



Others ruralities / understanding Chiloé: Proposals for a recomposition based on a new model of territorial epistemology

Francisco Ther-Ríos

Universidad de los Lagos, Chile, Calle Lord Cochrane 1056, Osorno, Chile

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Chiloé archipelago
Critical humanism
Complexity
Territory
Territorial recomposition

ABSTRACT

Adopting as an example the Chiloé archipelago, located in the Los Lagos Region, in Chile's south, this article presents a critical reflection on ways of *understanding* territory that have developed in the nation. The case of Chiloé is particularly relevant. It is an area that has historically been represented as poor, isolated, peasant and traditional and therefore requiring state intervention to promote modernization and development. These circumstances have resulted in interventions performed according to a mainland logic that fails to consider demands and idiosyncrasies that derive from the archipelago's territorial specificities. We propose a paradigm of complexity and critical humanism as an epistemological approach capable of obviating such historical faults and favouring a territorial recomposition of the archipelago directed by future imaginaries.

1. Introduction

To *understand* means to place ourselves in the activity, the process and metabolism that occur in the sea, territories, islands and archipelagos. Several if not all methodological approaches visualize spaces and territories as simultaneously symbolic, material and interwoven. The limitation remains, of course, of the impossibility of treating such concepts in a processual context, or as two dimensions of the same reality (uniduality, Morin, *sensu stricto*). In a processual context, movement in space seems undeniable because the material and symbolic components are interwoven in territorial imaginaries. From working experiences with artisanal fishermen in southern Chile, I have learned more than only rowing and how to ride the waves. Near Castro, in the Puntilla de Yutuy (Island of Chiloé), several years ago, as a teenager, I undertook an adventure for the first time. At midnight, I went out to sea with a few members of the Soto family. The youngest of the brothers, Yeyo, served as captain of our boat, which was no more than 6 m in length. Yeyo was a young man who learned at a young age the skills required to navigate. We departed at approximately one o'clock in the morning, warm with the hope of fishing in the gulf. We had actually selected nets and went out without much gear, but we felt sufficiently equipped. I was much older than Yeyo. Because I had worked in the Fisheries Development Institute (*Instituto de Fomento Pesquero*, IFOP), I was able to return on several occasions to accompany different traditional fishermen. With them, I learned more about the sea and the types of relationship one can have with it. My stays with the Mardones family in Puntilla Pichicolo

(Seno de Reloncaví), with primary school teachers in the Cochamó, with the several Fishermen's Unions on the Island of Chiloé and with the inhabitants of the remote Puerto Raúl Marín Balmaceda enabled me to become involved in the daily work of such individuals and thus to understand their ideas, interests, passions and knowledge. I learned that *understanding* is involvement and that it above all requires starting from recognizing differences, relationships and experiences. *Understanding* can be assimilated when navigating. I learned this fact from people of the sea. When we navigate, we must know and manage a set of knowledge: how a boat is piloted, the appropriate weather for sailing, how much cargo can be carried, how many people are required as a crew, how many passengers can accompany us, the general behaviour of the sea, the maps to use, how much fuel is required. Such matters represent an important set of knowledge that you should acquire in advance. However, even then, you will never truly know what navigating the sea will be like on the day you set out. Each new situation contains its secrets and exigencies, which are manifested only once they occur and whose character is not defined by anything except the relationships between many factors, which always intervene in a different way and to a different degree. In the middle of the sea, simple cloudiness can be just that or, in contrast, end in a great storm. Only once we are navigating will we *understand how* we are navigating. This fact gives meaning when we are navigating. Not only do we navigate. Not only do we simply walk through life. Rather, we *are navigators*. *We live by living*. Navigating in the abstract is one thing. *To be navigating* is another.

In recent years, many of the academic disciplines dedicated to the

E-mail address: fther@ulagos.cl.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.06.032>

Received 14 May 2019; Received in revised form 31 May 2020; Accepted 9 June 2020
0743-0167/© 2020 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

study of geographical spaces have adopted theoretical and methodological approaches that consider the understanding of territory in terms similar to this idea of *to be navigating*. Addressing the study of territorial dynamics means undertaking a path that necessarily leads us to uncover a complex network of incorporated meanings, knowledge implicit in experience and conjectural and imaginary truths in construction. Through this network, the different actors that reside in a territory and dispute with one another over its resources lend meaning to the natural landscape that surrounds them, inhabit it and legitimize their modes of interaction with it. However, at the level of public policies and decision-making, knowledge models and practices applied to a territory remain inspired by epistemological paradigms that are not particularly relevant and that, based on the rigid dichotomies of Western modernity, consider a space as a simple inert container of human action and view time as linear and teleologically progressive.

