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Abstract: In this article, we socialize some reflections we made the last fifteen years on the territory-development relationship, considering some classic and more recent works of foreign and Brazilian authors. We try to produce a synthesis that can serve as a theoretical and conceptual guidance for those working with this theme, as the basis for research and for our work on projects and territorial development processes of local and ecological basis. Therefore, we work the interface between research and extension, called by us as cooperation focused on development, in the specific case of this text, to be built in institutionalization processes of geographical indication from the heritage of each territory and the decision-making autonomy.
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INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXTUALIZATION

In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, we have lived profound changes in the international level, in society in general, in space, in time and in sciences. In Geography, in constant attempts to
understand the reality, with ruptures and continuities, among other aspects, there was the expansion of the use of the territory concept, often indiscriminately and, others, with the necessary academic and scientific care without neglecting the popular knowledge and other concepts also important, such as time, space, location, region and landscape. As it is already known, there is a fad that devalues the production of knowledge and trivializes concepts; however, at the same time, there are qualified debates, both in Brazil and abroad, in countries such as France, England, Italy, Switzerland, and others.

Why is the spread of the territory concept occurring? The answer, evidently, is neither simple nor restricted; however, we think it is important to mention that over the last 20 years we realized certain identification of many people with this concept in Brazil, with its plural meanings that lead us to broader and hybrid approaches. There are different possibilities of use in the study of reality, highlighting sometimes the cultural processes, sometimes the political, and others the economic processes and even environmental and / or natural ones. And this is a very important reason, because its use is spread in different areas of knowledge precisely because of it: it can serve as a guide for very different topics of study and at the same time, interdisciplinary, in line with the complexity of reality.

There are different approaches and historical-critical concepts of territory, each one with its scientific contribution. Territory is thus understood as a concept of guidance and interpretation and / or as an object of study and / or as mobilization, struggle and political and cultural resistance space. Therefore, it is easy to see different possibilities for its use inside and outside schools, among them, of course, Universities, in teaching, research and extension / cooperation focused on territorial development.

In Brazil, the territory concept use, in perspectives considered renewed, assumes greater intensity from the early 1990s, as already evidenced in previous works such as Saquet (2004, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011a, 2011b, 2013, 2014a and 2014b) as well as other researchers have shown, such as Heidrich (2010) and Fuini (2014). There are important previous publications, such as Andrade (1971 [1967]), Goldenstein and Seabra (1982), Becker (1983) and Santos (1988); however, the dissemination really occurs from the last decade of the twentieth century.

Briefly, from Becattini (2000 [1979]), we highlight the understanding of the “industrial district”, corresponding to: a “territorial reality” where there are subjects that maintain social relationships, technologies, infrastructure, networks, ideologies and a historically constructed identity; a set of social and natural elements, locally defined, with businesses, families, churches, schools and political parties; a “socio-territorial reality” that cannot be reproduced in other contexts!

Now, according to Becattini (2000 [1989]), in a more updated conception, the “industrial district” has the following characteristics: it involves a people community and a group of companies that influence each other, forming networks between suppliers and consumers; There is a “local network of specialized transactions in certain products” linked to “global networks”, in an empowerment process of local and specific features, like with typical products valuing also the “local community” and the bonds historically played! There is, therein, in the author’s words, a strong “sense of belonging to the local community, concentration, specialization and dispersion”, as well as coexistence of “competition and cooperation.”

From Bagnasco (1977), in turn, it is important to highlight the plurality of his conception of regional development, understood as a “territorial issue.” Therefore, he highlights the economic, political and cultural processes; the “territorial joints”; the changes and continuities. The Italian “industrial districts” are formed by “local production systems,” resulting from the State, market, social classes and local identities intervention. It is a “complex phenomenon” articulated to the international division of labor, they are “scattered” in the territory and are formed by small and medium enterprises substantiating a “heterogeneous and plural” reality.

