

TERRITORIOLOGY IN/OF THE PRAXIS?

<https://doi.org/10.4215/rm2022.e21031>

Marcos Saquet ^{a*}

(a) PhD in Geography.

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3435-8428>. **LATTES:** <http://lattes.cnpq.br/5464297116879647>.

Article history:

Received 05 December, 2022

Accepted 10 December, 2022

Published 15 December, 2022

(*) CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Address: UNIOESTE, Rua Maringá, 1.200, CEP: 85605010, Francisco Beltrão (PR), Brazil. Phone: (+55 46) 35204834

E-mail: saquetmarcos@hotmail.com

Abstract

Apparently, it may seem redundant or unnecessary to highlight the need to study the territory, however, this is not just any research we are arguing for. With this, we are, initially, reassuming our territorialist option to, soon after, establish an intimate relationship between the territory and the indigenous, African and peasant cosmologies, trying to contribute to the theoretical, conceptual, methodological and political qualification of a popular territorial science made through participatory-action-research. One of the results noted is the strong link between this theoretical-practical, horizontal, dialogical and reflective perspective with a decolonial and counter-hegemonic territorial conception in the context of university-territory, science-popular knowledge, subject-subject, teaching-research-extension/cooperation relations.

Keywords: Territory, Popular Science, Praxis, Participatory-action-research.

Resumen / Resumo

¿TERRITORIOLOGÍA EN/DE LA PRAXIS?

Aparentemente, puede parecer redundante o innecesario, continuar evidenciando la necesidad del estudio del territorio en la actualidad, sin embargo, no se trata de una investigación cualquiera la que estamos argumentando para su discusión. En este sentido, iniciaremos este trabajo reasumiendo nuestra opción territorialista para, inmediatamente después, establecer una íntima relación entre territorio y las cosmologías indígenas, africanas y campesinas, intentando contribuir a la cualificación teórica, conceptual, metodológica y política de una ciencia territorial popular hecha a través de la investigación-acción-participativa. Así mismo, y como uno de los resultados observados, tenemos la fuerte vinculación de esta perspectiva teórico-práctica, horizontal, dialógica y reflexiva con una concepción territorialológica decolonial y contra-hegemónica en el ámbito de las relaciones universidad-territorio, ciencia-saber popular, sujeto-sujeto, docencia-investigación-extensión/cooperación.

Palabras-clave: Territorio, Ciencia Popular, Praxis, Investigación-acción-participativa.

TERRITORIOLOGIA NA/DA PRÁXIS?

Apresentemente, pode parecer redundante ou desnecessário evidenciar a necessidade de estudar o território, porém, não se trata de qualquer pesquisa a que estamos argumentando. Com isto estamos, inicialmente, reassumindo nossa opção territorialista para, logo em seguida, estabelecer uma íntima relação entre o território e as cosmologias indígenas, africanas e camponesas, tentando contribuir para a qualificação teórica, conceitual, metodológica e política de uma ciência territorial popular feita por meio da pesquisa-ação-participativa. Um dos resultados notados é a forte vinculação dessa perspectiva teórico-prática, horizontal, dialógica e reflexiva com uma concepção territorialológica descolonial e contra-hegemônica no âmbito das relações universidade-território, ciência-saber popular, sujeito-sujeito, ensino-pesquisa-extensão/cooperação.

Palavras-chave: Território, Ciência Popular, Práxis, Pesquisa-ação-participativa.

INTRODUCTION

As we identify, in Brazilian literature through Google Scholar, Longo Filho's work (2022) as the only that mentions the concept of "territoriology", in the international literature, however, there is an interesting relationship of published works, especially written in English and Italian languages. Generally speaking, the understanding of "territoriology" as the science of territories seems to be recurrent, in an attempt to address existing problems, as well as desires and aspirations within the social relationships of each territorial constitution. In this science, there is a focus on the identification and analysis of the "traditions" of interpreting the territory that are carried out in different areas of knowledge - especially European ones - and, at the same time, to describe and understand how different territories are constituted in their multidimensionality.

This is a relational and processual perspective of territory – already well-known in Brazil – which, in turn, contains borders, rhythms, flows, consensuses, hegemonies, complexities, heterogeneities, different scales, etc., characterized, in the words of Andrea Brighenti, as an invitation to understand the territory as a social and relational, material-immaterial, and heterogeneous constitution, with its movements and relationships (BRIGHENTI, 2010, 2013). For further details on this understanding, in addition to the works cited here, see Brighenti and Karrholm (2022), which offer updated and provocative tendencies.

Despite the theoretical and conceptual advancements achieved in this European perspective – which must be acknowledged – we understand that our perspective on problematizing and understanding "territoriology" is different, as we are in a stage where there is a great effort to overcome the "modern" or "post-modern" Eurocentrism, which is usually academicist, universalist, urban-centric, and globalist, as we have described and argued in Saquet (2022). Perhaps a "territoriology" in/of praxis is currently emerging, with us, in Latin America, emanating and qualifying from our knowledge, flavors, colors, cosmologies, ecosystems, and territories, producing more useful knowledge for and with our people.

Therefore, it seems unquestionable to us the importance of the territory understood as an interpretative concept in geographical science and even in other related fields such as sociology, anthropology, and economics. If this concept is relevant, it means, at the very least, that the territory is also understood as a studied reality, that is, it is an object of study, potentially conditioning a categorical conception of the territory. As an analytical category, in our understanding that has been evidenced for at least 22 years, the territory must necessarily assume a well-defined political content in favor of popular and more vulnerable social classes, peasants, artisanal fishermen, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, and so on.

