TERRITORY, TERRITORIALIZATION, AND TERRITORIALITY: A PROPOSAL OF AN ADVANCE OF THEORETICAL KEYS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE DYNAMICS OF CITIES

TERRITÓRIO, TERRITORIALIZAÇÃO E TERRITORIALIDADE: PROPOSTA DE AVANÇO DE CHAVES TEÓRICAS PARA A ANÁLISE DA(S) DINÂMICA(S) DAS CIDADES

Mateus Pires Martins[1]
Priscilla Borgonhoni Chagas[2]

Abstract

The present work aims to present possibilities of analysis of the territorial dynamics (s) of cities based on theoretical keys that combine categories such as affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction. To this end, a theoretical debate is presented and it investigates the articulation of territorialization (the process of appropriation and domination, concrete or symbolic) and territorialities (identification and belonging, material or symbolic, of people with the territory) of social actors, with the proposed theoretical keys. Strong discussions on the subject of territory have been held in several areas of study, which have contributed to the understanding of the transformations of urban space in territories, as a result of social relations, within the dynamics of the city. It is intended to propose a theoretical advance in the territorial approach that can subsidize and contribute to the discussions and analyzes of this important field of study. The proposal presented here aims to expand possibilities of new perspectives on the organization and management of cities.

Keywords: Territory. Power. Resistance. Contradiction. Segregation.

Resumo

O presente trabalho tem por objetivo apresentar possibilidades de análise da(s) dinâmica(s) territorial(is) das cidades a partir de chaves teóricas que conjugam categorias como afeto, poder, segregação, resistência e contradição. Para tal, é apresentado um debate teórico que investiga a articulação da territorialização (processo de apropriação e dominação, concreta ou simbólica) e das territorialidades (identificação e pertencimento, materiais ou simbólicos, das pessoas com o território) dos atores sociais, com as chaves teóricas propostas. Discussões pujantes sobre a temática

---

[1] Master in Business Administration student at the State University of Maringá, Maringá - PR, Brazil. Email: mateus_pires@hotmail.com

[2] PhD in Administration from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Professor at the State University of Maringá, Maringá - PR, Brazil. Email: priscillabchagas@gmail.com

território vem sendo realizadas em diversas áreas de estudo, as quais têm contribuído para a compreensão das transformações do espaço urbano em territórios, fruto das relações sociais, dentro da dinâmica da cidade. Pretende-se propor um avanço teórico na abordagem territorial que possa subsidiar e contribuir nas discussões e análises desse importante campo de estudos. A proposta aqui apresentada visa a ampliar possibilidades de novos olhares sobre a organização e gestão das cidades.

Palavras-Chave: Território. Poder. Resistência. Contradição. Segregação.

Introduction

Studies on the territory have gained strength due to spatial transformations that reflect the political, economic, symbolic, and cultural relations, revealed in the daily plots of individuals in the city (FERREIRA, 2014). The city, which is studied and problematized in different ways from interdisciplinary discussions, is also a traditional object of investigation by professionals from the most diverse areas of knowledge. Thus, the dynamics of the city comprises two sides, meaning that it can be assimilated through its spatial and functional organization, such as its formal management, organizational practices, and its physical and territorial configuration. Therefore, the city can be understood not only as a space with clearly defined borders but as a territory with multiple territories that reveal relations marked by power.

According to Haesbaert (2004), the concept of territory is one of the main ones adopted to understand the relationship between society and its space and, in this perspective, the understanding of the city as a territory (or as a set of multiple territories) allows to analyze its spatial and social connections and to treat it as spaces for social relations and conflicts between the various agents that are part of it.

In this opportunity, the discussion that follows proposes a theoretical debate on how the contribution of the territory allows an articulated argumentation by the theoretical keys of affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction. The entire discussion is mediated by these theoretical keys that are connected to the concept of territory and allow a wide analysis of the processes of appropriation and domination of urban spaces.

It is assumed here that the territory is the result of the action of the social actors, who dominate and appropriate the spaces, transforming them into the territory, which occurs due to the power relations between the social actors (HAESBAERT, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2007a). By inhabiting a space and becoming aware of it, people transform the space into a territory (HAESBAERT, 2007).

Haesbaert (1994, 2004, 2005, 2007a) argues that the territory involves both materiality and symbolism. Therefore, the territory is understood as a delimited and controlled space that is full of identity and representative appropriations. "The territory, immersed in relations of domination and/or appropriation [...] unfolds along a *continuum* that goes from the most concrete and functional domination to the most subjective appropriation" (HAESBAERT, 2004a, p. 95-96). Both, in any situation, are related to a power relationship, from the most explicit domination to the most implicit appropriation (HAESBAERT, 2005).