In a later work, Bagnasco (1988) updated and completed this understanding, highlighting four mechanisms of economic regulation present in development territorialization: a) the existing “reciprocity” among individuals and / or institutions; b) the “market,” relationships and social activities maker; c) the “organization,” internal and external, of each company and; d) the “policy,” as an intervention in favor of certain social groups’ interests. In this processuality, there are also links, traditions, trust relationships, recognition and identity among similar companies dependent on each other; domination, dispersed and articulated systems; specific ways of producing (typical products).

From Dematteis (1989, 1994 and 2001), it is important to praise the concepts of territory and development, as well as the main factors of the latter. Studying issues such as the redistribution of population, counter-urbanization, displacement of activities and deconcentration, dispersion, scale, network debate and the dissemination of economic activities and individuals in the territory. There are reciprocal relationships among subjects in the “global-network system” with enhancement of local individuals and rooting, although it seems to be a contradictory aspect. There are articulated “territorial local systems” articulated in networks, formed by: “local networks of individuals,” where there are close and
more distant relationships; the “local milieu,” understood as a set of local environmental conditions in which subjects operate “collectively” and historically; the relationship of the local network with the ecosystem, cognitively and materially; interactive relationships of the local network with extra-local networks at different scales: regional, national and global (DEMATTEIS, 2001 and 2008; SAQUET; SPOSITO, 2008).

From Raffestin (1993 [1980] and 2005), we highlight the power relations, usually present in social relationships; energy and information as basic components of work; the territorialities and the different networks and us; therefore, each society organizes its space combining these elements and, thus, “produces” its territory relationally and “multidimensionally.” The territory is historically formed from space by social relationships, made among the “actors” and between them and nature, organized with the contents of a “territorial system.” The “actors” make possible to ensure cohesion of territories, control of people and “things,” according to their strategies, technologies and their interests.

In the territorial system, the “tessituras,” “nodes” and “networks” are “subsets” that support spatial practices, both economic and political and cultural practices, revealing the “territorial production” (RAFFESTIN, 1993 [1980]). At the same time, the actors work in order to achieve the maximum possible autonomy, there it is substantiated as a key benefit to the understanding of development, linking it to identity, to “active territoriality” (DEMATTEIS, 2001) and “governance,” obviously, self-managed and self-governed.

And it seems to us that Magnaghi (2000, 2003, 2006a and 2006b) produces a didactically very well prepared synthesis on the territory and development issue, on a sustainable, local and autonomous perspective. Territory is built historically, between society and nature, and it is precisely this relationship that defines the concrete development meanings, degrading or sustainable. Thus, he also highlights the place consistently, the environmental dynamics and the preparation of development projects.

Sustainability, in the conception built over the years by Alberto Magnaghi, is reflected through territory, that is, it advocates in favor of “political, economic, cultural and environmental sustainability,” which has its synthesis in “territorial sustainability.” Its nature is there, together with the identity and other components of each site containing stays (“cognitive materials and sediments”) and ruptures (Table 1). So, in territory, there is a capacity for mobilization and self-management which needs to be well understood and valued along with nature, mutual aid, small businesses, autonomy, manual labor, popular knowledge, cooperation, heritage, biodiversity, etc., as we advocate in previous works (SAQUET, 2007, 2011a, 2011b, 2014b and 2014c).

In Brazil, the systematic discussion of the territory and development relationship is also more recent, so we highlight some works of authors who are emerging. Initially, we have noted some Valdir Dallabrida’s works for his career in the studies on the theme. In Dallabrida (2003), we verified the consistent attention to the methodology issue, which
remains in production in subsequent years, as in his 2012 text, hereinafter mentioned. As it was not our purpose to make an exhaustive survey of his large production, due to our text theme, we chose another work, Dallabrida (2011a), by virtue of the qualified meeting in the same collection, of distinct authors’ texts on development fundamental issues such as the political and administrative decentralization and different ways of their realization in Brazil and other Latin American countries, especially on the COREDES built over time in Rio Grande do Sul. Other current and relevant topics are also addressed, such as social participation, territorial development, management, covenants, scales and political actions. In Dallabrida (2011b), more precisely, the author highlights two perspectives of decentralization: one centered on the transfer of financial resources, for example, the federal units; another, in a broader sense, procedural and political, trying to increase social participation and even the “distribution of power” at the State level.