The objective here is to analyse how the traditional ways of *knowing* a territory that have inspired the development policies of recent years have failed and to propose an alternative epistemological approach, one capable of visualizing spaces and territories in a processual context and accounting for heterogeneity. The Chiloé Archipelago, located in the Lakes Region, southern Chile, is an example of a space historically represented as isolated and pre-modern and therefore in need of state intervention to promote modernization. Performed according to a mainland logic, these interventions have failed to consider demands and idiosyncrasies that derive from the historical-cultural specificities and the ethnic and social heterogeneity of the archipelago. The result is a conflicting socio-political reality, characterized by the struggle against salmon farms, the privatization of natural resources and the recognition of autonomy on the part of indigenous communities, among other factors.

Thus, this article presents a critical reflection on the ways of knowing and understanding a territory in Chile that can be viewed as a tentative contribution to shifting to a more favourable paradigm. In the first part, a review of the current debate on territorial epistemology is presented. The review focuses on contributions that encourage “thinking with the archipelago” (Pugh, 2013) and considering the transcendence of the islanders’ imaginaries. Second, we introduce the main knowledge models applied to the Chilean territory that have predominated since the second half of the twentieth century and configure Chiloé (the centralist and mainland perspective) as a heterotopia (Foucault, 2009). Finally, we propose means to imagine a territorial recomposition of Chiloé inspired by the model of critical humanism.

2. Complex territories: Archipelagic relationships and islander imaginaries

Since its adoption in the fields of geography and the social sciences, the concept of territory has been widely applied. As Horacio Capel explains in the article *Las ciencias sociales y el estudio del territorio (Social sciences and the study of territory)*, the concept began to be used in the 1960s and expressed the desire on the part of geographers to create a knowledge of social utility, a science that could address problems both real and immediate (Capel, 2016: 10). In the same years, the territory as a geographic medium formed by physical and human elements become synonymous with regional space, and the region became the area of application par excellence of economic development policies and of the implementation of regionalization strategies (Juillard, 1962; Claval, 1981; Benedetti, 2009). Such interventions are referred to as “territorial ordering” and aim to balance state centralism while pursuing the greater economic integration of a nation. The idea of spatial planning also inspires international cooperation in efforts to promote development in the world’s poorest areas. Although the concept of territory has always implied an essential correlation between local society and nature, both forged by reciprocal influence, the interventions it inspires correspond to centralist and technocratic logics and pursue the homogenization of territory and assimilation to national and international hegemonic

canons (Pedrazzini and coord, 2011; Araya, 2012).

As the anthropologist James Ferguson (1990) states, in this way, development becomes an *anti-political machine*. The environment, for example, is considered only in its biophysical nature, which can be studied objectively thanks to the contribution of ecologists or physical geographers. This perspective results in interventions that are technical, rational and oriented to solving objective problems and therefore are politically neutral. The failure of this model and the opposition movements it has generated have led academia to reconsider the concept of territory while considering more carefully the social and cultural factors that contribute to its expression.

Within this paradigm shift, we are interested in the research of Chilean philosopher Nelson Vergara Muñoz, who proposes a new epistemology of territory. Vergara believes that to overcome the reductionist and technocratic approaches that science and politics have used to understand the territory, decision-making should be guided by those theoretical contributions that in the philosophical sphere have already revealed the crisis of the “great stories” (e.g., Lyotard, 1979; Vattimo, 1996; Ricoeur, 2001; Habermas, 2004). The Cartesian distinction between object and subject, as the proper loci of the world and of thought, respectively, together with the other fundamental dichotomies of modern thought must cease to inspire public policy. To understand a territory, Vergara states, it is necessary to direct oneself to the definition by Edgar Morin (1995) in *Paradigm of Complexity*. This book incorporates the research of outstanding authors from various disciplines (e.g., Capra, 2002; Maturana, 1975, 1990; Prigogine and Stengers, 1984; Nicolis and Prigogine, 1989), for whom “the real is always a fabric, a plot, a web of diversities and differences, as well as identities, a complex of relationships, interactions and inter-retroactions between humans and environments (or environments); between effectivities, virtualities, concepts and imaginaries, that is, the total of everything that interpenetrate and codetermine” (Vergara, 2010: 166). Within this epistemological framework and in line with the reflections of other contemporary thinkers (Arrighi, 2014; Santos, 1996; Massey, 2005; Haesbaert, 2011, 2013; Ther-Ríos, 2012), a territory should not only be understood as something material but on the contrary as a product that is integrally ideal. A territory is a space-time environment and horizon of collective experience because the social groups who inhabit it appropriate the landscape, which becomes territoriality through the words that constitute it and construct it socially. Therefore, a territory is an appropriate space, a system of identity and historical meanings of specific social groups. For these reasons, Vergara reflects, territoriality is paradoxical in its manifestations given that it consists of a metaphysical dimension and a socio-historical dimension. On the one hand, it is something inherent to human beings, a necessary connection to the environment they inhabit, and, on the other, it is a contingent condition that as such, wears away, rebuilds and recovers (Vergara, 2009).

