

IDEA OF TERRITORY, REGION, BORDER AND LIMIT



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n4-039>

Submitted on: 03/06/2025

Publication date: 04/06/2025

Clademir Trentini¹

ABSTRACT

The term region is not singular to a particular location in total space. It has physical and cultural characteristics and unique socio-economic dynamics that make this place unique in the face of the whole, but it is considered that this "place" is influenced by human cultural materialization. However, the question of territory is convinced that it is the form of appropriation and the taking of natural spaces by human occupation, which comes from the habitable space, when man takes it for himself and leaves his physical marks to delimit the environment in which he is inserted. Man appropriates and takes for himself a certain place and this individual tends to demarcate, that is, to create "zones" of influence that are designated borders, borders, landmarks, limits and extremes. Man takes, demarcates, disputes, appropriates and identifies places with imaginary lines and physical barriers that prevent the "other" from taking for himself what is already occupied. Thus, imaginary lines govern different societies and territories.

Keywords: Territory. Region. Boundary. Bound.

¹Master and Doctorate student in History of the Graduate Program in History of the University of Passo Fundo (UPF), in research line 2: Society, Nature and Territory, Campus of Passo Fundo- RS. CAPES Scholarship: Coordination Program for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel.
Email: clademirtrentini@gmail.com, and 206643@upf.com.br
Lattes Curriculum: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6757606113587105>

INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

We can hold a broad debate and argue about the definition of region, border, territory and boundaries. Debates generate different interpretations on the same theme between areas of knowledge, these dialogues are necessary to build a theoretical definition of what the aforementioned themes represent in reality. We need to question the meaning and significance that the words region, territory, limit and border represent in the face of the current political, social and economic conjunctures. We live in a "time" of intense innovations and in this sense we also need to reflect on some concepts and understandings that the proposed themes may vary today, and nations also diverge with the dilemma of delimiting and defining region and borders, because to what extent an idea or human activity/action is barred within the territorial limits of a State. Everyday debates socially promote customary law-based interpretations of boundaries and boundaries. University circles construct different contexts and interpretations that confront common sense and compile definitions on the subject. Common sense knowledge, when accepted, is compiled and helps to interpret the vision of those who live in territorial divisions and regional subdivisions that the States constitute in the course of their territorial demarcation and national consolidation.

The theme of region originates and fosters numerous dialogues between researchers and geographers, sociologists to build the idea of defining boundaries without imposing regional limits on the factors of location of the space occupied and characterized, because the region is formed and constituted by the whole, in its set of natural and human factors, so we cannot create a point that indicates exactly the end and the beginning of a dividing line to define region A or B. It happens that many definitions and questions arise about what we can define as regional, national and external the borders of a State, when these ideas are confronted we stimulate questions attributed to define and build some ideas referring to the set of factors that can compose the region. In this way, it can be said that the region is established as something not static, but physical, which suffers influences from the transformation of nature through cultural and material activities with a society superimposed on this particular terrain.

Factors of external interests, whether political, military or territorial, can make the physical border liquid/malleable when there is no respect for the territorial sovereignty of the peoples, when the territorial limits are modified and the limits that have been consolidated until then disappear and new ones emerge. The liquid border occurs when

one nation infiltrates the territory of another and refuses to return to the dividing lines prior to the territorial infraction. As such action occurs by the use of force, the newly constituted line will rarely be originally restored. Aspects like this are perceptible in contemporary territorial conflicts in different geographical points politically justified and massively redirecting borders in force, hatred and oppression.

Thus, Eunice Nodari made an interpretation of the border, focusing on environmental history, stating that "Environmental History allows us to dare and overcome borders that, after all, are fluid and culturally and politically constructed by humans". We can see a lot of encouragement when debating Environmental History to understand the boundaries imposed by humans and their socio-environmental consequences. Understanding or knowing borders "promotes a more traditional spatial delimitation, based on national borders, making research in the environmental area also go beyond political borders" (2012, p. 35).

Carbonari understands the region as:

The regional space is therefore not a fixed space, but a social space with heterogeneous groups in continuous interaction. It is the testimony of the past that acts on the present and conditions the future. Analyzing it implies seeing it as a dynamic space, in continuous movement. Therefore, as a product of history and at the same time acting on it (2009, p.28.)

Space is associated with the possibility of producing something, because without production there is no space, and production gives meaning to the idea of place, which is ready to determine a territory organized by a society established there. The location and form of occupation will influence the way in which man constitutes and reproduces values and ways of reinventing his own space already occupied.

