Territory as Sociopolitical Appropriation of Space. Between Deterritorialization and Multiterritoriality

El territorio como apropiación sociopolítica del espacio. Entre la desterritorialización y la multiterritorialidad

Guillermo Castillo*

Abstract. Despite its geographic origin, the concept of territory has been used primarily in various social-science disciplines to account for political, socioeconomic, and cultural processes in both urban and rural contexts. Building upon the concept of territory adopted by various geographic schools (Anglo-Saxon, French, and others), and following the approach of the Brazilian geographer Rogeiro Haesbaert, this article contends that, across different scales and frameworks of asymmetric power relationships between the government and other social actors, the concept of territory accounts for processes of land appropriation and conflict between different social groups and institutions, in various political and economic scenarios. Particularly important are the criticisms of Haesbaert on the dynamics of territory construction through de-territorialization processes and his proposal of multiterritoriality.

The first step of the theoretical-methodological strategy followed in this study was to examine the various concepts of territory, particularly those used by contemporary schools of geography in Europe, North America, and Latin America. This facilitated the analysis of various cultural, economic, and political proposals existent around this concept. Subsequently, the political formulations of territory (on which Haesbaert based his proposals) were addressed, based on the conceptual developments previously examined. This, supported in the conception of territory from the standpoint of the exercise of power, allowed focusing on the characteristics, scope, and limitations of the concepts of territory,

deterritorialization, and multiterritoriality as formulated by the Brazilian author.

Following the approach described above, this article comprises the following sections. First, the place that the concept of territory holds in geography and social science in Latin America, Europe, and North America is described. Second, the genesis and history of the concept are reconstructed to show the various approaches used in this science. Subsequently, the ideas of Haesbaert on territory are reviewed, particularly his proposals on deterritorialization and multiterritoriality. Based on the above, the contributions of his concept of territory are assessed. The concluding section discusses the contributions of the concept of territory as a historically determined category with socio-political character.

Finally, the findings of this study fall in two areas: 1) the balance and theoretical development of the territory category and the deterritorialization and multiterritoriality proposals associated to it, and 2) the lines of work and research derived from Haesbaert's proposals, as well as their validity within the literature on territory.

1) Regarding the first aspect, the territory is a category still under debate that has been addressed from various disciplinary fields. As proposed by Haesbaert, territory is a process still under construction, characterized by dynamics of spatial appropriation by various social groups and (government and economic) institutions, at various scales and in complex frameworks of power relations. Deterritorialization and multiterritoriality account for the histori-

* Department of Social Geography (Cubicle 19), Institute of Geography, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Av. Universidad 3000, Ciudad Universitaria, Mexico City, Mexico. Postal Code 04510. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8188-9929. Email: gcastillo@igg.unam.mx

cally changing character of territories. Deterritorialization allows conceiving the processes of territorial precarization of subaltern groups and the loss of territorial control by social subjects, within networks of asymmetric power relations with other agents or institutions. On the other hand, multiterritoriality opens up the possibility of conceiving the different social agents and institutions that fight for the control/management/use of a given space. With this, one of the most outstanding features of the concept of territory is its structurally political character.

2) Regarding the second aspect, territory has become a key category increasingly used in the analysis of various contemporary processes (economic change, productive restructuring, political reconfigurations, social order transformations, and identity dynamics) in the globalization framework. In particular reference to the proposals put forward by Haesbaert, recent works have used deterritorialization and multiterritoriality to analyze changes in contemporary territorial processes in rural and urban settings in various parts of Latin America. The analytical capability of these proposals for the conditions in Mexico still need to be tested in greater detail. Further studies are necessary that use the deterritorialization and multiterritoriality categories to analyse contemporary processes of territorial construction, tension, and conflict, at different scales (local, regional, national) in rural and urban contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Territory is a concept that, despite its long history (Mayhew, 2015; Gregory et al., 2009; George, 2007), has become relevant to explain political, socioeconomic, and cultural processes for several decades in different areas of knowledge and contexts (Ramírez and López, 2015; Haesbaert, 2013 and 2007; Delaney, 2005), and among different groups and institutions in various countries (Fernandes, 2012; Ramírez, 2013). Although Geography has addressed territory for decades (Raffestin, 2013; Fernandes, 2012; Haesbaert, 2011; Badie, 1995; Agnew, 1994), other areas of social sciences in Europe and Latin America have recently also addressed this concept (Ramírez and López, 2015; Barabás, 2014; Rodríguez, 2015 and 2010; Reyes and López, 2012).

Within the broad context of geographic knowledge production, this article contends that the approaches of the Brazilian geographer Haesbaert (2011, 2013, and 2016) allow for the concept of territory to account, at different scales and in the framework of complex asymmetries, for political and economic processes of appropriation,

Keywords: territory, geography, deterritorialization, multiterritoriality, territorialization.

Resumen. El territorio es un concepto que, no obstante su origen geográfico, desde hace varios lustros y en diferentes áreas de las ciencias sociales ha tomado relevancia para explicar procesos de tipo político, socioeconómico y cultural, en contextos urbanos y rurales. En el marco de las concepciones de territorio de varias escuelas geográficas (anglosajonas, francófonas, brasileñas, entre otras), este artículo argumenta que los planteamientos del geógrafo brasileño Rogeiro Haesbaert permiten que, en diversas escalas y en marcos de relaciones de poder desiguales con el Estado nación y otros actores sociales, el concepto de territorio de cuenta de procesos de apropiación y disputa del espacio entre diversos grupos sociales e instituciones, y en contextos de carácter político y económico. Particularmente importantes son las lecturas críticas de Haesbaert sobre las dinámicas de construcción del territorio a través de los procesos de desterritorialización y su propuesta de la(s) multiterritorialidad(es).