Table 1 – A summary focused on our operations in territorial development processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>G. Becattini (Economist)</th>
<th>A. Bagnasco (Sociologist)</th>
<th>Material reality, “modeled” from the environment by social, economic, political and cultural forces; It contains networks, ecosystems and identities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Social and territorial reality, singular, local empowerment, with concentration and dispersion, cooperation and competition, valuing community.</td>
<td>Social, territorial, plural, diffuse and heterogeneous, with reciprocity, market, State and political parties.</td>
<td>Corresponds to self-organization and self-management processes, preserving the environment and culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Moreover, we also realize the understanding of decentralization such as the construction of democracy, with decision-making autonomy and social inclusion, essential in the trend that we are working. This can happen in different scale levels, as shown by Cunha (2008) who, in
his thought-provoking reflection on territorial development, highlights it at the regional level. According to Alexandre Cunha, territory has a multidimensional, historical and natural content, a result of the relationships between society and nature, thus it takes on different forms and extensions that need to be considered in each territorial development project: this needs to be focused on “endogenous processes” and “social proximity” relationships, without disregarding other scales, particularly the regional one.

Therefore, from these above considerations, we note that different types and governance practices occur, as also is revealed by Pires et al. (2011): informatively and lucidly, they present us concrete interpretations of governance, modalities and some practices occurring in Brazil. After discoursing on the origins of the types of governance, they work, briefly, very important concepts, such as proximity, territory, actors, institutions, participation, etc., subsidizing the construction of development processes from the territorial governance, the book’s focus. Thus, they facilitate our understanding of the different ways that governance assumes, and it can serve as a mediator for the institutionalization of a certain geographical indication because territorial governance corresponds to an organizational coordination among “geographically close actors” to solve problems, forwarding “conciliations” and constructing synergies with qualitative changes in the population’s life (FUINI; PIRES, 2015 [2009]). They are texts that must necessarily be in our readings, among the priorities of those who work with these themes (for governance detailing, see also DALLABRIDA, 2015).

Falcade (2011), in turn, helps us more specifically to think and understand the geographical indication processes, in a quality thesis and methodological consistency built from the concept of landscape understood as processuality and representation; therefore, critical to understand certain territory, its societal organization and the possibility to build or not a geographical indication. The conditions for this are accomplished historically, involving and being involved by a specific regulation which governs its establishment. However, the statement, as warned consistently by the teacher Ivanira Falcade, requires uniqueness and quality of the product, connection with certain territory, the organization of production and marketing, forming a certain region, issues also identified by Dallabrida (2012), for example. Thus, the landscapes studied by Falcade (2011), historically and regionally substantiated, there are “symbols” of the regions and wines which need to be understood, preserved and valued, features that also seem to meet with the synthesis prepared by Dallabrida (2012): the geographical indication requires “brand identity” products, different from those of other regions, which can constitute innovative ways for product protection, add value and assign credibility in the market.

As we can see, in this debate, albeit with partially distinct concepts, the development formatting is evident in regions historically constructed with certain specificities, without disregarding the formation
of networks, sometimes competing, sometimes associative and/or cooperative and synergistic, as taught by the aforementioned Becattini (2000 [1979] and 2000 [1989]), Bagiasso (1977 and 1988), Dematteis (1989, 1994 and 2001), Raffestin (1993 [1980] and 2005) and Magnaghi (2000, 2003, 2006a and 2006b), among others. And this is an aspect that needs to be highlighted, along with the historical construction of the territorial conditions for the creation of certain geographical indication as the cultural identities regarded as heritage, nature and management of power relations. They are all elements and processes of territories in each space-time relationship.

In territory, there are internal and external relationships that form networks connecting individuals and places in trans-multi-scalar levels formed by nodes and networks of networks, which may take “self-centered” or “hetero-centered” forms (Turco, 1988 and 2010; Saquet; Alves, 2015). They are “trans-territorial” networks, in the words of Camagni (1993 and 1997) and Rullani (2009). There are different scalar levels of territories and territorialities: individuals, families, properties, streets, neighborhoods, localities, cities, counties, regions, states, nations, continents, economic “blocks” and global relations. Territorialities, thus, define identities and differences in each territory (Dematteis, 1999; Saquet, 2007), in a kind of “heritage territory,” in the words of Bourdin (1984) or a “territorial heritage” (Magnaghi, 2000, 2003 and 2011) in close unity relationship with nature. Briefly, we believe that development processes, through the geographical indication or not, need to be guided and objectified with principles such as participation, cooperation, production of ecological food, environmental preservation, cultural development and preservation of each social group and territory, craftsmanship, solidarity, etc., as already mentioned.