The region has its own identity some distinct factors and singular characteristics born with the human and geographical contribution to the uniqueness of the space, whether traditional with physical materiality or cultural generated by social agents. The idea of the dimension of space is faced with an unknown of the appropriation and proportion that the term region wants to diagnose, due to the understanding that space is something indeterminate, given the range of discussions on the subject. The spaces are not autonomous, they are part of a totality, but with distinct physiognomy originating in the process of human occupation and habitation.

In order to define in a singular way what space is, we have come to ignore that definitions are not immutable and eternal, but are always subject to change because

people throughout their history constitute different ways of living, producing and relating, reproducing new ways of defining and conceptualizing space, which is something natural, but taken over by man who elaborates social relations and uses his resources on it, this is how Milton Santos defines "space is a true field of forces whose formation is unequal, that spatial evolution does not present itself in the same way everywhere" (1985, p.122).

According to Milton Santos:

The space organized by man is like the other social structures, a subordinate-subordinating structure. It is like the other instances, space, although subject to the law of totality, has a certain autonomy (1978, p.145).

The conception of region as a smaller space within the broad space may sound very vague, even if it is identified according to its particularities, which are also not endless. Space in its totality can be represented or is the result of past and present actions. Therefore, it is necessary to identify representative human actions and the relations of the past that originated forms and modes of occupation of the indeterminate whole, which is now divided into regions. Thus, the regions are defined according to the criteria of occupation, with some economic, cultural, ethnic, linguistic characteristics, relief, climate, etc.

On the other hand, within the whole, there are natural regions, that is, "it is conceived as a portion of the earth's surface identified by a specific combination of elements of nature such as climate, vegetation, and relief. These combinations specifically translate natural landscapes that are not suffering from human interference" (Corrêa, 1997, p.184).

The region is now understood as the result of a long process of transformation from the natural landscape to a cultural landscape. The arrangement of the fields, the agricultural system and the rural habitat, the mode of occupation and urbanization, but also the dialect and customs are among others, constituting a space of territorial formation that is in constant transformation, because there is no such thing as something finished and perfectly constituted. This process of transformation of natural characteristics will occur in a constant and involuntary way in a space that, in Santos' understanding, is a human creation and nature is taken by man for himself and he socializes it (1978, p. 45). The fact that man takes the natural by appropriating it, it will give rise to what we call territory and, consequently, the region. The fruit of human demarcation actions is the possession of the

territory. The natural physical conditions of this occupied space determine the size of the territory.

Considering that the idea of region has been suffering some different interpretations over time, where at a certain moment region was designated a certain administrative locality and then in medieval periods we have the region as dominated territories and their subdivisions. In contemporary times, we have clearer definitions of a territory properly occupied and geographically delimited. Thus, the old notion of region does not support the current configurations of the economy, politics and territorial demarcation. Territory is something demarcated through social relations and their agents. Considering the term territory that comes from the Latin *territorium* and means an appropriate space of land.

But what would be the dimension of space today? Why is proposing an idea of space to confront physical, social, political, imaginary, cultural aspects, among others? Space is an indeterminate area, but man has its own characteristics: to demarcate it in accordance with the occupied space, which is derisory in the face of the conjuncture of the whole, when this smaller place is identified according to its configurations and these are not fixed, that is, they can change and therefore we cannot be deceived by the view that region is a determined space. The region has natural characteristics such as climate, relief and vegetation and includes a landscape that we can define as natural or artificial shaped according to the form of occupation. The main factor that determines the modified/artificial landscape is related to the ethnic/cultural factors of the peoples who occupy a given space.

Barros states that the landscape can coincide with a "natural region" or it can be derived from a pattern whose uniqueness is associated with a type of agricultural occupation or human organization of space. (1978, p.100). Still for Braudel, the environment and space are perfectly equivalent notions. Oscillating the idea that the environment determines man and that men settle in the natural environment, transforming it in such a way as to convert it into the main basis of their social life (1967, p.107). Thus, we can understand that space will determine which "man" will be formed and the various civilizations constituted there, and civilization is the occupation of a space, worked and organized. The region is defined through the functions performed and necessary for society, which is marked in a differentiated way in the most distinct spaces, the forms and their functions take on different biotypes in each social group. The region is a set: territory, people, something unique that produces, a political, cultural factor. But the region is understandable when we have the occurrence of the circulation of men, products and the

mixture of cultures. When man takes this place of occupation for himself, he then uses himself and proposes his particularities about it, which we can say are his identities.

Barros cites Raffestin to define the forms of territorialization of space that are promoted by men over time, quoting:

"place" of possibilities, [space] is the material reality preexisting to any knowledge and any practice of which it will be the object from the moment an actor manifests the intention to take possession of it. Of course, the territory rests on space, but it is not space. It is a production from space. Now, production, because of all the relations it involves, is inscribed in a field of power (1993, P.143).