The fact is that once it is assumed as a category, territory has a political meaning, either in favor of hegemony or in favor of counter-hegemony, which we have experienced in our various participatory action research projects (extension understood as cooperation) carried out over 26 years. Therefore, more than a concept, object, and category, territory has been assumed, by us, as a space-time of (in)formation, meeting, debate, participant-research, participatory action, in short, of popular mobilization, struggle, and confrontation in a conception that we consider, boldly, as territorialist of (im)materialized praxis with depth.

Should this reflection be coherent, our "territoriology" necessarily has a theoretical-practical, empirical-reflective content, of territorial immersion and social commitment with the subjects of each project and/or program of participatory action research, therefore, it is directly related to popular and sustainable praxis. It is also directly linked to popular cosmologies – including indigenous peoples – so we believe we can speak of a territory-cosmos composed by cosmos-territories and territories-cosmos. "[...] The constant and infinite rotation constitutes the force capable of uniting in the same shared life with the difference that exists in the universe and in the world [...]" (QUINTERO WEIR, 2021, p. 18). Bodies interact every day, sharing times and spaces: one's own life depends on the other's; social groups and classes condition themselves, simultaneously relating to the nature outside our bodies, cohabiting the Earth-galaxy-universe.

Choosing a historical-critical, relational (trans-multiscalar and transtemporal), and multidimensional conception of the territory, as we have argued over the years, means co-researching, co-teaching, and co-acting with different subjects, for and with them, as we will try to summarize in this text. It means acknowledging that our life is cosmic, where matter and idea are not separate; in fact,

visible matter formed by particles that interact with light enables us to see many things every day; where spirit is material and matter is spiritual (visible and invisible energy) within the intrinsic relationship of earth-solar system-galaxy-cluster of galaxies-universe, also filled with dark energy and matter.

The Earth is our body, and so are the Sun and the universe. Our life-death is energy being consumed that collapses and returns to the cosmos also in the form of energy! Humanity shares its existence with the Earth and the cosmos through the energy that originated life itself, that is, through integrated communication between "heaven and Earth"; without the Sun and the Earth there is no life, without energy and communication in the cosmic space, where universal laws are present, there is no life (RUEDA and RUEDA, 2022).

This means, simultaneously, that the territory-cosmos is life-death-life, therefore, a (vital) heritage for all of us, natural and social, temporal and spatial, singular and universal, containing subjects and knowledge, techniques and technologies, languages and memories, ecosystems, water and soil, vegetation and light, photosynthesis and atomic reactions, etc.

The territory-cosmos-heritage is also a category of analysis, a very complex reality and a potential for social liberation and preservation of nature, which requires from us a profound reflection and action to overcome environmental degradation and contamination, poverty, repression, wealth concentration, and centralization of power. The "depth" lies precisely in the roots of territorial coloniality and decoloniality, indicated and coherently reflected by Kusch (1962), in which the territory, as a heritage of humanity (MAGNAGHI, 2000, 2015; SAQUET, 2015 [2011]; BECATTINI and MAGNAGHI, 2015), needs to be properly looked after, in the present and for the future, without disconnecting it from the past.

The depth of theoretical-practical action-research, horizontal and dialogic, participatory and solidary, is fundamental to revolutionize human sciences such as geography, linking it directly to the resolution of our people's problems. We urgently need to overcome research conceptions that are "only" focused on a certain reality, although often critical, "walking" in a direction oriented towards environmental, contestatory and political-economic liberation movements, reaching a deeper level, working with the subjects of resistance, struggles, confrontations, decoloniality, and political, cultural, economic and environmental counter-hegemonies, as already evidenced in Saquet (2015 [2011], 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d, 2021a, 2021b, 2022).

In this way, as educators and researchers, we shall be within the transtemporal-transterritorial movements of popular struggle and resistance, confrontation and decoloniality; of (im)material and trans-multiscale praxis movements, therefore, reticular and multidimensional (social-natural), made with our direct collaboration, working with the popular, rural and/or urban masses (SAQUET, 2021a).

In this praxis, then, there is territorial involvement, deeply re-signifying the development of "modernity" and "postmodernity" centered on the idea of progress, economic productivity, Baconian-Cartesian-Kantian rational thought, of a single thinking, neoliberalism, etc. The single stories and geographies reveal, as Adichie (2019 [2009]) very well indicates, the power of those who rule and define the history and geography that should be told and taught, of those who establish what is and is not scientifically valid.

In this sense, as we have been referring to for several years in our participatory action research projects, previously called community-based, we have always strived to involve ourselves with the people, contributing directly to removing the oppressive, subordinate, dominating, and predatory involvement, involving the subjects of each project in a field of cooperation and solidarity, of sharing and synergy.

Thus, we co-constructed the involvement itself, the identity, respect, mobilization, struggle, resistance, and territorial confrontation, a process in which there is no social capital, but rather territorial and humanitarian heritage, with its flavors and smells, colors and knowledge.

We are, we exist, and we produce heritage every day, and therefore we need to make them visible, activate them, value them, animate them, and preserve them, directly contributing to the liberation of subjects through shared and community-based processes, communicative and dialogical, with decision-making autonomy and self-management, overcoming the colonizing and oppressive involvement and concealment (SAQUET, 2021b).