Saraiva, Carrieri, and Soares (2014) argue that no territorialization process is neutral. Social relationships are not exempt, on the contrary, they have intentionality and therefore, spatial configurations differ according to the social groups that dominate them (ARAÚJO, 2010; FERNANDES, 2005; FISCHER, 2010). As stated by Haesbaert (2007a, p. 23), "power relations have an inseparable component in space, both in the performance of functions and in the production of meanings".

When an individual occupies a certain space, he develops domination actions in that space, in other words, one transforms it into a territory and dominates it. These territorial behaviors of the social actors used to build, communicate, maintain, and restore the territory, clashes with the actions and strategies of other actors, in different power and resistance relationships (COIMBRA; SARAIVA, 2013; FISCHER, 2010; RAFFESTIN, 1993).

It is up to the social actors to become aware of the world in which they were inserted to understand how the territory affects them. That means understanding how the (im)materialities of the territory influence (affect) social actors, excluding or keeping them in the territory. This

category becomes very evident in the definition of territory given by Haesbaert (2007) when affirming that when inhabiting a space and becoming aware of it, people transform spaces into a territory. The (im)materiality can affect to the extent that it constrains people who cannot adjust themselves to the standards, at the same time that it accommodates those who identify with the territory.

Social actors redefine spaces by granting them identity and characteristics of belonging. Therefore, the forms of power intrinsic to social relations, in addition to the economic and political dimensions, also involve subjective, identity, affective, symbolic, and cultural ties (ALCADIPANI; ALMEIDA, 2000; FISCHER, 2010; HAESBAERT, 1997; MAC-ALLISTER, 2003; PEREIRA; CARRIERI, 2005; PICHETH; CHAGAS, 2018; SARAIVA; CARRIERI; SOARES, 2014).

There are interests of the dominant groups in a territory in guaranteeing the cohesion of practices and identities (HAESBAERT, 2009; 2012). The social actors take ownership of a space (territorialize it) through alliances, seeking to promote consumption, control the space, and also other social groups (HAESBAERT, 2012). This action segregates and opens up the city's contradictions.

As a result, when affected by the capitalist hegemony (HONORATO; SARAIVA, 2016; IPIRANGA, 2010; VIEGAS; SARAIVA, 2015), social actors systematize these affections into power, resistance, and segregation. When territories embarrass people (affect them), "telling them" that they are not "adequate" for that location, social actors through their powers, resist, fight. They create subversive practices, contradictory to the resistances imposed by occupying alternative territories, which are cracks in this homogenization (HONORATO; SARAIVA, 2016; PAULO, 2019; SOUZA, 2010). These are the cases of invasions, favelas, activisms, and social movements, which use territorialization to occupy and control spaces as a form of resistance to hegemonic powers (ROLNIK, 1995; SOUZA, 2009, 2010).

The territorialization of spaces, taken as territories, represents the contradictions and conflicts of social relations, through the forces and powers of the agents. This action segregates and divides those who can and those who cannot attend certain territories, segregating space through economic, political, and social differentiation (CARLOS, 2007a). There are some examples like the processes of hygiene and revitalization, which occur with extreme violence and segregate everything that does not match the hegemonic interests (SOUZA, 2010).

The cities become real territories, sustained by power relations between social actors and through city spaces that are appropriated concretely and symbolically by agents (HAESBAERT, 2009). All of this segregates and excludes the less fortunate to spaces far from urban centers, and what is left to them is the resistance to occupy alternative territories (PAULO, 2019).

In cities, this territorial separation is not only material and bounded by borders, but a mixture of spatial and representative dimensions. As a component of territories, territoriality controls, separates, and distinguishes individuals through identity (HAESBAERT, 2004). The institution of a society of the spectacle, where people buy more for symbolic representation than for functionality, confirms how territorial symbolism invades social relations in identities and representations, using discourses shaped according to the interests of the hegemonic classes to privilege few (BRETAS; SARAIVA, 2013; HAESBAERT, 2007).

By studying the processes of territorialization in the city, one can understand who is and who is not in certain territories and how the hegemonic classes appropriate themselves in certain spaces. And it is from these dilemmas and social problems which are results from the territorialization processes that one can understand the actions in which the territory is undertaken (HAESBAERT, 2009).

Therefore, this study assumes that the city is unequal, segregated, and contradictory, in which the urban space is marked by the struggle, resistance, and dispute of different social agents. The rejected resist to the imposed segregations through alternative ways of occupation, while the dominant actors resist the new ways that put their control at risk. It also comes from the conception that territory, territorialization, and territoriality, happen due to the social relations full of affective, identity, symbolic, political, economic, cultural, material, and immaterial powers.

By debating here in an introductory way the systematization of the concepts of territory, it is possible to notice how the theoretical keys of affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction are shown explicitly or implicitly in the argumentation. The social actors are affected by the territories, and they dispute it through the relations of power, in resistance between the actors. It is the action that marks the contradiction of social relations and confirms spatial segregation.