Thus, a territory is constructed discursively and imaginatively, and therefore, in the words of Vergara, a territory is “a project/journey” thought and created a priori that displays the prerogatives of the dream and utopia, prerogatives closer to emotions and sensibility than to reason (Vergara, 2012). However, the territory becomes concrete and real by virtue of the daily activities and relationships that reproduce such orders of meaning. This relational and dialogical aspect is particularly central in the *Paradigm of Complexity* because the real consistency of territory is not a set of “things” understood as objective data but a dynamic system based on relationships of co-existence susceptible to variation due to the uncertainties, vagueness and random phenomena of each contingency.

Today, geography and the social sciences have tried to move towards greater *complexity* in their understanding of territory. It is opportune here to introduce several concepts related to Vergara’s epistemological proposal and that provide useful tools with which to think about the case of Chiloé. We refer to the concept of the Archipelago and the reflections regarding the Island Imaginaries.

Island studies have undergone a surprising development in recent

years through a joint effort that has been directed to decentralizing static island concepts in favour of valuing the mobile, multiple and interconnected as well as relational nature of their social life (Baldacchino, 2006, 2007; Clark and Tsai, 2009; Fletcher, 2011; Hau'ofa 2008; Mountz, 2015; Pugh, 2018; Sheller, 2009; Steinberg, 2001; Stratford et al., 2011; Vannini, 2012). In different ways, much of this research can be summarized in terms of the idea of “thinking with the archipelago” (Stratford et al., 2011; Pugh, 2018). Through the idea of the Archipelago, one seeks to transform studies on island realities and emancipate islands from the stereotypical meanings that have been attributed to them throughout history. Such stereotypes characterize islands as icons of distance, isolation and backwardness marked by the inevitable destiny of being peripheral to power and modernity. The invitation to think with the Archipelago (Pugh, 2013, 2018) encourages one to understand islands as relational, mobile, multiple and connected spaces and therefore fully involved in global political-economic dynamics. However, this involvement does not only mean assimilation and domination. Rather, it refers to the inter-island movement that expresses the archipelagic mode and transfigures and transforms imposed cultural models, creating new interwoven configurations (ibid.). The archipelago idea is framed in what has been described as the “spatial turn” in the social sciences (Massey, 2005), where emphasis is placed on spatial interconnections instead of static forms of territoriality. According to this tendency, space ceases to be a politically inert object and becomes the main sphere of political struggle. In this sense, *thinking with the archipelago* enables us to question the dogma of state/territory ties and to think instead of issues of government, identities and sovereignty in fluid times, *ex situ* and of blurred borders (Pugh, 2013: 14).

Opposite and yet complementary in his perspective, Burkhard Schnepel (2018) does not consider it appropriate to iconoclastically reject the meanings the West has linked to islands, because these meanings contribute to the expression of *island imaginaries* that influence the social, political, economic and even geophysical realities of such territories. What local actors consider to be an “island” and what an “island” should be like guide what an island will become. While such imaginaries are often reductionist, essentialist, and a legacy of colonial domination, they are assimilated and appropriated by island populations and can occasionally endorse political claims. This phenomenon is due, observes Schnepel, to the ambivalence and plasticity of the island imaginaries, which synthesize contradictory meanings. In addition to being geophysical realities, islands are spaces, or *topoi*, of the human imagination that at least since Homer (Gillis, 2004) have played a central role in Western thought. The dialectic fed by reciprocal desires between island and continent has, on the one hand, generated the “island myth” of islands as lands of phantasmagoria and refuge, strongholds of primitive nature whose inhabitants preserve prelapsarian naiveté. On the other hand, the same conditions of isolation, virginity and liminality have also inspired an imaginary of confinement, imprisonment, abandonment, life outside the law and progress. Both in the literary world (Cooper-Richet and Vicens Puyol, 2012; Galindo, 2000) and in the real world (Gillis, 2004; Schnepel, 2018), islands become laboratories of utopian and dystopian projects, i.e., “other spaces” that Foucault (2009) defines as heterotopies. The material and imaginary legacies of these projects interact in forging the island’s social life and the daily awareness of *being islanders* that guides it.

The finite geography of islands compels the powers that be to view them as controllable and manageable places, closed units whose internal organization is easy to understand and therefore easy to intervene in and govern. Therefore, many colonization processes began on islands or, as in the case of Chiloé, will end there. As previously stated, the intent here is to overcome this presumption of simplicity and promote policies that seek to understand the complexity of territory. In this sense, we use the concept of *territorial recomposition* (Loinger and Némery, 1998) to indicate a process through which diverse actors from a fractured territory imagine and project new compositions for the future, re-assembling the fragments of the territory’s spatial organization. In line with the

concepts we have presented, we believe that Chiloé’s territorial recomposition should be based on a scientific paradigm that fosters a thorough understanding of the local socio-cultural dimension and understands how to disentangle territorial incompatibilities to guide the island community towards the realization of its imaginary of the future. Prior to presenting the epistemological approach that informs this territorial recomposition of Chiloé, it is necessary to analyse the models that have historically inspired territorial planning policies in Chile.