Palabras clave. territorio, geografía, desterritorialización, multiterritorialidad, territorialización.

tension, and dispute of space by social groups, and in contexts of power relations with the government and other social actors. Particularly relevant are the contributions of this geographer on his approach from a critical review of the deterritorialization processes and his suggestive contribution to the multiterritoriality proposal.

To achieve this objective, this work first addresses the different conceptions of territory, particularly from the various schools of contemporary geographic thought in Europe and North America (Painter, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009; Delaney, 2005; Storey, 2001; Agnew, 1994; Sack, 1986; Raffestin, 2009; Di Méo, 2000), as well as Latin America (Haesbaert, 2014; Fernandes, 2012; Porto Gonçalves, 2009a; Santos, 2004a; Barabás, 2014; Rodríguez, 2015; Reyes and López, 2012; Ramírez, 2006). This will allow visualizing the varied proposals (cultural, economic, and political) around that concept; subsequently, based on the previous conceptual developments, we will focus on the political formulations of the territory (on which Haesbaert elaborated his proposals). Within this framework and based on the construe of the territory from the exercises of power by this Brazilian geographer,

this article focuses on the scope and limits of the developments on territory, deterritorialization, and multiterritoriality proposed by Haesbaert (2011, 2013, and 2016).

Accordingly, the article is organized in the following sections. First, a brief account of the territory concept in Geography and the Social Sciences in Latin America, Europe, and North America is given. It is followed by a description of the genesis and history of this concept, particularly within the framework of Geography, allowing to show the different approaches to territory in this discipline. Based on this context, the next section explores Haesbaert's approaches to territory, particularly the proposals of deterritorialization and multiterritoriality, as means to contemplate territorial processes in a more comprehensive manner and from the frameworks of power relations between actors and multiscalarity. Then, the contributions of Haesbaert's proposal for the socio-political construction of the territory are assessed. Finally, this analysis concludes with reflections on the debate, contributions, and the construction of the territory as a historically determined concept with a strong socio-political character.

TERRITORY IN GEOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Although Geography has addressed territory as a category of socio-political analysis for decades (Mayhew, 2015; Gregory et al., 2009; George, 2007; Sack, 1986; Gottman, 1973), other areas of knowledge in Social Sciences and Humanities have also addressed this concept (Ramírez and López, 2015; Ramírez, 2013; Reyes and López, 2012; Haesbaert, 2011 and 1997). These include Anthropology, which, in an attempt to explain symbolic processes with indigenous groups in different rural societies, has proposed ethnoterritories (Barabás, 2014 and 2003) to link ethnic and cultural practices, human groups, and the biophysical environment.

Sociology, for its part, has resorted to this concept in the multi-scale analysis of cultural/symbolic processes in diverse human groups in urban areas

within the context of capitalist modernity (Giménez, 2005 and 2001). On the other hand, from the Political Science perspective, the concept has been key in the analysis of the sovereignty processes and the construction of national states through dynamics of appropriation, control, and management of resources and populations in a specific space delimited by various borders (Ramírez and López, 2015; Ramírez, 2013).

Today, from Geography, and similar to other concepts with a long history and relevance in the discipline (such as *region* or *space*) (Haesbaert, 2010; Ramírez and López, 2015; Massey, 2005; Hiernaux, 2010; Hiernaux and Lindón, 2006 and 1993), the territory category has been approached by different schools of thought with different purposes and in various fields (Raffestin, 2013; Di Méo, 2000; Giménez, 2005; Barabás, 2014; Ramírez, 2013; Ramírez and López, 2015; Fernandes, 2012 and 2010; Haesbaert, 2011, 2002 and 1997).

On the one hand, there are the Anglo-Saxon (Painter, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009; Delaney, 2005; Storey, 2001; Agnew, 1994; Sack, 1986) and Francophone (Raffestin, 2013; Di Méo, 2000; Badie, 1995; Scheibling, 1994), which have emphasized political processes and at various scales, about conceiving territory as a process to control goods, people, and resources in a given space, and delimited through various boundaries in political/administrative terms, especially in the framework of nation-states[1] and their institutions in capitalist modernity. *Within this context of geographical knowledge production, some authors have suggested that territory has been related for decades to political-cultural processes such as nationalism, nation-states, and democracy (*Gregory et al., 2009: 747).

On the other hand, there are the Hispanic-American approaches that, from various perspectives, have used the territory category to address socio-cultural and historical processes in specific

---

[1] This group includes approaches such as those of the English geographer Painter, who considers that territory is par excellence the space of the nation state (Painter, 2010). On the other hand, Sack, from North American geography and based on an operative definition, proposed in the past century that territory referred to a space that has controlled access (Sack, 1986).

ethno-rural and urban areas within the context of various asymmetrical power relations between several actors (social groups, organizations, the State, and companies, among others) (Téllez and Sánchez, 2018; Aguilar and Sanchez, 2018; Sanchez, Bocco and Casado, 2013; Barabás, 2014; Castillo, 2017; Pradilla, 2011; Rodríguez, 2010; Fernandez and Garcia, 2006; Giménez, 2005).