To this end, space is space because society occupies it and in its totality it is the result of social actions of the past and present, each space is the result of its own creation, as well as it can be fractionated according to the needs of the people involved, the space being something associated where something can be produced, Therefore, without production, we have no space.

A space for training can be called a territory. When men pay attention to taking for themselves and their community, a "group" that starts from the globe and calls it an appropriate territory, it begins to concentrate activities proper to the humanized animal instinct, but with its essences that are still commonplace and extractive that leave their marks and individualities. The particularities are interfered with by the environment in which this man is inserted, but at the same time he also begins to interact with factors external to the appropriate territory, factors that are instinctive to ensure demarcation and survival even in inhospitable places. According to Pierre Vilar, when we are dealing with territory, we are faced with a range of real estate appropriation distinct from individual interests, falling into the field of demarcation and occupation, meeting an expectation in which it is based on time and space, associating the division of political and institutional factors, but directs productive forces: such as agriculture, commerce, demography and the movement of men (2007, p. 07).

The process of human mobility and its formulas of accumulation are also clearly expressed in the way in which man appropriates space in his context of taking possession of what is around him, it is a way for man to identify with what suits him that in his space modified according to the perspectives of the same when he settles in a certain place, which may be controlled and territorialized with the peculiarities of the subject who settles there. Space is taken and modified, "constructed" by man in his set of actions to identify with it through the constitution of its values exposed in its form of production, regardless of

the territorial scope that the human is taking for himself, so the same man will approach other men to identify and interact with his environment and obtain something reciprocal for the constitution of his space.

The factors that are created and/or induced by man influence their means of territorial demarcation, as has occurred since the beginning with native populations and that will later attract a large human wave to these places that will impose a totally different mode of occupation that becomes clear over time and in our current places of habitation. These implications are reflections of the needs created by him "man" in the face of his own interaction and social changes over time. The territory is delimited by identity, by singular and social interests of human groups, resulting in a product of intervention of human labor in a given space.

Men have migrated and demarcated spaces since the beginning and as a consequence they have occupied and appropriated everything around them as something *ad aeternum* that was theirs, and this is clear through the forms of occupation and interaction with the environment. The acculturation of space is the result of man also no longer living in his natural way and in this sense we can use Barros to justify how man acts and appropriates space in the following way: the actions and transformations that affect that human life, which can be considered historically take place in a space that is often a geographical or political space and that, above all, it will always necessarily constitute a social space (1997, p. 106). The territory is built by man through the society installed there and its specific cultures, when we are very clear to us that the territory is a social construction. The territory is, at the same time, a collective creation and an institutional resource.

In this way, we can interpret that in a certain way space is constituted as a human way of applying its mark, because human groups are in a constant struggle of strength with nature and with their means of survival. As soon as man appropriates and territorializes himself, he begins to constitute and redefine the term region. Region extrapolates to political ideas and discourses, as we do not have a clear understanding of the dimension that the word region encompasses together with space, as these terms will be decisive for obtaining the definition of territory. The forms of territorial occupation, on the other hand, occur in different ways according to the socioeconomic activities or productions developed and even the moments that the particular group is going through; We are unpredictable in

the form of occupation and appropriation, but it is certain that the genus Homo is much more irrational in the appropriation of physical spaces than other beings.

A territory is a space constituted for market interests, a value added by man who, according to his location, has an added economic value, because man tends to want this space for himself to show himself to be influential in his environment. Therefore, territory is a social construction that refers to all societies at all times, because societies need geographic spaces and, in this sense, these spaces, when occupied and delimited, are facing other spaces already occupied and demarcated by other ethnic groups that also aim to expand their territorial domains and, when possible, subjugate the "other group" and appropriate its space.

A BRIEF DEFINITION OF FRONTIER

In relation to the spaces taken, man begins to occupy and create conventional borders. These human determinations can be terrestrial, maritime, river, lake (near lakes) and even aerial. In this sense, we are yet to define the denomination of the term "border", which has as its initial idea how far I can interfere and take it as mine, being a line that I would imagine that separates two spaces. When we go back to observe the forms of occupation and definition of borders in ancient times, we can use the definitions of the Romans that were based on something unstable, such as the occupied spaces of the cities of the time and empty spaces (with little or no human occupation) between them, called neutral. Correia states that:

the foundation of the modern State is accompanied by an effort to point out the limits and the new State builds for itself increasingly solid limits to which it gives a political, fiscal and, above all, military meaning, a fundamental element in the vocabulary itself since in French – as in Spanish and Portuguese – "fronteire/frontera/fronteira" comes directly from the military semantic field: it is about "facing" the enemy on the other side (2007, p. 05).