3. The islands of chiloé planned according to a mainland logic or imaginary

Following Brunner et al. (1993), in Chile, since the second half of the twentieth century, two models of knowledge and social practice have been applied to the national territory: a) the positivist-functionalist model and b) the Marxist model. The positivist-functionalist model has been characterized by the pragmatic application of scientific knowledge through social engineering operations. It is a *Hobbesian* system whose intellectual content varies over time and that has adapted and enriched itself with the development of the social sciences (Brunner et al., 1993). Fundamentally, this paradigm aims to establish an *empirical theory* of spaces and has encouraged the collection of data in the field through surveys and the discovery of correlations between data and the development of verifiable indicators. This model considers that the data on various spaces exist objectively and should only be sought to fulfil the requirements of constructing rules using clear techniques. This model is guided by the Cartesian principle in that it is based on recognizing a distance between the observer and the observed object-space. That is, the method inaugurated by Descartes is used to capture objective reality through observation and experimentation. The appearance of the *Discurso sobre el Método (Discourse on Method)* has undoubtedly served as an imaginary of substantial importance for the West, making theory and data the exclusive result of theoretical activity. With this idea, positivist-functionalism, as a rationalization, was incorporated into the political-territorial decision-making processes in Chile once it was perceived as a favourable technological base for the efforts of the benefactor state. For its part, the fundamental motivation of the Marxist model has been the understanding and large-scale transformation of structures, whereby territorial politics and planning are viewed as a battlefield for the conflicting social classes and those who support socialization, education regarding class and party and mass mobilization (Moulian en Brunner et al., 1993). The fundamental difference of this model from the positivist-functionalist paradigm is not so much epistemological, as both feed on the same modernist rationalism, but political. In both cases, there is a reality that presents objective deficiencies, which can and must be known and consequently intervened in to open the path to a more advanced form of society. What distinguishes the first model is that it seeks to maintain current power balances, resulting in a functional type of development that favours the structural *status quo*. In contrast, the second model aims to subvert such a structure, bringing to light the dialectic that animates it and intervening for a more equitable distribution of resources.

From both the national and the regional perspectives, the organization of the islands and sea in Chiloé has been understood and imagined through these models as the determination of a concrete course of action. This organization has entailed establishing guiding principles created by mainland Chile and the sequences of operations necessary to achieve what is desired in the sea, the territories, the islands and the archipelago. In addition, the necessary time frame, cost calculation and financing were established. Thus, the ordering of islands and sea is related to concepts such as efficiency, effectiveness, coordination, precision and control. It involves a rationalizing imagination of the future of the Chiloé Archipelago based on a mainland and centralist scenario, which corresponds to a closed type of reasoning with respect to predictability and direction. As it has been sustained by the paradigm of modernity, territorial ordering involves analysing, planning and

managing activity and techniques for the achievement of goals, objectives and results in the islands and the sea. Generally, there is no recognition of the interrelationships between economic and cultural practices in the instruments that attempt to plan and order what has been termed the maritorium (Álvarez et al., 2019). Both indicative and normative instruments reveal the primacy of models that, originating in mainland logic, order and classify the Inland Sea of Chiloé and the objects that comprise this territorial system through images and representations. From the researcher's perspective, the islands and the sea are represented by means of flat maps. However, representation remains nothing more than a way of ordering and imagining "our" world and the things of the world. In the representation of the islands and sea, what is represented is treated as if it were *truly that other*. Considering that to represent means "to be in the place of another" (Peirce, 1986: 43), in this type of representation, the contagion of subjectivities, emotions and values is avoided. Thus, the representation of the Inland Sea of Chiloé is nullified, being represented only as spatial aggregates.

An example of the inadequacy of territorial planning policies can be found in the PLADECOS (Community Development Plans)¹ of the ten communes of the Province of Chiloé. A study based on simple discourse analysis applied to PLADECOS² texts, in particular to their missions (objectives) and visions (future), has shown how diversity and the archipelagic condition are not primary categories in designing local policies. The study reveals that in the Communes of Chiloé there is little or no problematization of their coastal condition because issues related to the semantic areas of the sea and water are not prioritized. Therefore, the logic that governs the development plans is a mainland one. The island and archipelagic condition of the territory to be intervened in is not considered. Thus, the cultural diversity associated with sea and sea-border environments is silenced. The PLADECOS elaborated with continental logic are again an example of the lack of territorial relevance; and they just repeat the logic of control.