Related to the previous group, there are also various proposals from contemporary Brazilian geographers (from Haesbaert and Fernandes to Porto Gonçalves and Santos). These geographers, since the late twentieth century and through different theoretical and methodological perspectives, have importantly contributed to thinking about the use of the territory in the analysis of various actors and social movements much more comprehensively and from various perspectives (socioeconomic, political, and historical) (Haesbaert, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2014, 2016, 2007 and 2002; Fernandes, 2012, 2010 and 2009; Porto Gonçalves, 2009a, 2009b, 2006 and 2001; Santos, 2004a, 2004b, 2002 and 1994).

TERRITORY: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL CONCEPT

Geography, a science that addresses the relationships between man (in society) and space (as a socioeconomic construct and a biophysical environment) (Haesbaert, 2011 and 2010), has a long history, during which it has used various theoretical categories to develop its work (Ramírez, 2013; Gregory et al., 2009). Within the geographical theoretical scaffolding, some concepts (such as *space,*[2]

region[3], and *landscape*[4]) have been leading elements for many decades and have defined various approaches to the discipline. Although the territory did not enjoy an early central role in the modern age of the discipline, it has been gaining importance and has become much more visible in recent decades (Painter, 2010; Ramírez, 2013).

However, as suggested by Gregory and his collaborators (2009), the most frequent uses of the concept have had a political character and have been related to the capacity to control and the exercise of power to deny or enable entry to certain sites and places (Gregory et al., 2009: 746). In this line of ideas, these authors conceive territory as a set of contiguous spaces used, organized, and administered by certain agents (people, social groups, institutions) to contain or allow certain people access to these spaces.

There are also legal-political interpretations of the territory from diverse geographic and Latin American political science perspectives, framed within various space-power relations (especially institutionalized) (Ramírez and López, 2015; Haesbaert, 2011). According to these conceptions, the territory is thought of as "a delimited and controlled space through which a certain power is exercised, most of the time — although not exclusively — associated with the political power of the State (Haesbaert, 2011: 35)".

---

[2] Space has been one of the key concepts in the generation of knowledge from the Social Sciences in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Particularly in Geography, and recognizing the diversity of its polysemy (depending on the schools that have used it), space has played a central role as one of the core categories of the discipline (Ramírez and López, 2015: 17). Undoubtedly, one of the most notorious developments of the concept was to evolve from being conceptualized, in Cartesian terms, as a delimited surface with a geometric and container character (of objects), to being interpreted as part of social production in specific

historical contexts (Gregory et al., 2009: 708-709) or to be approached as a system of relations in the framework of capitalism (Massey, 2005; Santos, 2004b).

[3] Region is a concept with a long history in Geography, dating back to the 18th century in the context of the background and conformation processes of national states in Europe (Ramírez and López, 2015: 100-101). This concept is used to refer to an area or zone of the Earth's surface whose components (cultural, political, and social, among others) are functionally related (Gregory *et al.*, 2009: 630).

[4] Landscape is a category that has been widely used for decades by Human Geography, particularly by contemporary Cultural Geography (Ramírez and López, 2015). This concept has been used for the analysis of the different links between culture and nature (in the framework of the relationships between subjects and objects) (Gregory et al., 2009), in certain biophysical environments, and for particular historical contexts (Fernández and García, 2006).

For their part, other approaches from Brazilian and Mexican geographic schools have emphasized that, although there is a very prominent political aspect in the exercises of defining the territory concept, there have also been cultural notions (from disciplines such as Anthropology or Cultural Sociology) or those focused on productive processes and the socio-material reproduction of certain localities (Ramírez, 2013; Haesbaert, 2013).

The first of these notions, Anthropology, which emphasizes approaches to ethnic groups (traditional societies) through symbolic perspectives, has used the concept of territory to address the cultural dimensions of indigenous peoples and the social and identity ascription processes concerning the biophysical environment of a set of specific spaces (Barabás, 2014 and 2003).[5] There are also economic definitions, which emphasize the territory as a space appropriated and used that provides resources and means for the reproduction of the material life of certain groups and communities through various strategies and productive activities (López and Ramírez, 2015; Castillo and Pérez, 2019).

A POLITICAL READING OF TERRITORY, FROM DETERRITORIALIZATION TO MULTITERRITORIALITY

Territory as a Political Construct on a Material Basis

According to Haesbaert and in the framework of a Foucauldian reading of territory from power,[6] territories are the spaces (material and symbolic)

where power is exercised in multiple ways and at different scales, which may involve actors ranging from the referents of the nation-state (through sovereignty and population control) and economic and political power groups to other social players that, outside of the government sphere, have different capacities of agency and interests (Haesbaert, 2016: 121). Haesbaert makes a political reading of the territory from power, according to a conception from Foucault (2009 and 2008), where what matters is not so much what power is but how and under what conditions it is exercised (Foucault, 2009 and 2008), based on the complex dynamics of appropriation of a given material space (Haesbaert, 2013: 19).[7]

In this sense, Haesbaert pointed out that, rather than understanding power as a capacity or a finished object, it should be conceived as the asymmetrical and unequal relations of forces between various agents in contexts of varied actors and institutions (Haesbaert, 2013: 26). One of the core axes is to think about power in relation to its practices and effects in various spheres (Haesbaert, 2013: 27).