THE THEORETICAL AND POLITICAL IN(SUB)VERSION IN A POPULAR TERRITORIAL SCIENCE

The theoretical and political (in)version to build a popular territorial science necessarily requires overcoming Eurocentrism, and to do so, we identify a very fertile territory in Latin America, starting with indigenous, African and peasant cosmologies, about which the literature is vast. So, for our purpose in this text, we think it is necessary to "only" highlight some aspects that are part of the conceptions of nature, society, time and space, as we see, for example, in Reyes' excellent work (2009), according to which indigenous peoples in America conceived the unity of society and nature through their notions of time and space; cosmological times of the movements of the sun, moon, and Earth, with the latter conceived as the "mother" of humans, nourishing them with food and water; the space is directly related to the everyday place, therefore, with the cosmological reproduction of indigenous peoples.

Thus, according to Reyes (2009), an indigenous thought is produced centered upon Man and his rituals integrated into the cosmos, in an intimate relationship between society-nature, divinities-subjects. Each unique place provided families with food and other means to live, such as the rites and myths of each indigenous ethnicity. It seems that there was, rather than a linear time, a conception and daily practice of the simultaneous time, through which one perceived and felt, saw and observed, related and reproduced as nature-cosmology-universe.

Currently, due to different contestatory, critical, and liberation movements that permeate different areas of knowledge, spaces, and times, we can recognize the Mayan and African renaissances, the indigenous thoughts (DUSSEL, 2009; REYES, 2009) mentioned above, as well as the existence of an "indigenous science" (QUINTERO WEIR, 2011). We can also easily identify the existence of "indigenous and peasant intellectuals" as academic subjects who have some intellectual production and social commitment to their community; they need to research in order to revitalize their knowledge (RAMOS, 2020) and "make their communities" through their worldviews, feelings, practices, conflicts, and powers (QUINTERO WEIR, 2021). "What the discovery of African writers did for me was this: it saved me from having a single story about what books are" (ADICHIE, 2019 [2009], p. 14).

Therefore, when we discuss "alternative" research and development methods and processes, we need to have a very clear understanding of what is it that we want and need, and the desires and needs of each individual, family, group, and social class. The "alternative" content cannot camouflage bourgeois, Eurocentric, academic, urban-centric, and globalizing theories, methods, and processes, as these obviously serve bourgeois interests and strategies.

The "alternative" character of a certain process needs to carry the content of territorial praxis, popular, decolonial, and counter-hegemonic confrontation, strengthening relations of solidarity, cooperation, and trust, along with processes of environmental conservation and preservation. That is why we agree with Dussel (1995 [1979]) when he states that philosophy - and geography as well - needs to open itself up to the people, to listen to and interpret them and, at the same time, discuss with the people to participatively and creatively co-produce the revolution of popular classes in a conscious direction, through a popular philosophy (GRAMSCI, 1975 [1929-1932]) that, obviously, is not restricted to philosophy made in universities.

Therefore, we also agree with Hidalgo Flor (2011) in understanding counter-hegemony as an "alternative" form to neoliberalism, with a very clear and well-defined political position in favor of interculturality and indigenous resistance. Counter-hegemony is made with autonomous political consciousness, overcoming economism, articulation between social movements-critical intellectualism-political process, identified by Francisco Hidalgo Flor in indigenous movements through the concept of Sumak Kawsay (buen vivir), the Kichwa cosmovision, through which the struggle is to reproduce the balance of social-nature relations, to meet the needs of the population, respect for diversity, rights of nature, plurinationality and political autonomy.

A discernment about the "alternative" that we also notice in Rueda (2022), in which emancipation and counter-hegemony can occur through the narratives of indigenous peoples, from a decolonial, thinking-feeling, transgressive perspective to guide the critical and emancipatory praxis of their own communities: those who know, narrate, tell, to explain and project their own future. This problematic

was previously highlighted by Barkin (2012), for whom the "alternative" happens whenever individuals of a certain organization - such as indigenous communities - take control of their human, natural, and material resources, reacting to the forces of the global market, valuing solidarity, local knowledge, ecological diversity, and social participation.

This means, at the very least, that self-awareness is essential for self-recognition and political-cultural self-affirmation, for the liberation and autonomy of the oppressed, and to achieve this, it is vital to attack and defeat the colonizer and colonization, as Albert Memmi aptly stated. "The colonial condition cannot be altered except by eliminating the colonial relationship [...] Revolt is the only way out of the colonial situation, and the colonized realize this sooner or later" (MEMMI, 1991 [1957], p. 14).

Therefore, a certain "alternative" process is related to counter-hegemony and decolonization, which in turn means a process aimed at creating a "new man" through the struggle for liberation (FANON, 2005 [1961]), which in our view necessarily involves a revolution in the human sciences. In a subversive and counter-hegemonic territorial praxis, the "wretched" may resurface in a continuous movement of struggle for the liberation of one's own as well as for others, freeing themselves from oppression and colonization, subordination and dependence (FANON, 2005 [1961], 1974).

THEORETICAL-METHODOLOGICAL IN(SUB)VERSION IN A POPULAR TERRITORIAL SCIENCE

A discussion of the lives of people who I do not know and whose situation I am not familiar with is not only a waste of time, but also inhumane and impertinent (FEYERABEND, 2010 [1987], p. 363; emphasis in the original).

