacquant, *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva* (pp. 21-100). Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Zeas et al. (2004). *Territorialidad y gobernabilidad indígenas. Capitalización de la filosofía y práctica de la planificación, gestión y gobernabilidad de las Nacionalidades y Pueblos del Ecuador*. Quito: CODENPE.

Submission date: 2019/10/31; Acceptance date: 2020/02/07;
Publication date: 2020/03/01