Thus, the present study aims to present possibilities for analyzing the territorial dynamics of the cities based on theoretical keys that combine categories such as affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction. Therefore, it is intended to discuss possibilities for analyzing the territorial dynamics of cities based on the mediation of the theoretical keys and categories mentioned above.

The current research is justified by the connection of the hegemonic dynamics of the city, its dilemmas, and problems, which result from the processes of territorialization (HAESBAERT, 2009). Cities are organizations made up of several organizations, in other words, the city is a large territory, made up of several territories, full of power, contradictions, affections, symbolisms, resistances, segregations, and representations.

Therefore, this study proposes to expand possibilities of new perspectives on the organization and management of cities by discussing the antitheses and contradictions of the city in its territorial dynamics, through territorializations and territorialities. The discussion proposed here is strictly theoretical, however, it may serve as support for empirical analyzes of future studies that are based on the concept of territory. The present study is structured in three sections, besides this introduction. In the next section, the concepts of territory, territorialization, and territoriality are discussed. In the third section, the debates on territory, affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction are articulated with the concepts previously debated. In the fourth part, there are the final considerations of the study.

Territory, Territorialization, and territoriality

The origin of the word territory may come from two paths. It may come from the Latin *territorium* that derives from the word land, meaning legal and political domination of land use. But it also has a relationship with *terreo / territor* (terror / terrorize), referring to the domination, imposition, terror, fear of hegemonic agents above those hegemonized, in the privilege of using the territory through appropriation (ALMEIDA, 2014; FERREIRA, 2014; HAESBAERT, 2005, 2007; OLIVEIRA et al., 2019).

The concept includes dynamism, contradictions, power relations, identities, affection, circulation, and communication networks (ANDRADE, 1998; FERREIRA, 2014; OLIVEIRA et al., 2019; PICHETH; CHAGAS, 2018; SAQUET, 2007, 2010, 2013; SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). The definition of territory changed from the reflections on power relations, when there was an overcoming of the so-called classical geography (SAQUET, 2009, 2015).

Claude Raffestin (1993) was very important during this period, and power was the background of his concept. His work, influenced by the discussions brought by Foucault (1979), treats the territory as a form of relational power. In addition to the tangible and concrete dimension, the territory is also linked to a force field that projects into space at different scales as home, work, neighborhood, city, region, or country (RAFFESTIN, 1993).

To Raffestin (1993), the actors are endowed with a relational power where their production strategies collide with each other, in other words, the territory is not only that one with borders provided by the state, in a power that comes from the top to bottom, but an inter-spatial territory of power. A disciplinary power, which comes from microphysical relations from the sides, the bottom, the top, by the margins of the state, or different degrees, moments, and places (AMBROZIO, 2013).

Rogério Haesbaert (1994) is a Brazilian author who, influenced by the premises of Raffestin (1993), develops an important theoretical contribution about the territory. He exposes a conception of territory in an integrative approach. The author understands the territory as a hybrid of material and idealistic dimensions, involving cultural and political aspects. For him, power relations are essentially established in social relations, so the social relations condition and constitute the territory (HAESBAERT, 1994).

By inhabiting a space and becoming aware, social actors transform it into a territory (HAESBAERT, 2007), so the territory comprises both identification and appropriation (ANDRADE, 1998, CARA, 1998). It is necessary to understand, therefore, that this awareness of social actors is directly related to affection. Haesbaert (1997) himself defends the affective character of the territories. Social actors are affected by capitalist hegemony (HONORATO; SARAIVA, 2016; IPIRANGA, 2010; VIEGAS; SARAIVA, 2015), and when being affected, they systematize these affections into power, resistance, and segregation. In other words, social actors are influenced (affected) by (im)materialities and are aware by appropriating/remaining or excluding themselves from a given territory.

The action of social actors takes place in the city. There is material segregation, full of meanings, which is a consequence of these appropriations of city spaces. There is the neighborhood of mansions, the bohemian, the industrial, the proletarian, the gated communities, the places with adequate infrastructure, and the spaces of resistance (ROLNIK, 1995). Therefore, the occupation of the city is territorial. This means that the territory is both functional and symbolic, given the concomitance of the fulfillment of functions and symbolic production, that is, the construction of the territory is surrounded by symbolism and cultural relations (HAESBAERT, 2004, 2007), which directly affect the social actors.

When considering, besides political domination/appropriation, the symbolic domination/appropriation too, Haesbaert (2004) strengthens the debate about the role of identity and affective production in the territories. The territory is confirmed as a dynamic element, full of complementary dimensions, and not just as a cultural stage (VALE, SAQUET; SANTOS, 2005). As Haesbaert (2004) stated, the territory is a mixture of spatiality, social relations, representations, power, movement, and fluidity, therefore, it is important to do an integrative reading of the domain and appropriation relations.