Analyses in this sense produce interpretative confusion due to the most diverse definitions and meanings that the word "border" constitutes in the most diverse societies and in different places. Border or border in Latin *terminus*, to define the end of what belongs to me by relating possession/property. The frontier derived from the Old Latin derives *fronteria* or *frontaria*, indicating the territory *infront*.

Consolidated physical political states have their territorial delimitations consecrated and stable. National States already territorially constituted and politically stabilized have

defined border nuances, which are important aspects in relation to the neighboring State, such as its structural and socio-economic boundaries. Correia defines the border based on natural physical particularities while understanding that they are placed through a social construction (1998, p. 85). Remembering that the use of natural "landmarks"² will make the delimitations organized by human societies remain over time without modifying them structurally. Borders are manipulated and modified without taking into account the physical aspects such as those represented by rural economic factors and their productive activities that are proposed by their creators. Modifying natural boundaries and manipulating the environment to create an imaginary line is human beings. Nature has its physical lines and people create imaginary lines, called borders.

Borders have been and are being expanded over time by peoples, nations, animals, which they call necessary for the expansion of their border margins, either by migration, decimation of native ethnic groups and even today by political and economic imposition, not by taking territory but by influencing other territories beyond their borders. Man constantly promotes warlike conflicts, altering border boundaries modified by military and political interests. Therefore, we can affirm that men, even as numerous and demarcating as they are, do not have consolidated borders in the contemporary world.

The fatal point for the enlargement of borders is the absence of State Institutions, when the minorities who live in these corners will be able to identify with some aspects of the neighboring border and share with a feeling of belonging to the State that is on the other side of the border line, when in this sense the border should separate two distinct spaces, it may act in the opposite way. But the boundary lines should have the functions of protection and exchange, of being inside or outside a homogeneous or distinct space. When we neglect the action of the institutions of both states on both sides of the border, we can have an interaction between the minorities that inhabit the "despised" territory.

The imaginary border is the "dominion" that separates one nation from another, but also as the confines of a dominated and occupied territory. Many states ignore border issues of movement of people and goods, stressing that these are also wealth generators. Places unassisted by the State constitute, by necessity, nuclei of exchanges and mediations between the homelands to which they are involved. When we see in these places a "mixture of cultural factors and a cultural and economic uniqueness developing

² A land boundary marker is a physical element that delimits the boundary of a property. They are fundamental elements of georeferencing and are the physical expression of the owner's possession

on the border, which is much more than a dividing line but an intense circulation of people, ideas, goods and in itself a divided and shared feeling.

A border can be expanded and retracted by migratory movements, physical, military, cultural force, among others, because it is not only the marks of a conquered territory, but a space of national construction. A fixed border exists when peoples respect the limits of one and the other without reciprocal impositions. Territorial disputes expose the dispute for control of a place that serves the interests of both sides of the earthquake. War identifies the oppression exercised over a place/territory and the population struggles to escape exploitation according to the interests of each individual. Man wants to maintain the demarcation and give a human meaning to the place occupied. The moving frontier is constantly renegotiated, societies delimit and reconstruct it.

Borders reflect an occupied space and a mere division of territories, but they express a set of social, cultural, political and military factors that are interrelated with the occupied spaces through the physical protection and imposition of peoples. Borders can divide anything and not just land, but it can also serve to demonstrate the social abysses that exist in the same space. But ironically, we have the conviction of peoples and nations that there are no borders and a people constituted eternally.

The boundaries are used as the dividing line between states, and the boundary is within the territory, but the border is outside it. According to GOLIN apu (Moodie, 1965, p. 95) the limits can be understood as follows:

Once the dividing lines were laid, they tended to be regarded as rigid fixations that could only be modified by the outbreak of war. This failure to recognize the mutability of boundaries, or possibly the fears that such recognition might entail, has given way to attempts to reinforce their separative function. Tariff walls were erected and fortifications were established in the vain effort to achieve the mutual exclusivity of political entities, while the rapid increase in population, expanding interstate trade and the development of the means of communication that made this trade possible, required the removal of obstacles (2002, p. 12).