We are interested in imagining a strategy that if not opposite is at least an alternative to the mainland rationalization of the islands and the sea of Chiloé. This *strategy* (vgr Morin), which proceeds in a direction opposite to that of the *program* expressed in the Communes of Chiloé PLADECOS, is understood as a gamble that includes risk and uncertainty. Thus, it is close to the paradigm of complexity in its consideration of territorial action, process and metabolism. It is an open, imaginative rationality that includes reflection on uncertainty and the irreversibility of time in territories, islands and seas. In this regard, Edgar Morin states that "rationality is the game, the incessant dialogue between our spirit that creates the logical structures, that apply them to the world, and that dialogues with that real world" (1995: 102). One finds this type of rationality in critical humanism, an intellectual project involving authors from different disciplines that poses precisely an alternative science to the positivist-functional and Marxist models. This model of knowledge and social practice is interested in both large-scale understanding and small-scale change. Imagining and projecting politics as a field of domination/alienation, it is concerned with the study of different rationalities from molecular, interstitial and qualitative perspectives, relating its field of application with the search and creation/

emancipation of subjects as well as their territorial practices (Hopenhayn en Brunner et al., 1993: 257–258). Among the contributions of critical humanism, it is worth highlighting several approaches and concepts that are particularly appropriate to changing the direction of the applied sciences with respect to decision-making: autopoiesis (Maturana and Varela, 1973), human-scale development (Max-Neef et al., 1986), sustainable local societies (Elizalde, 2003) and endogenous development (Boisier, 2000).

The rationality expressed by critical humanism can alter the tasks of territorial ordering in the islands and sea of Chiloé, including its empirical, experiential and conceptual dimensions. These dimensions include contradiction, disorder, interweaving, interstices, borders, crossing-points, the imaginary and temporalities.

4. Chiloé's archipelagic system imagined as a contemporary heterotopia

The humanist rationality that exalts the understanding of archipelagic territory cannot do without an idea of the future, of a projection of society that guides the modifications that such understanding will generate, thus giving rise to what we term with Morin a strategy to open the north to territorial recomposition. Since ancestral times, human beings have longed been to know in advance what the problems they will face in the future. This longing is expressed by the desire to control the way in which important activities and events develop, such as social organization, politics, the economy and the market, electoral processes, consumer preferences or the political administration of a geographical space. It can be assumed that human beings initially used natural phenomena to divine their immediate future, for example, in relation to hunting activities undertaken across a geographical space, with which they constructed their territorialities by leaving records or traces of their passage and activity. Prehistoric cave paintings represent proof of this contention. In the cave paintings, early man anticipated, perhaps while remembering past experiences, good hunting by ceremonially drawing the death of his prey on the walls. The consulting of oracles in antiquity is another practice that exemplifies the desire to control the unknown, the unmanageable and fearsome. Occasionally, the message of an oracle was of such scope that it even predicted the fate of an entire kingdom. Today, none of these practices have disappeared: "when we talk about forecasts we immediately conjure up images of women in front of crystal balls or unreliable methods such as horoscopes in newspapers. Does this mean that modern man does not need or seek and control the future through the present? The answer is negative, because the difference lies in the type of oracles that we socially and culturally validate" (Siccardi s/f). In fact, there are other ways of representing those who construct the future and project it.

Therefore, it is necessary to differentiate between prediction and forecast or between program and strategy. While the first component refers to an anticipation of the future, that is, to what the future will be like, the second indicates possible scenarios for the future. Today, fortune tellers have not disappeared although on more than one occasion the encounter with reality has resulted in the disappointment of unfulfilled predictions. Techno-oracles continue to fascinate. Similarly, the planning of islands and seas today continues to respond to the logical concern to know the future although today one typically adopts a more active approach than simply waiting for what is predicted to occur. More specifically, what is sought with the ordering of islands and seas (and in general in any type of territorial ordering and planning) is not only the design of future scenarios but also a way to alter them and to obtain the most from them. The planning of the islands and the sea of Chiloé, guided by mainland logic, is being practised such that the future of the archipelago is being planned instead of experienced.

Traditional approaches to territory have imagined the future according to the modern idea of history, in which peripheral territories are viewed as mere ancestral survivals, destined to be dissolved in favour of techno-scientific progress. This type of approach has generated relations

¹ According to Law 18.695 (Organic Constitutional Law of Municipalities), the PLADECOS is a guiding tool for development in each commune. It includes policies aimed at satisfying the needs of the local community and promoting its social, economic and cultural progress. The PLADECOS's minimum validity is four years, and it is not required to coincide with the performance period of the municipal authorities elected by the citizens.

² The results of the study "Antropología y complejidad territorial. Lecturas sobre la diversidad territorial a nivel subnacional" ("Anthropology and territorial complexity. Readings on territorial diversity at a regional level") by Francisco Ther-Ríos were presented at the workshop "Bases para una política de territorios especiales en Chile" organized by SUBDERE (Subsecretaría de Desarrollo Regional y Administrativo) in Santiago on 31/08/2017.

of asymmetric neighbourhoods between the continent and the islands and the sea of Chiloé that make the latter heterotopies in the Foucauldian sense of the term (Foucault, 2009). As in the meanings linked to the island imaginaries by Western culture, this concept presents certain ambivalences that lend themselves not only to indicating a condition of stigmatization but also to inverting that condition by legitimizing antagonistic demands.