The territory is surrounded by relational powers that are incorporated in it by the social agents involved (HAESBAERT, 2005). Relational power depends directly on the spatial and symbolic organization (SOUZA, 1995). Thus, the relational territory is not only constituted of historical and social relations but also the complex relationship between the social and material. Also, as defended by Haesbaert (2004), considering only relational or material aspects reduces to a simplistic view of territory, falling into the mistake of considering only stability, delimitation, borders, or just the movement and flow.

The territory involves both spatial and concrete dimensions of social relations, as well as the representations about the space that gives it fluidity and movement (HAESBAERT, 2004). Thus, it is possible to notice that spatial power relations are also producers of identity and somehow affect, segregate, classify, separate, control, and distinguish individuals and social groups (HAESBAERT, 2004).

The point is that, like Haesbaert (2009), it is necessary to understand that most territorialization processes within capitalism favor the spectacle and consumption society, full of materialities and symbolisms. The territory is, therefore, a politically structured and appropriated domain (materially and symbolically) by interest groups, which through alliances, act, control, and segregate other social groups (HAESBAERT, 2012).

It is from the problematic involved in the territorialization processes, that the dilemmas and actions in which the territory is undertaken can be understood (HAESBAERT, 2009). As Souza (1995) proposes, more than the geographical characteristics, what is produced, or what are the identities of the social group and its territory (these items are still important to the author), it is to discuss "who dominates or influences and how one dominates or influences that space? [...] who dominates or influences who in that space, and how?" (SOUZA, 1995, p. 78-79).

The understanding of the processes of territorialization allows us to understand who is in the territories and who is not, makes it possible to understand the segregation and contradiction of the city, allows us to understand who appropriates and dominates these spaces, and mainly, how the urban dynamics "accepts" certain people in some spaces and removes others. One can think of the city from this point of view, seeking to understand how the hegemonic classes feel affected and become aware that they are a distinct category to appropriate themselves of the city spaces.

The agents of the territory want cohesion of identities and practices through the appropriation and political ordering, however, there is a (dis)(re)territorializing character of the flows and circulation networks, which, when segregating, open space for new forms of occupation of the city (HAESBAERT, 2012). Thus, the hegemonic agency creates discursive images that legitimize this territorializing process within the city, in a field where struggles, resistances, and conflicts are fought through social practices (SANCHÉZ, 2001).

These interventionist actions reinforce the segregation of the city into territories, creating spaces of domination, imposed by constant vigilance and control through values and behaviors (CARLOS, 2015), expelling and segregating the others to the peripheries, in the scales of the oppressed and their tactics of everyday resistance expressed spatially (SOUZA, 2009).

Those are examples of social activism and emancipatory social movements, such as dissident territories and expressions of insurgent spatial practices (SOUZA, 2009). As Souza (2009) points out, these resistance movements are based on spatial practices and territorialization actions.

Territorializations that are short-lived and full of instability, given the disproportionate confrontation with other forces of power, for example, the State. When a building is occupied, or when a street is blocked by a homeless organization, people are exposed to the risk of eviction and violence.

Thus, Haesbaert (2004, 2009) argues that power is linked to those who control mobility and flows. And those who do not have this control, but who also exert power, suffer from the attempts of immobilization and containment (HAESBAERT 2004, 2009). Containment was the term used by the author, precisely to show the ambiguity involved in the new forms of territorialization. Those are, for example, the cases of walls, fences, and laws restricting migratory flows, which spread throughout the world in an attempt to exclude, but that always involve impossibility of total seclusion, since those affected find a way through which they can cross (HAESBAERT, 2009).

In an increasingly globalized world, physical barriers of containment are used to control the "flow of people, [...] 'criminals' [...] in the name of speeches [...] based on fear [. ..] of the poor, 'dangerous classes', [...] in face of [...]' threats', or 'risks' imputed to the Other, to the different, [...] which must remain on the other side '"(HAESBAERT, 2009, p. 114). As if in a fluid world like ours, the 'other side' could effectively be discernible between 'us' and 'others', or between 'normal' and 'abnormal' (HAESBAERT, 2009).

It is important to notice the contradiction of this extremely violent process. At the same time that social actors want to contain the different, they are also contained. When some go away to gated communities, they end up contained in their residential districts with controlled access (HAESBAERT, 2009). Therefore, the territorializations that aim to contain the other, contain the territorializers themselves. And more than that, the "other" is increasingly present in "our" territory. One will always find new ways and new paths (HAESBAERT, 2009). In other words, it will not be authoritarian and segregationist territorializations of contention that will prevent the "contained" from resisting and finding a way out of this contradictory and violent logic, even when these resistance practices are full of risk and insecurity (HAESBAERT, 2009).

Thus, the power relations, the segregation, the contradictions, and the resistance involved in the processes of (dis)(re)territorialization of city spaces allows the understanding that the city can be understood as a territory at different scales, where the organizations are also territories, full of power, contradictions, affections, symbolisms, resistances, segregations, and representations.