The current limits may be the limits modified and disrespected tomorrow in the face of the radical changes that have occurred in the contemporary world. The limits/liquid/flowing border for the interests of nations converge on both sides, imposing their desires on those who occupy them. The border is a barrier that can be overcome, but which can be solidified by the power relations between peoples and States, but it is worth considering that a lack of definition of border boundaries is the result of the lack of State presence in these places. In the words of Martins, (1997, p. 150) "the border is essentially

the place of otherness", of conflict. Completing these statements TAU apud (Reckziegel 2000, p.48) the impression of the contemporary border phenomenon, however, should not deceive the fact that this "shared area" has also historically been in permanent "tension". It is thus justified that the borders may be placed within the current limits, but that they may suffer interference over time, according to the civilizations that are established there, and given the importance that the cross-border location is obtaining for the States in dispute.

Borders and territorial limits are the result of a society in motion. These may undergo modifications with political aspects, associated with social factors that are human creations, but we must also consider the natural border. Considering the unoccupied spaces, States encourage occupation as a way of making oneself present and demarcating the so-called human voids. States promote the occupation of territorial limits to impose themselves as a nation or develop the feeling of nationhood. Region and nation are formed by people who have a common identity and interrelationship, following the principle of *uti possidetis*. In the context of imposing and creating new border lines, the liquid lines easily succumb and are reborn far from there, without the real stakeholders being able to give their opinion. Liquid because they cannot be impregnated/rooted and wither away in the eyes of those who have verified the old and new lines imposed in the interval of occupation of civilizations.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the course of this discussion, it is possible to affirm that the characteristics to which we can identify the aspects that make up region, territory, limits and borders are broader than we can observe in common sense, because these aspects become clear when we raise arguments of the dimension that such statements have. Through the statements proposed above, we can consider that delimiting region is somewhat challenging, since it does not exist in isolation but has its own characteristics, which will be integrated in the junction of the other singularities of other places.

By discussing the different conceptions of border and region, we are creating a careful look at the particularities of the given space we want to characterize. Thus, to define something concrete, unstable and indefinite as some boundaries are, we can interpret that each human group established there is conditioned to provide for its interests before the collectivity.

When we determine a territory that belongs to a nation, we are giving it some characteristics of its own, which are its identity, which needs a space/territory to exist and

overcome the aspects that existed before the certain people delimited a border. The currency is created to divide, to determine what belongs to someone. Being a country's territory is the condition for a company to be incorporated in this place as a way of consolidating that territory. In the contemporary world we are gradually suffering interference and interfering in the post-border world and therefore we are the result of this mixture of human product built there collectively without the use of physical force but of the decisions that are applied by nation states, which ultimately generate a series of conflicts

On the other hand, these singularities will be perceptible through the occupation of space and appropriation of territory, which is a form of taking over the place by an ethnic or cultural group. This territory itself will be identified by its natural and artificial physical characteristics constituted by the man inhabiting this place and this delimitation of the form of occupation will be characterized by the borders themselves, that is, what belongs to the other group that is already different. Essentially we live in territorially demarcated places, we create boundaries and boundaries at all times in wide expanses of land to thus constitute boundaries of "States, Countries, and Plateaus".

REFERENCES

1. Barros, J. D. (2004). O campo da história: Especialidades e abordagens. Vozes.
2. Braudel, F. (1966). *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*. Armand Colin. (Original work published 1949)
3. Braudel, F. (1967). *Civilisation matérielle et capitalisme*. Armand Colin.
4. Carbonari, M. R. (2009). De como explicar la región sin perderse en el intento: Repasando y repensando la historia regional. Unisinos.
5. Corrêa, L. S. (1998). *História e fronteira*. AGB.
6. Corrêa, R. L. (1997). *Trajetórias geográficas*. Bertrand Brasil.
7. Golin, T. (2002). *A fronteira*. L&PM.
8. Martins, J. S. (1997). O tempo da fronteira: Retorno e controvérsia sobre o tempo histórico da frente de expansão e da frente pioneira. In *Fronteira: A degradação do outro nos confins do humano* (pp. 1–XX). Hucitec. [Note: Page range missing; please provide]
9. Moodie, A. E. (1965). *Geografia e política*. Zahar.
10. Nodari, E. S. (2012). Mata Branca: O uso do machado, do fogo e da motosserra na alteração da paisagem no Estado de Santa Catarina. In E. S. Nodari & J. Klug (Eds.), *História ambiental e migrações* (pp. 35–53). Oikos.
11. Raffestin, C. (1993). *Por uma geografia do poder*. Ática.
12. Reckziegel, A. L. S. (1999). *A diplomacia marginal*. UPF Editora.
13. Santos, M. (1978). *Por uma geografia nova*. Hucitec; Edusp.
14. Santos, M. (1985). *Espaço e método*. Nobel.
15. Vidal de la Blache, P. (1921). *Principes de géographie humaine*. Armand Colin.
16. Vilar, P. (2007). *Uma história total em construção*. EDUSC.