In our understanding, the qualitative changes that we identify in the sciences, especially in the humanities, result from theoretical, conceptual, methodological innovations, and a lot of political courage/anchorage in favor of the oppressed other, the colonized, the enslaved, those discriminated against, inferiorized, etc., aspects that still need to be addressed more deeply due to the misery of a large part of the world's population and the serious worsening of contamination and environmental degradation.

One of the concrete-abstract and political-cultural possibilities that we have is based on the knowledge that we have inherited historically and culturally, that is, ancestrally, from indigenous, African, and peasant peoples - as mentioned above - without neglecting other peoples who are also very important, such as Europeans and Asians. This heritage is formed by the multiple histories and memories of each subject-family-place (ADICHIE, 2019 [2009]). Ancestry through which we can co-construct solutions to everyday problems, in a broader movement that results in "popular and own science" (FALS BORDA, 1981, 2006 [1980], 2015 [1970]; BONILLA, CASTILLO, FALS BORDA, and LIBREROS, 1972; CICHOSKI and ALVES, 2019; SAQUET, 2019a, 2019b, 2021b, 2022; SAQUET and BOZZANO, 2020), bringing together tradition and innovation, empiricism and reflection, theory and practice, science, and politics.

We need a way of thinking that is not limited to the ability to process information and use techniques [...]. We must [...] part with the stereotype of the intellectual limited to the handling of the universal accumulation of knowledge (ZEMELMAN, 2011 [2005], p. 278).

In this territory of knowledge, in constant geopolitical, epistemic, cultural, environmental and economic disputes, science and popular knowledge integrated through an appropriate method contribute to generating many of the answers we need daily, favoring the understanding of "the people with their own science" for the defense and satisfaction of their needs (FALS BORDA, 1981; SAQUET, 2018a, 2019a, 2019b, 2022). "Knowledge determines the conditions and possibilities of action, but action also determines the conditions and possibilities of knowledge [...]" (ACOSTA, 2008, p. 98).

Thus, we can co-produce a popular and territorial science in a movement of praxis, simultaneously constructing knowledge, thoughts, and actions through a process of participatory research and action. The co-production of knowledge has the potential to reconfigure power relations, contributing to breaking down the dichotomy between specialized and local knowledge (TORO-MAYORGA and DUPUITS, 2021). When done so, it is a science of the present and future - without disregarding the past - made with the involvement of the researcher, participating within the studied process, teaching and learning, and trying to contribute to a continuous and autonomous demand and struggle in a multidimensional scope (SAQUET, 2021b). Visions of the future are essential to guide the debate and co-creation of solutions to identified, understood, represented, and explained problems.

Such a movement does not forego the "consciousness of place" discussed and practiced territorially in interdisciplinary and interinstitutional teams, with peasants and other citizens, within and outside the university, activating territorialities, colors, flavors, and knowledge, social participation, and solidarity, for the reproduction of the place as a space of coexistence with community relationships and as an antidote to economic globalization (BECATTINI and MAGNAGHI, 2015; SAQUET, 2017, 2019b, 2022; SAQUET and BOZZANO, 2020).

And this territorial reflection-action necessarily requires a lot of courage/anchorage in the time and space of the subjects of each project, in their most urgent needs, in their knowledge and forms of organization, mobilization, and political struggle, promoting reciprocity, synergy, and cooperation. Thus, instead of an individual and objectified subject, there is a social-natural-spiritual-cosmological subject. The aim is to overcome "modern" and "postmodern" fragmentations, as well as the denial of the concrete thinking and creative subject of everyday life, in order to contribute to the achievement of decision-making autonomy.

The guiding principles of research and action are transformed into practices at different scales: family-home, rural or urban landholdings, streets and roads, popular mobilization and training centers, neighborhoods, cities, municipalities, region (trans-multiscalarity), always aiming at valuing the subjects of the countryside and the city. We analyze the current characterization of rural properties, urban lots, and families, establishing goals, actions, required budget, and responsible parties for each activity planned and approved in community assemblies. The regional consumer market for agroecological foods was also analyzed, considering short and preferably direct networks for commercialization, contributing to create and expand ecological and solidary consumption.

Actions of research and cooperation were carried out to strengthen the political-cultural resistance movement and fight against hegemonic agents, as well as to achieve better living conditions. We always evaluate each project carried out to guide future research-action, trying to facilitate the overcoming of the many complex difficulties encountered in the countryside and in the city.

Working at the interface of university-territory, research-action, science-popular knowledge, we have learned that synergies are fundamental, integrating knowledge and techniques, urban and rural subjects, contributing to overcoming the historical separation between science and common sense, intellectualism and popular mass. In this interface or frontier, the creation of learning spaces in each participatory research-action project was very enriching for our political-cultural formation and to inspire farmers and citizens through workshops, courses, technical exchanges, meetings, assemblies, political mobilizations, and promotion of their agroecological productions, among other activities.

In these learning spaces that we create, we clearly perceive the broader perception highlighted by Zemelman (2006 [2003]), as he refers to the "spaces of incorporation of the subject" in the construction of knowledge, where these - the subjects - open themselves to the unprecedented, the unknown, beyond the solutions and concepts already academically established. Listening is fundamental!

Cultural rootedness (in relationships of trust, belonging, and political-territorial recognition) has also proven to be very appropriate for activating and/or improving existing cooperation in local ties and short networks of agroecological production, certification, and commercialization. Thus, popular participation in fields of synergies has been fundamental to valorize the subjects and their knowledge, to stimulate commitments, and to integrate (a)theoretical, academic, and popular knowledge, in a territorial management that we consider dialogical and supportive (SAQUET, 2021a).