IDENTITY, HERITAGE AND GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION

Identity can be a powerful process of revitalization, renovation, preservation, political struggle and local development. It must be understood, explained, valued and it can be enhanced through dialogical participation in decision-making in territories, amid the inequalities and differences. The socially and historically constructed identity, as indicated by Gottmann (1947 and 1952), Dematteis (1994, 1995 and 2001) and Dematteis and Governa (2005), among others, can be an important mediator for resistance and the construction of locally-based development projects. We understand identity, as already socialized in Saquet (2007), Saquet and Galvão (2009) and Saquet and Briskievicz (2009), as a historical and relational product and condition for development in the direction signaled by Dematteis and Governa (2003) and Raffestin (2003).

Identity means “dialectical unity” in the terms indicated by Lefebvre (1995 [1969]), thus involving people and economic, cultural and political
relationships without detachment of nature and territory. It contains, evidently, affective and belonging relationships, it may mediate the political organization from the differences and the common features among individuals with a view to projecting and (im)materialization of the present and future. Thus, in identity, there are heterogeneity, conflicts, differences, desires, needs, utopias and must occur necessarily mobilization initiatives and the struggle for social and territorial improvements, as praxis in a movement linked to an “effective freedom” (Dematteis, 1985). Identity, in this sense, is a component of the territorial heritage.

Heritage contains the elements and processes of each territory, being natural and social, material and immaterial. It is built socially and naturally; therefore, needs to be identified, understood, explained, represented, valued and enhanced culturally and politically. And then we are present, as directly connected bodies and dependent on our “external nature” (Marx, 1984), as beings who think, create, breathe, eat, sleep, walk, invent, degrade; so, they can revise daily spatiotemporal practices when they do not meet the objectives of preserving culture and environment, when they do not meet our needs of experience reproducing solidarity and cooperation. There, they also assume centrality, “our” political organization, mobilization, “our” identities, our customs, knowledge, “our” water, plants, our animals and soil! We highlight the pronoun “our” because, if we understand the planet we live as collective, we need to think and act for the other thinking and not thinking beings, because we live related, interdependent on the same planet as the heritage of all mankind!

And one of the ways we have to preserve, even innovating, the territory we need so much every day is the identification, qualification and appreciation of typical products, with the institutionalization of geographical indications, as properly exposed by Falcade (2011), or in terms revealed by Denardin and Sulzbach (2010): a product with territorial identity incorporates all “goods, services, information and specific images” of certain territory, as in handicraft production of cassava flour in the coast of Paraná, for example, with unique flavor and differentiated texture, featuring an “asset” that involves services, information and representations. Thus, identity is one of the components of the territorial heritage, along with other economic, political and natural ones, which can guide the construction of certain geographical indication.

And, in an attempt to make the text more didactic, we developed a synthesis for such studies (Table 2a e b), serving as guidance for both research and accomplishment of extension / cooperation projects focused on territorial development. To this end, we have been inspired by Marx (1985 and 2005), Marx and Engels (1991), Quaini (1974a and 2011), Dematteis (1964, 1985, 1995 and 2001), Raffestin (1977, 1993 [1980], 1984, 2003, 2005 and 2009), Santos (1996), Magnaghi (1976 and 2000), Indovina and Calabi (1974), Bagnasco (1977 and 1978), Turco (1988 and 2010), Thompson (1998), Rullani, Micelli and Di

A very important observation is the fact that this synthesis is not configured, in any way, as a model to be applied mathematically. There are different realities in Brazilian heterogeneity and other countries that need to be necessarily considered in each research process and/or operations in territorial development projects, either through the creation of a geographical indication, or through other initiatives. The levels and political organization intensities, for example, vary from region to region, from country to country, as well as soil types, climates, knowledge, etc. This synthesis is also composed of suggestions derived from our trajectory in teaching, research and university extension, which must be adjusted to each research and cooperation project for development.