Order and disorder are organized in the effective and unreal neighbouring spaces, creating heterotopies, i.e., other spaces, different spaces, spaces of crisis and concealment. In Chiloé, the heterotopies of crisis give rise to hidden territories, or hiding spaces, as a result of the high and intense production of salmon, areas of minimal control over the overexploitation of species and fishery-artisanal resources, for example, or spaces in which rites and traditions are simulated to attract tourism. These spaces are intentionally hidden to be subsequently uncovered by mere economic aims.

Maintained somehow between the heterotopies of crisis and the heterotopies of concealment, heterotopies of deviation also occur in the Inner Sea of Chiloé. Nature today represents a type of deviation driven by the territorial transformations that are being experienced as a result of accelerated progress in science and technology. Knowledge, technology and management are articulated by the knowledge agencies to reinvent the world's visions and overlap with the daily life of island and coastal societies. In this sense, it is important to inquire to make sense of technonature as a product of the combination of technology, environment and the transformation of the local. Ontologically, nature in Chiloé has been viewed as invariant over time, conceptually recognized as prediscursive and presocial (Escobar, 1999). It seems that nature in the Sea of Chiloé is there in itself and outside history and human action. It is an existential space given and maintained by itself. However, this same conception denotes an unnaturalness: the natural is not natural in Chiloé. Artificial realities confuse the natural and the real. For some time, Chiloé has lived *in* a technonature. In this sense, on the one hand, the archipelago is aligned to a world of diversion. On the other hand, in opposition to this process, Chiloé opens up to the re-existence of the anomalous, rebellious and desiring deviation that, for example, disdains a gigantic mall in the City of Castro or, definitively, the construction of the 2750-m Canal Bridge over Chacao, a bridge that, being valued positively by no more than half of the population of Chilota, continues to be built despite the explicit disagreement of the other half of the population. Among other possible redesigns, the mobilized chilotes assure that with the money invested in the construction of the Bridge over the Chiloé Canal, the construction, for example, of hospitals on the Isla Grande de Chiloé would be preferable. In cultural terms, this phenomenon implies that the same heterotopy of deviation is assigned highly different functions according to the Chilote cultural environment, which is complemented by the fact that in the effective territory of the islands and sea the non-natural nature, in its relationship with the Chilote culture, has the quality of juxtaposing “in a single real place different spaces, several locations that are excluded from each other” (Foucault, 2009). In this way, the heterotopies of deviation in Chiloé are always related to temporal conceptions that are managed according to socio-diversity. In this sense, the islands and the sea close, isolate themselves, communicate with other spaces, privatize, resist, shrink and transform themselves, among other processes. Subsequently, the “other spaces” in the Inner Sea of Chiloé are “massified” from the local, exploiting the cultural diversity to live the time of simultaneity, juxtaposition, proximity and distance, contiguity and dispersion. The hidden supremacy of time awards temporality in Chiloé crucial importance in ordering the activities of this archipelagic system.

5. Conclusions

The islands and the sea of Chiloé contain exigencies not programmed for anything except the same interrelations between the different elements and qualities that the inhabitants of Chiloé have in the local area

in significant relationships that unite different and equal subjects, spaces and time. The subject-space-time relationship forms a system in which contextualized subjects live in time. They live and share a temporality. Every space of coexistence, whether “natural” or deliberately stimulated, always brings something new. Consequently, the local space of the archipelago affords us a favourable opportunity to raise questions regarding territories and the future. However, at the same time, the local space of the archipelago also furnishes a favourable opportunity to revolutionize outcomes socially, politically and culturally.

The preceding is better understood because in Chiloé, the succession, duration and simultaneity of territorial phenomena and processes are observed. In fact, over chronological and kairological time, the islands and sea of Chiloé are influenced by human action. Simultaneously, human activities are explicit in the temporal dimension. “To do without time, therefore, amounts to depriving oneself, without a well-founded reason, of the possibility of understanding everyday life, of rendering an account of its effective development” (Pieretti, 1997: 200). At this point, research on territory involves proceeding towards what *occurs in the local* and that in passing creates and projects events in a different way. The analysis of the territorial-everyday in Chiloé then becomes spaces for representation (Halfacree, 1993). Spaces with a strong emotional charge for the islanders. La Mar (in feminine) is present; Expectations regarding the maritory are recognized (). Following Halfacree (1993, 1995), it is about the space of the symbolic and of territorial emotions. They are the spaces lived from temporality.

How can we make the territorial analysis of the islands and the sea of Chiloé have movement and be understandable at the same time? How can we make understanding propitiate territorial recomposition? The answers to these questions undoubtedly concern the imagination, reflection and the organization of knowledge regarding the local and everyday, what could be termed an *epistemology of the imaginary located in time*. When searching for pathways from the territorial everyday, we are advancing towards an encounter with topochronological borders where spaces and times are influenced by human action. Investigating this relation of relationships means incorporating the interior/past in the exterior/future. It concerns the dimension *to occur full of contradictions*. To advance further, one must imagine the future acting on a space inhabited and lived among present challenges. It means entering –in the sense recognized by Halfacree (2006, 2007) for rural studies– in a kind of golden braid built by the experiences of the islanders, mobility practices and the durations of travel at sea, along with the representations or conceived of the archipelago that planners own.