Therefore, understanding who is in the territory and who is not, makes it possible to understand who appropriates and dominates this space, its contradictions, powers, and resistances. As Dallabrida (2020) states, the notion of territory, as a social, historical, and relational construction, requires a critical position concerning the development in the spatial arrangements that compose the different territorial sections. For Haesbaert (2007), when inhabiting a space and becoming aware of it, individuals transform it into a territory, directly connected with the theoretical categories of affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction. Therefore, in the next section, the theoretical keys and the possible elements of analysis are elucidated based on the territory assumptions discussed here.

Territory, affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction

The territory is one of the main concepts that answer the problem of the relationship between society and space (HAESBAERT, 2007), and to do that, it needs to be handled based on the subjects who exert power, control, and segregate spaces (HAESBAERT, 2007a). Therefore, studying the process of territorialization (domination and appropriation) involves considering the multiple manifestations of power through the multiple social actors involved, their struggles, resistance, affectivity, awareness, and contradictions (HAESBAERT, 2007a).

By systematizing the concepts of territory, territorialization, and territoriality, mediation categories were used. They guided the discussions and appeared explicitly or implicitly in the argumentation. These categories are the theoretical keys of the research, and because of that, they are listed below.

The first theoretical key is affection. The question is to understand how people are affected by the territory. The study intends to understand how the (im)materialities of the territory influence social actors, excluding them or keeping them in the territory. Social actors become aware of the world in which they operate to understand how the territory affects them.

The second theoretical key, which is also linked to all of the others, is power. As stated by Raffestin (1993), all actions of social actors are marked by power relations, a power that comes not

only from above but from below to the top, in different degrees and places. Thus, power is inherent in social relations, and it is in the background of appropriations and dominations, which condition and constitute the territory (HAESBAERT, 1994).

This theoretical key is related to the resistance one. The rejected ones resist the imposed conditions, in this constant relationship of power between social actors (BOTELHO, 2005; LEITE, 2008; SOUZA, 2010). It is important to note that resistance has a double meaning. It is also seen in the dominant groups, which resist the new forms of occupation to guarantee their hegemony.

The social actors through their powers resist and fight when the territories constrain (affect) them, "telling" them that they are not "adequate" for that place. They create subversive practices, which fight the imposed resistance, occupying alternative territories, cracks of this homogenization (HONORATO; SARAIVA, 2016; PAULO, 2019; SOUZA, 2010). These are the cases of invasions, favelas, activisms, and social movements, which use territorialization to occupy and control spaces as a form of resistance to hegemonic powers (ROLNIK, 1995; SOUZA, 2009, 2010). Territorializations that are short-lived, full of instability, and that happen at the most different scales and temporalities. Even so, they confirm themselves as an important emancipatory social movement (SOUZA, 2009).

Finally, the last theoretical keys are segregation and contradiction. The territorialization of spaces, taken as territories, represents the contradictions and conflicts of social relations, through the forces and powers of the agents. This action segregates and divides those who can and those who cannot attend certain territories, segregating space through economic, political, and social differentiation (CARLOS, 2007).

One example is the hygiene and revitalization processes, which occur with extreme violence and segregate everything that does not match the hegemonic interests (SOUZA, 2010). As Honorato and Saraiva (2016, p. 179) argue, "how to talk about a 'city for all' when there is no space for those who already live in it? How to show a 'beautiful' city according to aesthetic standards defined by an elite when the population that lives in it is, in itself, different from that standard?".

Table 1 below, contemplates systematization and lists the possible elements of analysis of these mediation keys linked to the concept of territory, territorialization, and territoriality.

Table 1: Concepts, theoretical keys, and possible elements of analysis

Concept	Theoretical keys and possible elements of analysis
Territory	AFFECTION The role of territory in the social dynamic of the city; POWER/RESISTANCE The Economic dimension of territory; The Political dimension of territory, by control and delimitation; The Cultural dimension of territory, by meaning; The Natural dimension, by nature's disposition to meet the interests of social actors; SEGREGATION/CONTRADICTION The territory, its surroundings, and the city;
Territorializat ion	AFFECTION The representation and symbolism of the territory to the social actors; POWER/RESISTANCE The spatial organization in the exercise of power, identity, and control; Who dominates the territory, and how? The control of people, flows, and goods in the territory; SEGREGATION/CONTRADICTION The cohesions and fragmentations of the territory; The dynamics of the use of the territory by the social actors;
Territoriality	AFFECTION The identification of social actors with the territory; POWER/RESISTANCE Symbolic control of the territory through identity; SEGREGATION/CONTRADICTION Values, appearances, behaviors, classes, colors, genres of the social actors as a form of control and separation;

Source: the authors (2021).