This relational and historical/contextual conceptual scaffolding of power allows Haesbaert to think that there are different types of territories that can be clearly linked and determined. On the one hand, there is the territory-zone, characterized by constant and extensive control over access to a specific appropriate space by an institution or agent, which restricts the entry or exit of goods and people within a set of specific limits (borders) (Haesbaert, 2013: 23). This is clearly the case of the order of the nation-state and the exercise of sovereignty over the national territory and can be replicated at different government levels.

On the other hand, there is the network-territory, where rather than exercising control over a specific area, the focus lies on the articulation and flow of goods, resources, and people across a series of spaces and borders. The network-territory is neither opposed to nor exclusive of zone territo-

---

[5] Thinking of categories that, like those proposed from Anthropology on ethnoterritories or indigenous territories (Barabás, 2014), emphasize the relationships between territory, indigenous groups, and biophysical environment within an inter-ethnic relations framework.

[6] Haesbaert (2013 and 2016) recovered Foucault's proposals related to the idea that three types/forms of power in the modern world that overlap and relate to each other: (a) at the macro level, the sovereign power of the nation state; (b) disciplinary power (schools, prisons, hospitals), characterized by microphysics to regulate time and space at the individual level; and (c) biopower, i.e., control (biological and bodily) of populations (Haesbaert, 2016: 122).

---

[7] In this context, Haesbaert comments that "every territory, geographically speaking, always has a spatio-material basis for its constitution (Haesbaert, 2013: 19)".

ries. Examples are transnational corporations and companies within the context of global neoliberal capitalism, where what matters is the circulation of goods, capital, and information (Haesbaert, 2013: 23) and which occurs within the articulation of network-territories of nation-states.

Finally, and returning to previous developments, there are the macro territories (such as the sovereign power of the nation-state) or micro territories related to the processes of resistance from social groups and at more local scales (Haesbaert, 2013: 25).

In summary, this geographer conceived an inseparable binomial between power and territory, so that "territory is always linked to power and the control of social processes through the control of space (Haesbaert, 2013: 13)". This entails, as a critical route, the need to investigate from different historical/structural contexts and at various scales, the multiple "spatial/territorial forms in which power is exerted (Haesbaert, 2016: 121)". In this way, this author, through a geographic integration that incorporates various spheres of social life and from multiple contexts of exercise of unequal power relations, delves into a notion of territory whose axes are the dynamics of economic and political control/dominance and cultural and symbolic appropriation of certain spaces by human groups (Haesbaert, 2011: 16) at various scales. However, these processes are not static and evolve. Therefore, from a historical perspective, it becomes important for this author to address changes within the framework of various events and processes. In this sense, the terms deterritorialization and multiterritoriality play a central role.

Deterritorialization to Understand the Territory

In the late 1990s and within the context of his doctoral thesis on *gauchos* in north-eastern Brazil (Haesbaert, 1997), Haesbaert analyzed the categories of territory and deterritorialization to account for territorial change processes. Subsequently, he further elaborated on the characteristics, scope, and limits of this concept in the book *El mito de la desterritorialización* (The deterritorialization myth) *(2011),* where he related deterritorialization to reterritorialization and multiterritoriality.

For this author, deterritorialization is a term used profusely since the last decade of the past century (Haesbaert, 2016)[8] that, although having an analytical depth, has frequently entailed ambiguity and imprecision. On the one hand, for this geographer, several uses of deterritorialization as an analytical category lack a clear definition of territory. Furthermore, deterritorialization is conceptualized as a uniform process, without nuances and in clear contrast to the re-territorialization dynamics (Haesbaert, 2011: 28 and 29).

On the other hand, for Haesbaert and about what he calls the "deterritorialization myth" (Haesbaert, 2011: 16), one issue when this term is used loosely refers to thinking that humans are able to live without territorializing themselves and that societies lack territories to settle and reproduce. As this geographer points out, when a human group loses control over a territory, other social agents or institutions appropriate the use of and access to it. In this way, "deterritorialization can never be dissociated from re-territorialization (Haesbaert, 2013: 13)".

One of this category's most recurrent (and drastic) uses is the abandonment (emptying) or destruction of the territory. However, in contexts where social subjects have not entirely lost control over the appropriation of space, deterritorialization can also be used for the description and analysis of the "territorial precarization of subordinate groups (Haesbaert, 2013: 9)". Haesbaert deepens his critical reading and points out that although deterritorialization can be used in a negative sense "as fragility or loss of territorial control (Haesbaert, 2013: 13)", it can also entail a positive sense, insofar as territorial destruction and reconstruction occur simultaneously.

Derived from the definition of territory in various orders of social life, Haesbaert (2013 and 2011) states that deterritorialization has been exces-

---

[8] According to Haesbaert (2016), since the 1970s and in the framework of the French philosophy of the time, this term was used by certain French philosophers (Deleuze and Guattari, 1995). For Deleuze and Guattari (1995) deterritorialization refers to the "lines of flight" in the processes of generating "new agency in the fields of practices and spatial representations (Haesbaert, 2016: 120)".

sively used in different ways (economic, political, and cultural).