In this sense, the metabolism of the islands and the sea of Chiloé could be understood as a cognitive environmental model, made up of the experiences and practices of the islanders, generally invisible in the analyzes with continental logic, together with the representations of the Archipelagic space present in the minds of planners. Or as a knowledge-thought or theorizing theory regarding the customs that summon a moral born, as we stated at the outset of this paper, in *navigating together*.

Credit author statement

The author thanks the National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research (CONICYT) of the Government of Chile; who financed the FONDECYT 1171827 Project “COASTAL BEHAVIORS SETTINGS”: for an Anthropology of the Territorial Recomposition in the Chiloé Archipelago”. I also thank my colleagues Ricardo Alvarez, Carlos Hidalgo, Alejandra Lazo and Andrea Freddi, for their valuable comments and always timely advice.

Declaration of competing interest

The autor declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research (CONICYT) of the Government of Chile; who financed the financed the FONDECYT 1171827 Project.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.06.032>.

References

- Álvarez, R., Ther-Ríos, F., Skewes, J.C., Hidalgo, C., Carabias, D., García, C., 2019. Obre el concepto de maritorio y su relevancia para los estudios de Chiloé contemporáneo. *Rev. Austral Ciencias Soc.* (in press) S.
- Araya, F. (Ed.), 2012. Paisaje y territorio. Perspectivas didácticas y metodológicas. III Seminario Nacional de Investigación en Educación Geográfica. Editorial Universidad de La Serena, La Serena.
- Arrighi, G., 2014. Il lungo XX secolo. Denaro, potere e le origini del nostro tempo. Il Saggiatore, Milano.
- Baldacchino, G., 2006. Islands, island studies, island studies journal. *Island Studies Journal* 1 (1), 3–18.
- Baldacchino, G. (Ed.), 2007. A World of Islands: in Island Studies Reader. Charlettetown: PEI. Institute of Island Studies, Prince Edward Island.
- Benedetti, A., 2009. Los usos de la categoría región en el pensamiento geográfico argentino. *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias sociales* 13 (286).
- Boisier, S., 2000. Desarrollo (local); ¿de qué estamos hablando. Santiago de Chile: Estudios Sociales, N° 103, C.P.U.
- Brunner, J., Hopenhayn, M., Moulán, T., Paramio, L., 1993. Paradigmas de conocimiento y práctica social en Chile. Libros FLACSO, Santiago de Chile.
- Capel, H., 2016. Las ciencias sociales y el estudio del territorio. *Biblio 3W. Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*. [En línea]. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 5 de febrero de 2016 XXI (1.149). <http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/b3w-1149.pdf>.
- Capra, F., 2002. Las conexiones ocultas, implicaciones sociales, medioambientales, económicas y biológicas de una nueva visión del mundo. Anagrama, Barcelona.
- Clark, E., Tsai, H.M., 2009. Ecologically unequal exchange and landesque capital on Kinmen island. *Asia-Pacific Forum* 44 (2), 148–167.
- Claval, P., 1981. Evolución de la Geografía humana. Oikos-Tau, Barcelona.
- Cooper-Richet, D., Vicens Puyol, C., 2012. De l'île réel a l'île fantasmée: voyages, littérature(s) et insularité. *Nouveau Monde, Paris*.
- Elizalde, A., 2003. Desde el "Desarrollo Sustentable" hacia sociedades sustentables. *Polis* 4, 1–21.
- Escobar, A., 1999. El final del salvaje: naturaleza, cultura y política en la antropología contemporánea. Santafé de Bogotá: CEREC.
- Ferguson, J., 1990. The Antipolitics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fletcher, L., 2011. '... some distance to go': a critical survey of island studies. *New Lit. Rev.* 47/48, 17–34.
- Foucault, M., 2009. [1967] Los Espacios Otros. Available at: Cuatro Tap Anteproyecto. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A9XHx6IEEx-usipxhs2fIcnlqoxPF1WL4ZquozbnG78/edit?pli=1%3C>. (Accessed 1 April 2019).
- Galindo, O., 2000. El imaginario insular antiutópico en la poesía chilena reciente. *Rev. Austral Ciencias Soc.* 4, 175–185.
- Gillis, J., 2004. Islands of the Mind. How the Human Imagination Created the Atlantic World. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingtoke.
- Habermas, J., 2004. Modernidad: un proyecto incompleto-. In: Casullo, N. (Ed.), *El Debate Modernidad-Postmodernidad*. Retórica, Buenos Aires, pp. 53–63.
- Haesbaert, R., 2011. El mito de la desterritorialización. Mexico: Siglo XXI.
- Haesbaert, R., 2013. Del mito de la desterritorialización a la multiterritorialidad. *Cultura y representaciones sociales* 8 (15), 9–42.