As it is fairly well known, in the capitalist mode of production, there are characteristics inherent to life in society as tensions, conflicts, territorial disputes, subordination to capital agents and state regulations, substantiating what Martins (1973) and Bagnasco (1999) call as “local society”. Cooperation relationships and, concurrently, class relationships, technical and technological innovations, innovations in daily practices that need to be considered along with the identities, are accomplished.
Table 2a – A synthesis attempt - territorialities and temporalities in the TDR process at the same space at different times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERRITORIALIZATION</th>
<th>DETERIORATIONALIZATION</th>
<th>RETERRITORIALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN FEATURES AND LIMITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAIN FACTORS AND IMPACTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>MAIN POSSIBILITIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inorganic nature</td>
<td>- Water, soil, vegetation cover, geomorphology, climate.</td>
<td>- Concentrated, degrading and polluting transformations. - Preserved areas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects, relationship s and classes</td>
<td>- Classes and social groups, objectives, goals, rhythms and needs. - Local and regional commands, disputes and conflicts. - Relations of trust and reciprocity. - Organizations and mobilizations. - Economic initiatives. - Customs and identities. - Know-how and craftsmanship. - Ecological food production. - Preservative initiatives, etc.</td>
<td>- Buildings (especially with heritage meaning), agreements, covenants, coalitions, political, recreational and cultural associations. - Agrochemical crops. - Technological innovations, financing, subordination, etc. - Different insertions in the market. - Accelerated life rhythms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In)material mediators</td>
<td>- State, federal, state and municipal. - Private and public companies. - Techniques and technologies. - Knowledge, popular knowledge and science. - Technical assistance. - Associations. - NGOs. - Unions. - Workforce. - Social movements.</td>
<td>- Buildings, existing and projected projects, levels of water, soil and subsoil contamination (where applicable), forms of disposal of liquid and solid waste, distribution of land and other common goods, public spaces, performance quality and gains already achieved. - Management mechanisms and public policies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Im)material spatiotemporal practices</td>
<td>- Distinct temporary and more effective allocations. - Properties, domains, installment payments, delimitations, demarcations. - Different life rhythms, etc.</td>
<td>- Land concentration and other means of production. - Concentrated, degrading and polluting transformations. - Expropriation of workers and owners. - Popular, associative, cooperative and solidary organizations of struggle and resistance to capital and the bourgeois state. - Accelerated production and life rhythms, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2b – A synthesis attempt - territorialities and temporalities in the TDR process at the same space at different times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL IDENTITIES AND REFERENCE TERRITORIES</th>
<th>DETERRITORIALIZATION</th>
<th>RETERRITORIALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Fragile and strong ties with the place and territory: anchoring / rooting.</td>
<td>- Changes / disruptions and dissolutions.</td>
<td>- Continuities / permanencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Belonging, affection and recognition.</td>
<td>- Fragile ties with the production place and daily life.</td>
<td>- Resistance and struggle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Historical heritage (buildings, know-how, identity, languages, rites, customs...).</td>
<td>- Advances already achieved politically and culturally, i.e., with typical products, etc.</td>
<td>- Reproduction of peasant culture with the incorporation of other behaviors and values: cooperation, solidarity and market coexistence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peasant culture with the incorporation of other behaviors and values: cooperation, solidarity and market coexistence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identity renewal, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL AND EXTRA LOCAL NETWORKS, AND NODES (IN DIFFERENT SCALES)</th>
<th>DETERRITORIALIZATION</th>
<th>RETERRITORIALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Asymmetries and conflicts.</td>
<td>- Limits / boundaries transposition, discontinuities / disruptions.</td>
<td>- New spatial continuities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spatial Continuities</td>
<td>- Dissemination and fluidity.</td>
<td>- Tendentially local and/or regional self-centered networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tendentially national hetero-centered networks.</td>
<td>- Tendentially domestic and international hetero-centered networks.</td>
<td>- Synergies and reciprocity: cooperation, solidarity, associations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tendentially local and/or regional self-centered networks.</td>
<td>- Solidarity marketing: local and/or regional market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Solidarity marketing: local and/or regional market.</td>
<td>- Synergies and reciprocity: cooperation, solidarity, associations, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Synergies and reciprocity: cooperation, solidarity, associations to produce marketing, celebration, at last, in order to live, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This is a didactic proposal, nothing more than that, to contribute to the discussion of the topic, especially trying to clarify the importance of the territory and development in a pluralistic conception focused on environmental preservation, autonomy, cultural appreciation, in short, under the terms marked here. The theoretical and conceptual issue is essential and has also been the subject of our academic and popular work, through a concept focused on territorial development of a local basis, in a practice of cooperation with the subjects of each territory (DANSERO, 2008; DANSERO; ZOBEL, 2007; SAQUET, 2011b and 2014b; SAQUET; DANSERO; CANDIOTTO, 2012).