The theoretical key called affection is linked to the representation and symbolism that the territory has for the social actors. In other words, what the material aspects represent for the agents. It is always important to remember that representation is already a form of appropriation. Thus, it can be operationalized by verifying whether people identify with the territory or not, whether they feel represented by it or not, whether they identify with the other social actors who are there or not, therefore, how and why the social actors systematize the affections.

Questions about how identity determines who may or may not be in the territory, the meaning of having or not having access to the territory, how the territory is organized, and its relationship with the city, allow us to understand how the territory affects social actors. For example, how the subjects' territoriality are linked and reflect the materiality of the place, where each social actor is installed, what their strategies are, how they interact and talk. The researcher must also observe how the material dimension and the ideal dimension are used as a form of explicit domination (material) and implicit appropriation (immaterial) as a form of power to affect, contain, and control the social actors.

The theoretical keys of power and resistance may be worked out by exploring which social actors are in the territory, what their role is and how they relate to each other, if alliances are formed, who dominates who, why, and how. Besides that, exploring the spatial organization of the territory in exert of power, resistance, identity, and control, as a reflection of the cultural, political, economic,

and natural aspects of the territory. And also, understanding the materialization of representations and symbolic aspects of the control and resistance of people, flows, and goods.

How the territory is organized, what are the boundaries (explicit or implicit), how are people dressed, what do they consume, what are their behaviors, their functions, interrelations, and what are the interests in the territory, are ways of identifying the power strategies among social actors and how they are exerted. Also, the researcher must perceive identity as an instrument of power; who delimits and controls the space, and how; what it means to be in the territory; the territory as a way to earn money, and nature used as a way of power and resistance.

The contradiction and segregation can be understood through the (im)material and spatial organization of the territory. Perceiving the hierarchies, fragmentations, and divisions of the territory and their uses, where each social actor is found and why, and the interactions between them. It is possible to perceive and identify the cohesions and fissures of the territory, values, appearances, behaviors, classes, colors, genders, always as a contradictory form of control, separation, segregation.

The use of these theoretical keys opens space for new possibilities of views on the organization and management of and in the cities, through the understanding of the territorialization processes of city spaces. These are categories that allow us to understand the city as a territory of different scales, and mainly, how the urban dynamics "accept" certain people in the space and remove others.

Studying the processes of territorialization is a way of debating who is in the territories and who is not, who appropriates and dominates the city spaces. In the hegemonic dynamics of the city, organizations are territories, full of interests, powers, disputes, resistances, affections, problems, and antitheses. For this reason, we dedicate ourselves in this study to present new opportunities for analyzing the territorial dynamics of the cities based on theoretical keys that combine categories such as affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction.

Final considerations

The present work aims to present possibilities of analysis of the territorial dynamics of the cities based on theoretical keys that combine categories such as affection, power, segregation, resistance, and contradiction. Based on the assumptions of Haesbaert (1994) that the territory is a hybrid of material and symbolic dimensions, established and conditioned by the power relations between the social actors and Haesbaert (2007) that when inhabiting a space and becoming aware, the social actors transform it into a territory, it was possible to build an argumentation that the social actors, when affected by (im)materialities, systematize these affections into power, resistance, and segregation, in a contradictory process.

These theoretical keys have always been implicitly or explicitly present within the argumentations that are theoretically based on the territory, however, unveiling them and explaining possible elements of analysis shows a theoretical advance that may enable alternative views of the cities. No attempt was made to determine or even limit this broad concept to these suggested intermediation keys, but to propose a debate on these concepts that are important to understand the dilemmas and contradictions that the processes of territorialization reveal.

The social actors, when territorializing the spaces, seek for the cohesion of practices and identities, however, this process opens space for new forms of occupation of city spaces. The city becomes a field of struggles, disputes, resistances, where social agents act through socio-spatial practices according to their interests.

The cities start having real territories, at different scales, through the appropriation and domination of urban spaces. In a domain that involves not necessarily material, but representative and identity boundaries. In this sense, understanding the city as a territory, composed of multiple territories, advances in the discussion of socio-spatial connections (im)materialized in the transformation of urban spaces into territories, within the city dynamics.

The proposal presented here aims to expand possibilities for new perspectives on the organization and management of cities, which may correspond to an escape from classification schemes based on hegemonic logic. Therefore, it is noticed that the territorial approach is a way to understand, for example, the conflicts and the power relations waged between the different social actors that compose the cities. Therefore, it is believed that the study contributes with a broad approach, explaining elements that can be considered in urban territorial development. However, it

is noteworthy the importance of empirical studies that are based on the theoretical perspectives cited in this research.

Finally, as a suggestion for future studies, we believe in the analysis of recent Brazilian urban phenomena enlightened by the concepts and theoretical keys discussed here, starting from the point that the perception of the social actors involved is necessary since this view makes it possible to analyze the city and its processes of appropriation and domination of urban spaces considering it as the stage of struggles and *locus* of manifestations, to make it fairer, more accessible and egalitarian for all.