a) In the first place, and concerning productive economic processes and their relationship with the dynamics of spatial appropriation by certain groups, *deterritorialization in its economic aspect* can involve multiple scales and diverse processes, from the territorial dispossession of peasants due to extractivism and privatization in socio-environmental conflicts (Paz, 2017; Rodríguez, 2010) and precarious migrant workers in the countries of the global north (Castillo, 2017; Sassen, 2010 and 2007) to the territorial relocation of multinational companies and corporations (Haesbaert, 2013 and 2011). However, as Haesbaert (2016, 2013, and 2011) rightly points out, all these processes occur in specific territories. What happens is that the links between these economic actors or institutions and a given territory may be precarious, temporary, or highly utilitarian and ephemeral. As this Brazilian author points out, deterritorialization does not necessarily refer to processes that occur without territories (which is impossible) but to change the relationship dynamics between territories and social and economic groups. This term frequently refers to territorial precariousness processes among social subjects and their diverse material and symbolic spheres of life.

b) The other way of using the term *deterritorialization involves a political dimension* and refers to the well-known discourse on the deterioration and weakening of nation-states, relating it to the decline in state control and power and its borders in the late 20th century (Haesbaert, 2013 and 2011) within the dynamics of globalization, free market, and neoliberal capitalism. However, nation-states have not disappeared in the advent of this century.

For several decades, the control of national territories by various countries has indeed deteriorated. However, with the current resurgence of nationalism and border closures, nation-states have returned with strength and prominence to the international political scene. In this framework, the term deterritorialization would serve to think about how it has changed and what now characterizes the control and administration of national territories by nation-states (Haesbaert, 2013) in the framework of asymmetrical power relations within their confines/frontiers, but also in broader contexts of regional and international geopolitics.

c) Finally, there are also the *dynamics that link certain territories with cultural hybridism narratives* and the loss of traditions and ways of life, in which deterritorialization acquires a cultural character (Haesbaert, 2013). However, it is worth noting that cultural practices do not combine in a vacuum and without a material, territorial referent but in asymmetrical power contexts between the groups involved. Instead, it is a matter of the precarization in the relations between a social group, certain cultural practices, and certain territories.

From Deterritorialization to Multiterritoriality

Haesbaert considers that when the term deterritorialization is used, sometimes it refers not to the deterioration of the bonds of certain social subjects with the territory but to diverse territorialization dynamics that co-occur in a given space and among which opposition and tension relations may take place, hence his proposal of multiterritoriality (Haesbaert, 2011). This geographer defines multiterritoriality as the experiences, either concurrent or successive, of multiple territories in the composition of our territoriality (2016: 121) and in which several actors or institutions participate.

According to Haesbaert, multiterritoriality involves two aspects. *One is successive*, which refers to the contiguity and contact between different territorial orders (at various scales) and which, for example, can be illustrated when one moves from a micro territory (such as a street or a household) to territories of a different order (a school, a hospital).

The other aspect refers to *overlapping multiterritoriality* ("*in-situ* conjugation"), which refers to the fact that diverse territorial processes may overlap in a given point/locality (Haesbaert, 2013: 35).

For this geographer, an example is when different territorial orders overlap in the same place; thus, we find private property in a given urban node, but within municipal and nation-state control and scope.

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE TERRITORY: HAESBAERT'S CONTRIBUTIONS

Within the prolific production of geographic knowledge and other Social Sciences disciplines in relation to this concept (Painter, 2010; Raffestin, 2013; Barabás, 2014; Ramírez and López, 2015; Fernandes, 2012; Haesbaert, 2013 and 2016; Reyes and López, 2012; Ramírez, 2006), it is worth asking, what are the contributions of deterritorialization and multiterritoriality developed by Haesbaert to the understanding and development of the territory concept and the analysis of territorial processes at different scales (micro, meso, macro)? From Haesbaert's political interpretation of the territory, understood as a process of power in a space controlled/used/restricted by certain actors and institutions, deterritorialization and multiterritoriality represent major contributions, as they allow us to conceive the territory as the dynamics of spatial appropriation, as constructs continually changing and socially determined and differentiated.

Uses of Deterritorialization and Multiterritoriality
Within the framework outlined above, it is worth stressing that, from various disciplinary approaches (Sociology, Anthropology, Geography), several investigations in Mexico have used Haesbaert's proposals on deterritorialization and multiterritoriality to address territorial transformations in diverse urban and rural contexts at various scales and in different parts of the country (Castillo and Pérez, 2019; Castillo, 2017; Rodríguez, 2015; Paz, 2017; Arévalo, 2020 and 2016; Lozano and Ferro, 2009).

This group of studies ranges from research on social movements in territorial processes related to socio-environmental conflicts (Paz, 2017) and the dynamics of extractivism and dispossession (Rodríguez, 2015 and 2010) to works on territorial reconfigurations and impacts in peasant localities derived from migration (Castillo and Pérez, 2019; Castillo, 2017) or studies related to residential relocation processes linked to re-territorialization and deterritorialization dynamics (Arévalo, 2016 and 2020).

However, there is also research in other Latin American countries that have resorted to such categories to address territorial processes, such as the cases of Colombia on access to natural resources (Pérez, 2018), Chile in Mapuche ethnic contexts (Olguín and Cubillos, 2015), and Brazil with urban walls in São Paulo to separate favelas from wealthy neighborhoods (Haesbaert, 2016) and changes in the territorial dynamics of gauchos in north-eastern Brazil (Haesbaert, 1997), among others.