This is, paraphrasing Torres Restrepo (1985 [1964]), an "incarnation in humanity", in culture and history, with a popular guiding principle committed to the common good of the oppressed majorities.

Furthermore, it seems clear that one of the conditions for the co-production of knowledge is precisely the identification and valorization of the historical roots of each social group within a certain territory (TORO-MAYORGA and DUPUITS, 2021), a co-production that can very well be carried out through participatory action research (PAR), or in the original formulation in Spanish, IAP [Investigación-Acción-Participativa].

Therefore, PAR reveals itself as a productive method of scientific work (not only research) that involves organizing and driving grassroots social movements as broad fronts of popular classes and different groups committed to structural change. (FALS BORDA, 2012 [1986], p. 139).

The co-production of knowledge that we have been experiencing and learning throughout the years, innovating and adapting, researching-reflecting-doing and doing-reflecting-researching. For instance, see Saquet and Ramírez-Miranda (2021), Canevari (2021), and Silva (2022), among other works, in which we work with the very well-known and established successive research stages in human sciences, while simultaneously incorporating activities to facilitate participatory action research, trying to overcome the long and recurring theoretical, historical, and contextual chapters - in dissertations and theses - to the detriment of the analysis of the object of study. We also resort to the simultaneity of participant research and participatory action to involve the subjects - and ourselves - in research, analysis, and cooperation actions. Obviously, this is not a harmonious and seamless process, on the contrary, it is arduous, complex, slow, and requires a lot of patience and sensitivity from all those involved in each PAR process.

Therefore, we are in(sub)verting theories, references, concepts, and categories, together with the way of researching and producing knowledge. The literature review, which is always necessary, is happening throughout the research, while we collect and analyze secondary data, produce maps (digital and/or social), and collect and analyze primary data (Table 1). The focus of readings is on the central themes of each project; questionnaires are applied by us and by the subjects of each project, who receive our analyses to discuss and contribute: they usually know, popularly, what they do daily. Cooperation actions, as expected in a popular and territorial science made with IAP, are discussed and defined based on the demands of the families and social groups with whom we work.

Table 1 – Examples of different forms of knowledge production. Source: Elaborated by Marcos Saquet, March 2021.

1º. Literature review: Green Revolution around the world	1º. Agroecology in Brazil and in the studied area can be analyzed by comparing it to the Green Revolution
2º. Green Revolution in Brazil	2º. Territory, geographical space (or others concepts), supervising research with primary and secondary data as well as PAR
3º. Agroecology around the world and in Brazil	3º. Agroecology on the space under scrutiny: participatory research
4º. Development at an international level	4º. Agroecology and the activation of territorialities: participatory research
5º. Territory, geographical space and others concepts	5º. Suggestions toward territorial management of the involvement
6º. Documental research	6º. Reports or pedagogical notebooks specific to each subject and institution can be produced
7º. Collection, processing and analysis of secondary data	---
8º. Collection, processing and analysis of primary data etc.	---
9º. Concluding remarks	---

As we work within the scope of interdisciplinarity and multidimensionality, and given the complexity of the problems usually identified, we always define priorities for short, medium, and long-term actions. These actions complement each other over time and space, among the different dimensions of life in society and nature. This process obviously nourishes self-organization, awareness of place, social participation, political commitment, levels of commitment in the university-territory relationship, integration of science-popular knowledge, and, at the same time, the participatory research process and the writing of a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation (Table 2).

Table 2 – The process and coexistence in PAR. Source: Elaborated by Marcos Saquet, March 2021.

Bibliographic and documental research			Reflection-action
	secondary dice	primary dice	Reflection-action
Conversation	Questionnaires and/or interviews	Interviews Digital cartography	Reflection-action
Discussion	Participatory research: workshops, social cartography, living together, etc.		Participatory action: Action- reflection-action

Methodological and conceptual versatility is then fundamental, combined with the objectives and goals of each participatory action research project, in the face of a fleeting and uncertain socio-natural-cosmological reality, diffuse and amorphous, ephemeral and lasting, revealing and rhythmic, unknown and known, (a)theoretical, (meta)physical, objective and subjective. Such reality seems to be elusive and deprived of the possibility of reordering power relations – towards social justice and environmental conservation – through universalizing, globalizing, evolutionist, economic and urban-centered theories and methods, whether “modern” or “postmodern”.

The imperial subject of global capitalism remains concealed behind the market’s rationality and metanarratives, naturalizing transnational relations and processes as if they were normal and necessary for everyone (ACOSTA, 2008; SAQUET, 2022). The “alternatives” to neoliberalism do not exist for bourgeois intellectuals, except, obviously, for the immersion in long networks in a market that has become an utopia and a fetish to be achieved by everyone. Perhaps “another globalization” (SANTOS, 2008 [2000]) is not possible moving from a single thought to an “universal consciousness” without a(n) (im)materially deep-seated change co-produced with our people. It seems that Fals Borda (2000) is right when he claims that many national policy failures stem from an ignorance of territorial identities in favor of imperial influences. Incidentally, telling others what needs to be done, based on research done without ever leaving the premises of the university, is a hypocritical and vulgar way of mocking the suffering of others. What we have noticed is that both “modern” and “postmodern” researchers have reduced unique social groups’ knowledge and perpetuated themselves as hegemonic, thus silencing and erasing the knowledge of traditional communities (RAMOS, 2020; SAQUET, 2022). There are still many who argue toward the alleged neutrality of science and the researcher, perpetuating themselves – incredibly – as “useful idiots”, in the words of Camilo Torres Restrepo!