References

ALCADIPANI, R.; ALMEIDA, A. O. O feitiço incluiu o feiticeiro: uma análise sobre a implementação de um escritório aberto. In: Encontro Anual da Associação Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração, 24, 2000, Florianópolis. **Anais.** Florianópolis: ANPAD, 2000.

ALMEIDA, D. R. Mito da desterritorialização: do fim dos territórios à multiterritorialidade. **Revista Formadores:** vivências e estudos, v. 7, n. 1, p. 74-77, jun./2014.

AMBROZIO, J. O conceito de território como campo de poder microfísico. **Revista de Geografia,** v. 3, n. 2, p. 1-10, 2013.

ANDRADE, M. C. Territorialidades, desterritorialidades, novas territorialidades: os limites do poder nacional e do poder local. In: SANTOS, M. SOUZA, M. A. A.; SILVEIRA, M. L. (Orgs). **Território, globalização e fragmentação.** São Paulo: Hucitec, 1998. p. 213-220.

BOTELHO, T.R. Revitalização de centros urbanos no Brasil: uma análise comparativa das experiências de Vitória, Fortaleza e São Luiz. **Revista Eure,** v. 31, n. 91, p. 53-71, ago/2005.

BRETAS, P. F. F.; SARAIVA, L. A. S. Práticas de controle e territorialidades: um estudo sobre lavadores e flanelinhas. **Gestão.Org.,** Recife, v. 11, n. 2, p. 247-270, maio-set/2013.

CARA, R. B. Territorialidade e identidade regional no Sul da Província de Buenos Aires. In: SANTOS. M; SOUZA, M. A. A.; SILVEIRA, M. L, (Orgs). **Território, globalização e fragmentação.** São Paulo: Hucitec, 1998. p. 261-269.

CARLOS, A. F. A. **A cidade.** 8. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2007.

_____. A reprodução do espaço urbano como momento da acumulação capitalista. In: **Crise Urbana,** São Paulo: Contexto, 2015.

COIMBRA, K. E. R.; SARAIVA, L. A. S. Territorialidade em uma organização-cidade: o movimento quarteirão do soul. **Gestão & Regionalidade.** v. 29, n. 86, p.34-46, mai-ago/2013.

CORREIA, G. F. A.; COLARES, A. F. V.; SARAIVA, L. A. S. Onde termina o público e começa o privado? Análise da privatização da cultura na Praça da Liberdade em Belo Horizonte. **Acta Scientiarum, Human and Social Sciences,** v. 39, n. 2, p. 109-120, maio-ago/2017.

DALLABRIDA, V. R. Território e governança territorial, patrimônio e desenvolvimento territorial: estrutura, processo, forma e função na dinâmica territorial do desenvolvimento. **Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional,** v. 16, n. 2, p. 63-78, maio-ago/2020.

FERNANDES, B. M. Movimentos socioterritoriais e movimentos socioespaciais. **Observatório social da América Latina,** Buenos Aires: CLACSO, v. 8, n, 6, p. 273-284, jan-jun/2005.

FERREIRA, D. S. Território, territorialidade e seus múltiplos enfoques na ciência geográfica. **Campo – Território,** v. 9, n.17, p. 111-135, abr/2014.

FISCHER, G. N. Espaço, identidade e organização. In: **O indivíduo na organização**: dimensões esquecidas. 2ª ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2010.

FOUCAULT, M. **Microfísica do Poder.** Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1979.

HAESBAERT, R. O mito da desterritorialização e as "regiões-rede". In: Congresso Brasileiro de Geografia, 5, 1994, Curitiba: AGB, **Anais,** 1994, 206-214.

_____. **Des-territorialização e identidade**: a rede "gaúcha" no Nordeste. Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, EdUFF, 1997.

_____. Des-caminhos e perspectivas do território. In: RIBAS A. D.; SPOSITO, E.S.; SAQUET, M.A. **Território e desenvolvimento:** diferentes abordagens. Francisco Beltrão: Unioeste, 2004, p. 87-119.

_____. Da desterritorialização à multiterritorialidade. In: Encontro de Geógrafos da América Latina, 10, 2005, São Paulo: USP, **Anais,** 2005.

_____. Concepções de território para entender a desterritorialização. In: SANTOS, M.; BECKER, B. K. (Orgs). **Território, territórios**: ensaios sobre o ordenamento territorial. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2007, p. 43-71.

_____. Território e Multiterritorialidade: um debate. **GEOgraphia.** Rio de Janeiro, v.11, n.17, p. 19-44, mar/2007a.

_____. Dilema de conceitos: espaços-território e contenção territorial. In: SAQUET, M. A.; SPOSITO, E. S. (Orgs). **Territórios e territorialidades**: teorias, processos e conflitos. São Paulo: Expressão popular, 2009, p. 95-120.