Scope of Deterritorialization
Deterritorialization makes it possible to address transformations in territorial processes throughout different temporalities and related to different economic and political processes. Deterritorialization is a very useful term to criticize an essentialist, ahistorical, and mono-determinist vision of the territory, particularly from the referents of the nation-state and the economic powers of certain national and transnational companies and corporations, thinking of an approach that challenges the notion that the territory only emerges under a centralized power scheme and strict control of a given space by a hegemonic power group. Undoubtedly, deterritorialization contributes to thinking that although the material dimension of the territory cannot be omitted (Haesbaert, 2013), territories are far from immutable, finished, and homogeneous constructs.

On the contrary, this term helps to conceive territorialization processes from a far more complex and historical perspective. deterritorialization deals with territorial tensions, disputes, and conflicts within state and non-state power frameworks. A primary aim of this proposal is to show that, derived from different causes, the deterioration and precariousness of the dynamics through which certain territories are built bring together different

actors and institutions with varied and sometimes conflicting interests and goals.

In this way, deterritorialization can contribute to revealing the diversity of actors who wish to appropriate certain spaces within the tensions and asymmetrical and socio-historically determined power relations between the various subjects involved.

Multiterritoriality and its Scope

Multiterritoriality allows addressing multiple actors in territorialization processes, considering subjects and social actors from other spheres and orders. This makes it possible to find cases where these territorialization processes, which may involve various social actors and institutions and do not completely cancel each other out despite their asymmetry or relative tension and opposition. In addition, it gives the possibility to approach and understand the differentiated dynamics of appropriation of space to build diverse territorialities by various actors. This differentiation can involve different scales (micro, meso, and macro) and take place in relation to the inquiry and visibility (practices, activities, discourses) of the agencies through which the subjects involved build different territories in a given space.

Multiterritoriality also makes it possible to transcend a political interpretation of the territory that is limited only to the nation-state and its control over the population and resources within a space managed and limited by state institutions. It allows drawing how the power relations, practices, and discourses are expressed in the construction of territories. Thus, multiterritoriality, insofar as it gives rise to the consideration between macro and micro territories, allows highlighting the multiscalarity in the construction of territorial processes concerning the scope and capacity of agency of the various actors and institutions involved.

CONCLUSIONS. TERRITORY: A CATEGORY UNDER DEBATE AND CONSTRUCTION

Within the framework of the broad academic production of Geography and Social Sciences on

the concept of territory (Raffestin, 2013; Barabás, 2014; Painter, 2010; Ramírez, 2013; Ramírez and López, 2015; Fernandes, 2012; Haesbaert, 2013 and 2016; Storey, 2001; Di Méo, 2000; Agnew, 1994), the contributions of this paper focus on three areas. (1) On the one hand, in relation to the balance and theoretical development of the territory category and the related proposals of deterritorialization and multiterritoriality. (2) On the other, in reference to the lines of work and research opened by Haesbaert's proposals. (3) Finally, regarding the location and validity of Haesbaerth's proposals within the literature on the territory concept.

1) Territory is a debated category with approaches from various disciplinary fields. According to Haesbaert's proposals (2011, 2013, and 2016), the territory is a process under construction characterized by spatial appropriation dynamics by different social groups and institutions (governmental and economic) at different scales and within complex power relations. Both deterritorialization and multiterritoriality reflect the changing (historical) character of territories. As Haesbaert points out, "territory must be conceived as a combined product of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, that is, of power relations constructed in and with space (Haesbaert, 2013: 269)".

Within the framework of this conceptual scaffolding, deterritorialization allows us to analyze the territorial precariousness of subordinate groups and the deterioration of territorial control over a given space by social subjects within a framework of asymmetrical power relations with other agents or institutions. Likewise, multiterritoriality gives the possibility of conceiving the different social agents and institutions that dispute the control/management/use of a given space., Within the complex and integral interpretation of power, the structural-political nature of multiterritoriality stands out as one of the main features of the territory.

Multiterritoriality also allows for interpreting the territorial construction processes at different scales (micro, meso, macro) within frameworks of asymmetrical power relations in various contexts (urban and rural). It also makes it possible to account for the various orders (political, economic,

socio-cultural) that intersect and shape each other in territories.

2) Within the framework of Social Sciences in Europe and Latin America, the territory has become a relevant category increasingly used for the analysis of various contemporary processes (economic changes, productive restructuring, political reconfigurations, identity dynamics) (Raffestin, 2013; Barabás, 2014; Ramírez and López, 2015; Fernandes, 2012; Haesbaert, 2013; Gregory et al., 2009) within the globalization context. Particularly, and with regard to Haesbaert's proposals, recent works have used deterritorialization and multiterritoriality to nalyze changes in contemporary territorial processes in rural and urban settings in various areas of Latin America (Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, etc.) (Arévalo, 2020; Pérez, 2018; Castillo, 2017; Castillo and Pérez, 2019; Haesbaert, 2016 and 1997; Olguín and Cubillos, 2015; Rodríguez, 2015 and 2010; Paz, 2017; Ramírez and López, 2015; Lozano, and Ferro, 2009).

Nevertheless, particularly in the case of Mexico, the research capacity of Haesbaert's proposals needs to be tested in further detail. Undoubtedly, there are no studies using deterritorialization and multiterritoriality precisely and critically in the analysis of the territorial construction, tension, and dispute processes at different scales and for rural and urban contexts. In particular, these categories have an explanatory potential that needs to be used and tested through case studies at the local level.