Thus, understanding the cultural, natural, economic and political processes is essential, in time and space, identifying and understanding the “cultural heritage” (MARTINS, 1973) or the “cultural roots of the peasant world” (QUAINI, 2011), e.g., together with the other characteristics of each ecosystem. Procedural culture that involves values, meanings, conflicts, “common customs” and innovations, in short, social relationships and daily practices (THOMPSON, 1998). It is transmitted, from generation to generation, knowledge, values, principles, techniques and standards; continuities and economic, political, cultural and natural
and fundamental changes coexist in the study and in the execution of the geographical indication as a possible mechanism to build a territorial development participatively.

**FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The territory-development relationship, therefore, can take different paths, privileging cultural, natural and political processes, as now we have pointed out, with local, participative, preservative basis, amplitude facilitated precisely by the polysemy of the territory concept and its (im)material singularities. From the latter, multiple possibilities for development can be set up, such as through the institutionalization of a certain geographical indication.

The studies for the geographical indication implementation need to be consistent, “multi-dimensional” (DANSERO; ZOBEL, 2007), historical and interdisciplinary, and its consummation must contain, necessarily, social participation, decision-making autonomy and self-management, preservation of “our” external and social nature, appreciation of our culture, the enhancement of the specific conditions of each ecosystem, the relationships of solidarity and trust, social and spatial proximity (community relationships) and sustainable possibilities. This must take place through a continuous, educative, cooperative and co-participatory work among individuals of the local society, involving, of course, Universities and other associative institutions and NGOs working with the people, as well taught by Paulo Freire, as recently outlined in Saquet (2015) as well as indicated by Fuini and Pires (2015 [2009]): the local “actors” are “potential” for development.

It is imperative to rebuild corporate and territorial processes with alternative paths that, for us, happen through the formation of a “class and place consciousness” (HARVEY, 1982; MAGNAGHI 2000, 2009 and 2011; LUSSAULT, 2009; QUAINI, 2010), assuming the meaning of territorial struggle awareness and a more communitarian, solidary and cultural life with a qualified policy. The aspiration to social justice, supplying people’s needs, along with the appreciation of man as a political individual is an essential premise, and it is understood in a “praxis” in favor of autonomy and social transformation (MARX; ENGELS, 1991; FREIRE, 2011 [1974] and 2011 [1996]).

And this conception focused on cooperation and territorial development is essential, because we believe in a process of “identity renewal” (Rullani, Micelli and Di Maria, 2000), within the “peasant culture” (THOMPSON, 1998) and the “power fields” (RAFFESTIN, 1993 [1980]), that combines customs and changes from the references of each territory, centered in what is called the “territorial sharing” made through the “complexity government” with autonomy (RULLANI; MICELLI; DI MARIA, 2000; MAGNAGHI, 2000) and nature conservation. The society-nature coevolution, in these terms, present in territories, with identities, differences, inequalities and nature, must be understood as “humanity’s heritage” (MAGNAGHI, 2000, 2006a and
2006b; DEMATTEIS, 2007); therefore, it should be self-governing with social and environmental responsibility.
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