The typical Western intellectuals are persons who don’t get their hands and feet dirty. Many of them speak from the top of their chairs, teaching what they have read or the conclusions they have reached from their highly people-sanitized laboratories, but not about what they live (RAMOS, 2020, p. 138).

It is therefore extremely necessary to research-act-reflect in depth upon/at territorial singularities, with action-reflection-action, with commitment and social-territorial immersion, horizontality and dialogue, co-generating specific solutions for localized problems, and universal solutions for global problems, co-producing theories, concepts and methods for and with our people.

A TERRITORIOLGY IN/OF PRAXIS?

By working in the way we have alluded to here, we may be contributing to build an effectively decolonial and counter-hegemonic conception within the scope of university-territory, science-popular knowledge, subject-subject, teach-research-outreach relations, as well as to silently produce a revolution in the forms and contents of knowledge, permeating undergraduate and postgraduate courses. The popular territorial praxis can and must occur inside as well as outside the universities, co-creating a political-cultural-environmental revolution to benefit the simplest and humblest people, substantiating a territorial praxis linked to the different subjects of each territory and place, in time and in space.

Through our (im)materialized praxis over the years, we believe that we are collaborating towards the political-cultural-environmental qualification of an (Im)material Geography of popular and decolonial territorial praxis (SAQUET, 2021a) or a popular territorial Geography, rooted in place, made preferably with the people, also named as Geography (a)effectively community and vicinal (SAQUET, 2021b).

Any thought that is not committed to historical reality, which is the only reality we have been given to live in, is a sophistic thought, inauthentic and that stands in solidarity with the status quo, with the domination and murder of the poor (DUSSEL, 2017 [1973], p. 12; emphasis in the original).

Through a geography oriented towards popular praxis, we can generate co-created, shared, debated and reflected solutions. The participation occurs from data collection and analysis, through discussion of method and techniques, concepts and objectives, on to planning and carrying out actions aimed at territorial involvement and commitment, with a lot of reflective empiricism and territorial anchoring. Thus, it is not inappropriate to mention that Torres Restrepo (1985 [1967]) had already indicated that the social sciences became inductive, highlighting the “irrefutability of facts”, the natural-“supernatural” unity and Man as an “integrated reality” from the standpoint of both matter and spirit. This is a (im)material reality, as we have already stated on other occasions, in which the feeling is in us and in the other, in the everyday experience made with sensitivity, living and cooperating with the other, participating from within their life, living in the same world.

And this really seems to be indeed one of the conditions for advancing qualitatively in knowing-making-knowing aimed at the lives of the most humble and vulnerable people: knowledge takes place along the “walk” of the world, among us, on a daily basis, from the places whence one thinks and feels: “Thus, according to the very logic of *añuu* feeling-thinking, *eirare* is the place from where we see and feel with the spirit, with our heart” (QUINTERO WEIR, 2021, p. 10). Sight, observation, reasoning and feeling happen together in thought – which is obviously not restricted to the university – and, as such, we can see what is not visible, perceive what we do not see, understand what we do not hear, as occurs between the indigenous Kichwas from Ecuador when referring to *Pacha-Kawsay*, which means space-time, world, existence, knowledge lived and experienced by themselves (QUINTERO WEIR, 2021).

Feeling-thinking and co-acting/cooperating, in teaching, research and outreach, inside and outside the university, can bring about a revolution in the production of knowledge and its use for the common good. Moreover, this can happen in our undergraduate and graduate courses! The other needs to be conceived as a “living and active subject, subject of knowledge”, contributing to break the perpetuation of “modern” and “post-modern” paradigms (ACOSTA, 2008). Finally, yet far from concluding this reflection, we must ask our eventual readers: Are we headed in the direction of a “territoriology” in/of praxis? Perhaps, in this perspective, lies the life-energy of the future “territoriology” in/of praxis, theoretical-practical, scientific-popular, participatory and cooperative, decolonial and counter-hegemonic. How can we, in fact, build a more humane, “counter-rational”, solidary, politicized world, in short, a “new civilization”, as advocated by Milton Santos?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank attentively the important comments made by Prof. João Osvaldo Nunes, as he helped us

deepen some fundamental questions such as IAP. We are also grateful to the financial support extended by CNPq (productivity scholarship, PQ 2) and Araucária Foundation (Paraná) - the latter through its Novos Arranjos de Pesquisa e Inovação (NAPI) funding program.

REFERENCES

ACOSTA, Yamandú. *Filosofía latinoamericana y democracia en clave de derechos humanos*. Montevideo: Editorial Nordan-Comunidad, 2008.

ADICHIE, Chimamanda Ngozi. *O perigo de uma história única*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2019 [2009].

BARKIN, David. Communities constructing their own alternatives in the face of crisis, *Mountain Research and Development*, n. 32, 2012, p. 11-22.

BECATTINI, Giacomo. *Ritorno al territorio*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2009.

BECATTINI, Giacomo e MAGNAGHI, Alberto. *Coscienza di classe e coscienza di luogo*. In: BECATTINI, G. (Org.). *La coscienza dei luoghi*. Roma: Donzelli, 2015. p. 115-222.