There is also the need for conducting meso and macro research exercises for comparative purposes in different contexts. For example, a topic to explore would be peasant groups and social movements in rural contexts of change and deterioration of production processes within frameworks of complex power relations with the nation-state and agro-industrial transnational corporations (Fernandes, 2012 and 2009) or international migration processes and their territorial impacts on the rural localities of origin (Castillo, 2017; Castillo and Pérez, 2019).

3) Finally, as regards the relationship with literature on the definitions of territory, more detailed exercises of linkage and contrast between Haesbaert's proposals and other conceptual developments around territory should be carried out, both within the Brazilian geography itself (Fernandes, 2012; Porto Gonçalves, 2009b; Santos, 2004a) and in other Latin American areas (Barabás, 2014; Castillo and Pérez, 2019; Ramírez, 2013; Pradilla, 2011; Rodríguez, 2010; Fernández and García, 2006), as well as in relation to European and North American schools of geographical thought (Painter, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009; Delaney, 2005; Sack, 1986; Raffestin, 2013; Di Méo, 2000).

Particularly suggestive would be the dialogue with the territorial proposals of Fernandes (2012 and 2010), who considers several characteristics (sovereignty, totality, multiscalarity, and multidimensionality) that define this geographical category from his broad experience with rural peasant localities about the development of agrarian capitalism in contemporary Brazil (Fernandes, 2012). Both authors address a complex political interpretation and sociohistorical construction of the territory (involving various agents and institutions), which also contemplate different scales and the varied spheres in which power relations are evident.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agnew, J. (1994). The territorial trap: The geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of International Political Economy, 1,* 53–80.

Aguilar, D., and Sánchez, M. (2018). Efectos socioterritoriales de las políticas neoliberales en la agricultura del maíz: El caso del Distrito de Desarrollo Rural Atlacomulco del Estado de México. 1990-2015. In I. Egurrola, y R. Rózga (Coords.), *Dinámica económica y procesos de innovación en el desarrollo regional* (pp. 142-166). Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and Asociación Mexicana de Ciencias para el Desarrollo de Regional.

Arévalo, M. (2016). La reubicación como proceso de desterritorialización. *Política y cultura*, *45,* 153-180.

Arévalo, M. (2020). Reubicación y procesos de territorialización en la Ciudad Rural Sustentable Nuevo Juan del Grijalva. *Íconos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 66,* 81-105.

Badie, B. (1995). *La fin des territoires.* France: Fayard Collection.

Barabas, A. (2003). *Diálogos con el territorio.* Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Barabas, A. (2014). Territorialidad indígena en el México contemporáneo. *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena, 46*(3), 437-452.

Castillo, G. (2017). Migración internacional y cambio en los poblados de origen. *Revista mexicana de sociología, 79*(3), 515-542.

Castillo, G., and Pérez, E. (2019). Procesos de (re)territorialización en localidades campesinas mexicanas en contextos migratorios. *Revista América Latina Hoy, 83,* 129-142.

Delaney, D. (2005). *Territory. A short introduction.* India: Blackwell Publishing.

Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (1995). *Mil platos: capitalismo y esquizofrenia*. São Paulo: Editora 34.

Di Méo, G. (2000). *Géographie sociale et territoires.* Paris: Nathan.

Fernandes, B. (2012). Territorios, Teoría y Política. In G. Calderón y E. León, (Coords.). *Descubriendo la espacialidad social desde América Latina* (pp. 21-51). Mexico City: Ítaca.

Fernandes, B. (2010). Acerca de la tipología de los territorios. En C. Rodríguez (coord.)*, Defensa comunitaria del territorio en la zona central de México. Enfoques teóricos y análisis de experiencias* (pp. 33-56). Mexico City: Juan Pablos Editor.

Fernandes, B. (2009). Territorio, teoría y política. En F. Lozano y J. Ferro, (Eds.), *Las configuraciones de los territorios rurales en el siglo XXI* (pp. 35-50). Bogotá: Pontificia universidad Javeriana.

Fernandes, B. (2005). Movimentos socioterritoriais e movimentos socioespaciais: contribuição teórica para uma leitura geográfica dos movimentos sociais. *Revista Nera*, *8*(6), 14-34.

Fernández, F., and García, A. (2006). *Territorialidad y paisaje en el Altépetl del siglo XVI.* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica / Instituto de Geografía de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica.* Madrid: Akal.

Foucault, M. (2008). *Seguridad, territorio y población.* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

George, P. (2007). *Diccionario de Geografía.* Madrid: Akal.

Giménez, G. (2001). Cultura, territorio y migraciones. Aproximaciones teóricas. *Revista Alteridades, 11*(22), 5-14.

Giménez, G. (2005). Territorio e identidad. Breve introducción a la geografía cultural. *Revista Trayectorias, VII*(17), 8-24.

Gottman, J. (1973). *The significance of territory.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watt, M., and Whatmore, S. (Eds.; 2009). *The Dictionary of Human Geography.* United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Haesbaert, R. (2016). De la multiterritorialidad a los nuevos muros: paradojas contemporáneas de la desterritorialización. *Revista Locale, 1*(1), 119-134.

Haesbaert, R. (2014). Lógica zonal y ordenamiento territorial. *Revista Cultura y Representaciones sociales, 8*(16), 9-29.

Haesbaert, R. (2013). Del mito de la desterritorialización a la multiterritorialidad. *Revista Cultura y Representaciones sociales, 8*(15), 9-42.