- Halfacree, K., 1993. Locality and social representation: space, discourse and alternative definitions of the rural. *J. Rural Stud.* 9 (1), 23–37.
- Halfacree, K., 1995. Talking about rurality: social representations of the rural as expressed by resident of six English parishes. *J. Rural Stud.* 11 (1), 1–20.
- Halfacree, K., 2006. Rural space: constructing a three-fold architecture (chapter 4). In: Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. (Eds.), *Handbook of Rural Studies*. SAGE, London, pp. 44–62.
- Halfacree, K., 2007. Trial by space for a 'radical rural': introducing alternative localities, representations and lives. *J. Rural Stud.* 23 (2), 125–141.
- Hau'ofa, E., 2008. *We Are the Ocean*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu.
- Juillard, E., 1962. La région: essai de définition. *Ann. Geograph.* 71 (387), 483–498.
- Loinger, G., Némery, J.C., 1998. Recomposition et développement des territoires. Enjeux économiques, processus, acteurs. Paris: LHarmattan.
- Lyotard, J.F., 1979. *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Minuit.
- Massey, D., 2005. *For Space*. Sage, London.
- Maturana, H.R., 1975. The organization of the living: a theory of the living organization. *Int. J. Man Mach. Stud.* 7 (3), 313–332.
- Maturana, H.R., 1990. Science and daily life: the ontology of scientific explanation. In: Krohn, W., Koppers, G., Nowotny, H. (Eds.), *Selforganization: Portrait of a Scientific Revolution*. Dordrecht. Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 12–35.
- Maturana, H.R., Varela, F., 1973. *De Máquinas Y Seres Vivos*. Editorial Universitaria, Santiago de Chile.
- Max-Neef, M., Elizalde, A., Hopenhayn, M., 1986. *Desarrollo a escala humana. Una opción para el futuro*. CEPALUR, Santiago.
- Morin, E., 1995. *Introducción Al Pensamiento Complejo*. Gedisa, Barcelona.
- Mount, A., 2015. Political geography II: islands and archipelagos. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* 39 (5), 636–646.
- Nicolis, G., Prigogine, I., 1989. *Exploring Complexity: an Introduction*. W. H. Freeman, New York.
- Pedrazzini, L., coord., 2011. *Ámbitos periurbanos. Líneas guía paisajísticas para la gobernanza urbana/Periurban Landscapes. Landscape planning guidelines. Líneas Guía. Pays. Med.Urban/Guidelines. Pays.Med.Urban, 03, Milano, s.f.*
- Peirce, Ch S., 1986. *La ciencia de la semiótica*. Buenos Aires: ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Pieretti, A., 1997. La vida cotidiana en la prospectiva del futuro. En *Pensar la vida cotidiana. Actas del III Encuentro Internacional de Filosofía*, editores Marcelino Agís V. y Carlos Balañas. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Prigogine, I., Stengers, I., 1984. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Bantam Books, New York.
- Pugh, J., 2013. Islands movements. Thinking with the archipelago. *Island Studies Journal* 8 (1), 9–24.
- Pugh, J., 2018. Relationality and island studies in the anthropocene. *Island Studies Journal* 13 (2), 93–110.
- Ricoeur, P., 2001. *Ideología Y Utopía*. Gedisa, Barcelona.
- Santos, M., 1996. *A Natureza Do Espaço*. Hucitec, São Paulo.
- Schnepel, B., 2018. Introduction. In: Schnepel, B., Alpers, E.A. (Eds.), *Connectivity in Motion: Islands Hubs in the Indian Ocean World*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingtoke, pp. 3–32.
- Sheller, M., 2009. The new Caribbean complexity: mobility systems, tourism and spatial rescaling. *Singapore J. Trop. Geogr.* 30 (2), 189–203.
- Siccardi M (s/f) "¿Se puede predecir el futuro?", artículo disponible en: <http://www.mundolatino.org/siccardi/predecir.htm>.
- Steinberg, P.E., 2001. *The Social Construction of the Ocean*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- Stratford, E., Baldacchino, G., McMahon, E., Farbotko, C., Harwood, A., 2011. Envisioning the archipelago. *Island Studies Journal* 6 (2), 113–130.
- Ther-Ríos, F., 2012. Antropología del Territorio. *Polis* 11 (32), 493–510.
- Vannini, P., 2012. *Ferry Tales: Mobility, Place and Time on Canada's West Coast*. Routledge, New York.
- Vattimo, G., 1996. *La Sociedad Transparente*. Paidós Ibérica, Barcelona.
- Vergara, N., 2009. Complejidad, espacio, tiempo e interpretación (Notas para una hermenéutica del territorio). *Alpha* 28, 233–244.
- Vergara, N., 2010. Saberes y entornos: notas para una epistemología del territorio. *Alpha* 31, 163–174.
- Vergara, N., 2012. Significación social y territorio: aproximaciones metodológicas. *TerraPlural* 4 (2), 169–178.