BONILLA, Victor; CASTILLO, Gonzalo; FALS BORDA, Orlando; LIBREROS, Augusto. *Causa popular, ciencia popular*. Bogotá: Publicaciones de La Rosca, 1972.

BRIGHENTI, Andrea Mubi. On territorology: towards a general science of territory, *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 27, n. 1, 2010, p. 52-72.

BRIGHENTI, Andrea Mubi. *Teoria dei territori*, *Scienza & Politica*, vol. 25, n. 48, 2013, p. 175-183.

BRIGHENTI, Andrea e KARRHOLM, Mattias. *Territories, environments, politics. Explorations in territoriology*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2022.

CANEVARI, Tomás. *Disputas de sentidos y reconfiguración de lo social a partir de la inundación de 2013 en un barrio popular de La Plata. Comunicación, ciudad y procesos de transformación*. La Plata, tesis de doctorado (Doctorado en Comunicación), Universidad Nacional de La Plata, 2021.

CICHOSKI, Pâmela e ALVES, Adilson. A pesquisa-ação na obra de Orlando Fals Borda: contribuições para repensar o desenvolvimento rural, *Revista Campo-Território*, vol. 14, n. 34, 2019, p. 61-85.

DUSSEL, Enrique. *Introducción a la filosofía de la liberación*. Bogotá: Ed. Nueva América, 1995 [1979].

DUSSEL, Enrique. *Introducción*. In: DUSSEL, E.; MENDIETA, E.; BOHÓRQUEZ, C. (Org.). *El pensamiento filosófico latinoamericano, del Caribe y “latino” [1300-2000]*. México, DF: Siglo XXI Editores, CREFAL, 2009. p. 15-20.

DUSSEL, Enrique. *Para una ética de la liberación latinoamericana – Tomo 1*. México, DF: Siglo XXI Ed., 2017 [1973].

FALS BORDA, Orlando. *La ciencia y el pueblo*. In: GROSSI, F.; GIANOTTEN, V.; WIT, T. (Org.). *Investigación participativa y praxis rural*. Lima: Mosca Azul, 1981. p. 19-47.

FALS BORDA, Orlando. *El territorio como construcción social*. In: FALS BORDA, O. *Acción y espacio. Autonomías en la nueva República*. Bogotá: IEPRI, 2000.

FALS BORDA, Orlando. *Aspectos teóricos da pesquisa participante: considerações sobre o significado e o papel da ciência na participação social*. In: BRANDÃO, C. R. (Org.). *Pesquisa participante*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2006 [1980]. p. 42-62.

FALS BORDA, Orlando. *Primera lección: saber interactuar y organizarse*. In: HERRERA FARFÁN, N. y LÓPEZ GUZMÁN, L. (Org.). *Ciencia, compromiso y cambio social. Textos de Orlando Fals Borda*. Buenos Aires: El Colectivo – Lanzas y Letras – Extensión Libros, 2012 [1986]. p. 123-141.

- FALS BORDA, Orlando. Hacia el socialismo raizal y otros escritos. In: Orlando Fals Borda – Socialismo raizal y el ordenamiento territorial. Bogotá: Ed. Desde Abajo, 2013 [2007]. p. 35-136.
- FALS BORDA, Orlando. La crisis, el compromiso y la ciencia. In: _____. Una sociología sentipensante para América Latina. Cidade do México: Siglo Veintiuno; CLACSO, 2015 [1970]. p. 219-252.
- FANON, Frantz. Os condenados da terra. Juiz de Fora: Editora UFJF, 2005 [1961].
- FANON, Frantz. Dialéctica de la liberación. Buenos Aires: Pirata, 1974.
- FEYERABEND, Paul. Adeus à razão. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2010 [1987].
- FREIRE, Paulo. Pedagogia do oprimido. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011 [1974].
- FREIRE, Paulo. Pedagogia da autonomia. Saberes necessários à prática educativa. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011 [1996].
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. Quaderni del carcere, vol. I (1929-1932). Turim: Einaudi, 1975.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. Quaderni del carcere, vol. III (1932-1935). Turim: Einaudi, 1975.
- HIDALGO FLOR, Francisco. Buen vivir, sumak kawsay: aporte contrahegemónico del proceso andino, Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana, vol. 16, n. 53, 2011, p. 85-94.
- KUSCH, Rodolfo. América profunda. Rosario, Argentina: Editorial Fundación Ross, 1962.
- LONGO FILHO, Fernando. Brasília: Direito do território, cartografia jurídica e arranjos institucionais. São Paulo: Editora Dialética, 2022.
- MAGNAGHI, Alberto. La lunga marcia del ritorno al territorio. In: BECATTINI, G. (Org.). La coscienza dei luoghi. Roma: Donzelli, 2015. p. VII-XVI.
- MEMMI, Albert. The colonizer and the colonized. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991 [1957].
- QUINTERO WEIR, José. Wopukaru Jatumi Wataawai: el camino hacia nuestro propio saber, Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana, ano 16, n. 54, 2011, p. 93-116.
- QUINTERO WEIR, José. Conocer desde el sentipensar indígena – teoría y práctica del conocimiento para la vida. Universidad Autónoma Indígena, Guadalajara, México, 2021.
- RAMOS, Antonio Dari. Alcances e desafios teórico-metodológicos da epistemologia decolonial: intelectuais indígenas e camponeses no centro do debate. In: KNAPP, Cássio; MARSCHNER, Walter (Org.). Educação e territorialidade. Dourados, MS: Editora UEMS, 2020. p. 112-145.
- REYES, Luis Alberto. El pensamiento indígena en América. Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2009.
- RUEDA, Eduardo. Orígenes y trayectorias de la humanidad: narraciones originarias y emancipación. In: RUEDA, Eduardo et. At. (Org.). Retornar al origen: narrativas ancestrales sobre humanidad, tiempo y mundo. Buenos Aires: CLACSO; Montevideo: UNESCO, 2022. p. 17-22.
- RUEDA, Eduardo y RUEDA, Nicolás. Un techo entretejido: memoria del origen y porvenir. In: RUEDA, Eduardo et. At. (Org.). Retornar al origen: narrativas ancestrales sobre humanidad, tiempo y mundo. Buenos Aires: CLACSO; Montevideo: UNESCO, 2022. p. 127-148.
- SANTOS, Milton. Por uma outra globalização: do pensamento único à consciência universal. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2008 [2000].
- SAQUET, Marcos. Consciência de classe e de lugar, práxis e desenvolvimento territorial. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Consequência, 2017.
- SAQUET, Marcos. A perspective of counter-hegemonic analysis and territorial transformation, Geographica Helvetica, v. 73, p. 347 - 355, 2018a.