_____. Desterritorialização: entre as redes e os aglomerados de exclusão. In: CASTRO, I. E. DE; GOMES, P. C. DA C.; CORRÊA, R. L. **Geografia:** conceitos e temas. 15. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2012, p. 165-205.

HONORATO, B. E. F.; SARAIVA, L. A. S. Cidade, população em situação de rua e estudos organizacionais. **Revista Desenvolvimento em Questão.** v.14, n.36, p. 158-186, out-dez/2016.

IPIRANGA A, S. R. A cultura da cidade e os seus espaços intermediários: os bares e os restaurantes. **Revista de Administração Mackenzie,** São Paulo, v. 11, n. 1, p. 65-91, jan-fev/2010.

LEITE, R. P. Localizando o espaço público: gentrificação e cultura urbana. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais,** v.83, p. 35-54, dez/2008.

MAC-ALLISTER, M. Emergência do espaço organizacional para a gestão social. In: Colóquio Internacional sobre Poder Local, 9. Salvador: Escola de Administração: EAUFBA, Salvador, **Anais,** 2003.

OLIVEIRA, A. A.; CHAGAS, P. B; BORGES, W. A; GONÇALVES, J. S. Intervenções urbanas a partir de investimentos do Programa de Aceleração do Crescimento (PAC): a reterritorialização dos moradores do entorno da obra Contorno Norte de Maringá-PR. **Gestão & Regionalidade**, v. 23, n. 103, p. 278-295, jan-abr/2019.

PAULO, C. F. de O. **(Des)(Re)Territorialização e produção do espaço urbano:** um estudo sobre uma ocupação na cidade de Maringá-PR. 2019. 194 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Administração) – Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá, 2019.

PEREIRA, D. C.; CARRIERI, A. P. Movimentos de desterritorialização e reterritorialização na transformação das organizações. **RAE Eletrônica,** v.4, n. 1, jan-jul/2005.

PICHETH, S. F; CHAGAS, P. B. Interfaces entre territorialidade e identidade: analisando as vivências das mães do Grupo Maternati. **Cad. EBAPE.BR.** Rio de Janeiro, v.16, n.4, p.788-801, out-dez/2018.

RAFFESTIN, C. **Por uma geografia do poder.** São Paulo, Ática, 1993.

ROLNIK, R. **O que é cidade.** Coleção Primeiros Passos. Editora Brasiliense. São Paulo, 1995.

SANCHÉZ, F. A reinvenção das cidades na virada do século: agentes, estratégias e escalas de ação política. **Revista de Sociologia e Política,** Curitiba, n.16, p.31-49, jun/2001.

SAQUET, M. A. **Abordagens e concepções de território**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

_____. **Abordagens e concepções de território.** 2ª ed. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2010.

_____. As relações de poder e os significados do conceito de território. In: SAQUET, M. A. **Abordagens e concepções de território.** São Paulo: Outras Expressões, 2013, p.27-35.

_____. **Abordagens e concepções de território.** São Paulo: Outras Expressões, 2015.

SAQUET, M. A.; BRISKIEVICZ, M. Territorialidade e identidade: um patrimônio no desenvolvimento territorial. **Caderno Prudentino de Geografia,** v.1, n.31, p.3-16, 2009.

SARAIVA, L. A. S.; CARRIERI, A. DE P.; SOARES, A. DE S. Territorialidade e identidade nas organizações: o caso do mercado central de Belo Horizonte. **Revista de Administração Mackenzie,** v. 15, n. 2, p. 97-126, mar-abr/2014.

SOUZA, M. L. de. O território: sobre espaço e poder, autonomia e desenvolvimento. In: CASTRO, I. El et al. (Org). **Geografia:** conceitos e temas. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1995.

_____. Território da divergência (e da confusão): em torno das imprecisas fronteiras de um conceito fundamental. In: SAQUET, M. A.; SPOSITO, E. S. (Orgs). **Territórios e territorialidades:** teorias, processos e conflitos. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009, p. 57-72.

_____. Com o Estado, apesar do Estado, contra o Estado: os movimentos urbanos e suas práticas espaciais, entre a luta institucional e a ação direta. **Revista Cidades.** Presidente Prudente, v.7, n.11, p.13-47, 2010.

VALE, A. L. F.; SAQUET, M. A.; SANTOS, R. A. O território: diferentes abordagens e conceito-chave para a compreensão da migração. **Revista Faz Ciência.** Francisco Beltrão: Unioeste, v. 7, n. 1, p. 11-26, jan/2005.

VIEGAS, G. C. F. S.; SARAIVA, L. A. S. Discursos, práticas organizativas e pichação em Belo Horizonte. **RAM, Rev. Adm. Mackenzie,** São Paulo, v.16, n.5, p. 68-94, set-out/2015.

WU, C. T. **Privatização da cultura:** a intervenção corporativa nas artes desde os anos 80. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2006.