Haesbaert, R. (2011). *El mito de la desterritorialización. Del "fin de los territorios" a la multiterritorialidad.* Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Haesbaert, R. (2010). *Región-Global. Dilemas de la región y la regionalización en la Geografía contemporánea.* Argentina: Concejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.

Haesbaert, R. (2007). Território e multiterritorialidade: um debate. *GEOgraphia,* IX(17), 19-46.

Haesbaert, R. (2002). *Territorio-territórios.* Rio de Janeiro: Programa de Pós-Graduacao em Geografía, Universidade Federal Fluminense.

Haesbaert, R. (1997). *Des-territorialização e Identidade: a rede "gaúcha" no Nordeste.* Niterói: Universidade Federal Fluminense.

Hiernaux, D. (2010). *Construyendo la geografía humana.* Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa / Anthropos.

Hiernaux, D., and Lindón, A. (2006). *Tratado de Geografía Humana.* Mexico City: Anthropos Editorial / Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa.

Hiernaux, D., and Lindón, A. (1993). El concepto de espacio y el análisis regional. *Secuencia, 25,* 89-111.

Lozano, F., and Ferro, J. (2009). *Las configuraciones de los territorios rurales en el siglo XXI.* Bogotá: Pontificia universidad Javeriana.

Mayhew, S. (2015). *Dictionary of Geography.* United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space.* London: Sage.

Olguín, S., and Cubillos, F. (2015). Procesos de Desterritorialización / Reterritorialización en el Waj Mapu. *Boletín de Geografía, 35,* 60-87.

Painter, J. (2010). Rethinking territory. *Antipode, 42*(5), 1090-1118.

Paz, M. (2017). Luchas en defensa del territorio. reflexiones desdelos conflictos socio ambientales en México. *Acta Sociológica, 73,* 197-219.

Pérez, M. (2018). De la desterritorialización a la reterritorialización en el acceso, uso y regulación de recursos socioambientales: caso de las provincias de Almeidas y Sabana Centro (Cundinamarca, Colombia). *Revista Eleuthera, 18,* 31-57.

Porto Gonçalves, C. (2009a). Entre América e Abya Yala – tensóes de territorialidades. *Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente, 20,* 25-30.

Porto Gonçalves, C. (2009b). De Saberes y de Territorios: diversidad y emancipación a partir de la experiencia latino-americana. *Polis, Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana,* 8(22), 121-136

Porto Gonçalves, C. (2006). *A Globalização da Natureza e a natureza da globalização.* Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilização Brasileira.

Porto Gonçalves, C. (2001). *Geo-grafías, movimientos sociales, nuevas territorialidades y sustentabilidad.* Mexico City: Siglo XXI.

Pradilla, E. (2011). *Los territorios del neoliberalismo en América Latina.* México: Miguel Ángel Porrúa, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco.

Raffestin, C. (2013). *Por una geografía del poder.* Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán.

Ramírez, B. (2013). De la elegía del espacio a la del territorio. *Economía, Sociedad y Territorio, 43,* 795-803.

Ramírez, B. (2006). Espacio-tiempo en la comprensión del territorio. *Ciudades*, *70,* 3-8.

Ramírez, B., and López, B. (2015). *Espacio, paisaje, región, territorio y lugar: la diversidad en el pensamiento contemporáneo.* Mexico City: Instituto de Geografía, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Xochimilco.

Reyes, M., and López, A. (2012). *Explorando Territorios. Una visión desde las Ciencias Sociales.* Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Xochimilco.

Rodríguez, C. (2015). *Geopolítica del desarrollo local. Campesinas, empresas y gobiernos en la disputa por los territorios y los bienes naturales en el México Rural.* Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Xochimilco / Ítaca.

Rodríguez, C. (2010). *Defensa comunitaria del territorio en la zona central de México. Enfoques teóricos y análisis de experiencias.* Mexico City: Juan Pablos.

Sack, R. (1986). Human Territoriality: A Theory. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 73*(1), 55-74.

Santos, M. (2004a). *Por otra globalización. Del pensamiento único a la conciencia universal.* Bogotá: Edición del Convenio Andrés Bello.

Santos, M. (2004b). *Por uma geografia Nova.* São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 6ª edición.

Santos, M. (2002). O Dinheiro e o Território. En R. Haesbaert, *Territorio-territórios, Rio de Janeiro, Programa de Pós-Graduacao em Geografía* (pp. 9-15). Brazil: Universidad Federal Fluminense.

Santos, M. (1994). *Territorio, Globalização e Fragmentação.* São Paulo: Hucitec.

Sánchez, M., Bocco, G., and Casado, J. M. (2013). *La política de ordenamiento territorial en México: de la teoría a la práctica. Reflexiones sobre sus avances y retos futuros.* Mexico City: Instituto de Geografía y Centro de Investigaciones en Geografía Ambiental, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático.

Sassen, S. (2007). *Una sociología de la globalización.* Buenos Aires: Kast.

Sassen, S. (2010). *Territorio, autoridad y derechos. De los ensamblajes medievales a los ensamblajes globales.* Madrid: Katz Editores.

Scheibling, J. (1994). *Qu´est-ce que la Géographie?* Paris: Hachette.

Storey, D. (2001). *Territory.* Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Téllez, I., and Sánchez, M. (2018). La expansión territorial de la minería mexicana durante el periodo 2000-2017. Una lectura desde el caso del estado de Morelos, *Investigaciones Geográficas, (96).* doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.14350/rig.59607