SAQUET, Marcos. A descoberta do território e outras premissas do desenvolvimento territorial, *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, v. 20, n. 3, 2018b, p. 479 - 505.

SAQUET, Marcos. Ciência popular e contra-hegemonia no desenvolvimento. In: CURY, M.; MAGNAMI, E e CARVALHO, R. (Org.). *Ambiente e território: abordagens e transformações sociais*. Londrina: Madreperóla, 2019a. p. 33-49.

SAQUET, Marcos. *Saber popular, práxis territorial e contra-hegemonia*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Consequência, 2019b.

SAQUET, Marcos. O conhecimento popular na práxis territorial: uma possibilidade para trabalhar com as pessoas, *AGEI - Geotema, Suplemento* 2019c, p. 5-16.

SAQUET, Marcos. O território: a abordagem territorial e suas implicações nas dinâmicas de desenvolvimento, *Informe Gepec*, v. 23, 2019d, p. 25-39.

SAQUET, Marcos. Praxis in territorial counter-hegemonic development: other paradigms of research and participatory action. In: GRIGNOLI, D. e BORTOLETTO, N. (Org.). *Dal locale al globale e ritorno: nuovi paradigmi e nuovi modelli di azione*. Milano: Franco Angeli, 2019d. p. 61-75.

SAQUET, Marcos. Uma Geografia (i)material voltada para a práxis territorial popular e descolonial, *Revista NERA*, vol. 24, n. 57, 2021a, p. 54-78.

SAQUET, Marcos. O território numa perspectiva popular. In: MEURER, Ane Carine et al. (org.). *As categorias e as geografias do século XXI*. São Paulo: FFLCH, 2021b. p. 152-196.

SAQUET, Marcos. Singularidades: um manifesto a favor da ciência territorial popular feita na práxis descolonial e contra-hegemônica. Rio de Janeiro. Editora Consequência, 2022.

SAQUET, Marcos e BOZZANO, Horacio. Territory conceptions and practices in Latin America: contributions to the debate (I), *Revista Continentes*, ano 9, n. 16, 2020, p. 257-281.

SAQUET, Marcos e RAMÍREZ-MIRANDA, César. The Transversal and Territorial Praxis of Regional Development. In: Mishra, M. et al. (ed.). *Regional Development Planning and Practice*. Singapore: Springer Nature, 2021. p. 10-33.

SILVA, Luis Fabiano. *Práxis territorial e contra-hegemônica: uma experiência de investigação-ação-participativa no Quilombo Bom Sucesso, Mata Roma, MA*. Tese (Doutorado em Geografia), Universidade Estadual do Centro-Sul, Unicentro, 2022.

TORO-MAYORGA, Lorena y DUPUITS, Emile. Coproduciendo el desarrollo territorial: estrategias público-comunitarias por el agua y los alimentos en Imbabura, Ecuador, *Eutopía*, n. 19, 2021, p. 157-174.

TORRES RESTREPO, Camilo. El hombre bidimensional. In: Camilo Torres Restrepo – escritos, Bogotá, 1985 [1967], p. 43-46.

TORRES RESTREPO, Camilo. Responsabilidad del cristiano en la planificación económica. In: Camilo Torres Restrepo – escritos, Bogotá, 1985 [1964], p. 61-67.

ZEMELMAN, Hugo. Sujeito e sentido. Considerações sobre a vinculação do sujeito ao conhecimento que constrói. In: SOUSA SANTOS, B. (Org.). *Conhecimento prudente para uma vida decente*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006 [2003]. p. 457-468.

ZEMELMAN, Hugo. La premisa de la conciencia histórica. In: ZEMELMAN, H. *Configuraciones críticas. Pensar epistémico sobre la realidad*. México, DF: Siglo XXI/CCREAAMC, 2011 [2005], p. 273-290.

Author's Affiliation

Marcos Saquet - Professor at the State University of West Paraná, Francisco Beltrão (PR), Brazil.

Authors' Contribution

Marcos Saquet - The author elaborated the entire text.

Editors in Charge

Alexandra Maria Oliveira
Alexandre Queiroz Pereira