



HONEY IN/FROM THE PANTANAL: THE TERRITORY, TERRITORIALITIES AND POWER RELATIONS

**MEL NO/DO PANTANAL: O TERRITÓRIO,
AS TERRITORIALIDADES E AS RELAÇÕES DE PODER**

HONEY IN/FROM THE PANTANAL: THE TERRITORY, TERRITORIALITIES AND POWER RELATIONS

MEL NO/DO PANTANAL: O TERRITÓRIO, AS TERRITORIALIDADES E AS RELAÇÕES DE PODER

Geraldino Carneiro de Araújo¹ | Elaine Dupas² | João Pedro Ferraz Zanetoni³
Daniela da Silva Carvalho⁴ | Milton Augusto Pasquotto Mariani⁵

Received: 04/09/2025
Accepted: 09/11/2025

¹ PhD in Business Administration (UNINOVE).
Professor at the Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul. Campo Grande, MS, Brazil.
Email: geraldino.araujo@ufms.br

² PhD in Public Law (USP).
Professor at the Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul. Campo Grande, MS, Brazil.
Email: elaine.dupas@ufms.br

³ PhD in Business Administration (UFMS).
Naviraí, MS, Brazil.
Email: joao.zanetoni@ufms.br

⁴ PhD in Business Administration (UFMS).
Naviraí, MS, Brazil.
Email: joao.zanetoni@ufms.br

⁵ PhD in Human Geography (USP).
Professor at the Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul. Campo Grande, MS, Brazil.
Email: milton.mariani@ufms.br

ABSTRACT

The objective of this article was to analyze the territory, territorialities, and power relations in honey production from the perspective of riverside residents of the Pantanal in Mato Grosso do Sul. Two communities were considered: Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar. The research is characterized as exploratory and descriptive, with a qualitative approach using observation and interviews as data collection methods. The data were treated according to content analysis and report writing. Based on the description of space and territory-the Pantanal and Pantanal Honey-the study sought to understand the territory and territorialities surrounding honey production in and from the Pantanal, in order to analyze power relations. Two realities were identified: "Honey in the Pantanal" and Pantanal Honey, in which the differences (cultural, social, political, and economic) are mainly based on the possibility of appropriating the Geographical Indication (GI)-in the case of Pantanal Honey-and the relationships communities have with other actors. "Honey in the Pantanal" represents a rustic, homemade, cultural, and manual production that does not appropriate the GI.

Keywords: Beekeeping. Riverside community. Southern Mato Grosso Pantanal.

RESUMO

O objetivo deste artigo foi de analisar o território, as territorialidades e as relações de poder na produção de mel pela percepção dos ribeirinhos do Pantanal de Mato Grosso do Sul. Foram consideradas duas comunidades: Paraguai Mirim e Vila do Amolar. A pesquisa se caracteriza como exploratória e descritiva, com uma abordagem qualitativa utilizando observação e a entrevista como método de coleta de dados. Os dados foram tratados de acordo com a análise de conteúdo e elaboração de relatórios. Partindo da descrição do espaço e território - Pantanal e do Mel do Pantanal -, procurou-se entender o território e as territorialidades em torno da produção de mel no e do Pantanal, para então analisar as relações de poder. Foram identificadas duas realidades, o “Mel no Pantanal” e o “Mel do Pantanal”, em que as diferenças (culturais, sociais, políticas e econômicas) se apoiam principalmente na possibilidade da apropriação da Identificação Geográfica (IG) - no caso, do Mel do Pantanal - e nas relações que as comunidades têm com outros atores. O “Mel no Pantanal” é uma produção rústica, caseira, cultural e manual que não se apropria da IG.

Palavras-chave: Apicultura. Comunidade ribeirinha. Pantanal sul-mato-grossense.

INTRODUCTION

The Pantanal is the largest flooded plain in the world, an ecosystem that covers parts of three countries: Brazil, Bolivia, and Paraguay. In the Brazilian portion, the biome occurs in the states of Mato Grosso and Mato Grosso do Sul, and this study considered the region of the Paraguay River in Corumbá-MS. The riverside communities in this region are, for the most part, families that live basically from selling bait to tourists and who live along the course of the region's rivers, in communities such as Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar.

For the riverside community, there are alternatives for products and services beyond bait, many of them aimed at meeting the demands of tourism, with honey production being an alternative for work and income generation. In this sense, there seems to be great potential for honey production in the territory by riverside families. The proof of this is the Geographical Indication (GI) of Pantanal Honey: the honey produced in the Pantanal region, with due approvals, can use the seal that identifies it, which is a differentiator in the market.

Dorneles *et al.* (2014) highlight that the state of Mato Grosso do Sul has great potential for the expansion of beekeeping. However, not all riverside residents have knowledge about the GI or even about Pantanal Honey; those who are on the sidelines of this information produce “Honey in the Pantanal” in a cultural way, that is, in the way they believe is correct and can generate income.



In view of this entire context, this text proposes to analyze the territory, territorialities, and power relations in honey production from the perspective of the riverside residents of the Pantanal, considering two communities: Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar, in Mato Grosso do Sul. The specific objectives involve: (a) characterizing the space, territory, and Pantanal Honey; (b) describing the territory and territorialities around honey production; and (c) analyzing the power relations in honey production in the territory.

The present research is anchored in the concept of regional development, understood as social and economic progress at a territorial level, which incorporates both aggregated indicators, such as income and employment, and specific local factors - social, cultural, institutional, and economic - that shape the evolution of a territory (Madureira, 2015). Previous studies on GIs, such as those by Flores (2007), Velloso (2008), and Farias (2022), show that geographical certification can promote regional development by valuing local products and strengthening community organization. In this way, this work articulates the analysis of the territory and territorialities with the perspective of regional development, demonstrating how honey production in the Pantanal can contribute to income generation, cultural preservation, and the strengthening of riverside communities.

In terms of the text's structure, this first section presented the introductory aspects, with the presentation of the central idea, guiding questions, the research problem, and the research objectives. The second section deals with the theoretical foundation on territory and territorialities. In the third section, the methodological procedures with the characteristics and stages of the research carried out are presented. The fourth section presents the results and analysis. In the fifth section, the final considerations are discussed, and finally, the acknowledgments and text references are presented.

THE TERRITORY AND THE TERRITORIALITIES: A THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

To understand regional development in its entirety, it is necessary to look at the local processes that shape the social and economic organization of a territory. In this sense, territory and territorialities emerge as fundamental concepts, as they allow us to analyze how communities interact with the space in which they live and how their social, cultural, and economic practices contribute to regional progress (Reis; Maia, 2009; Abreu, Braga, 2019; Madureira, 2015).

Abreu and Braga (2019) highlight that the dynamics of territory and territoriality directly impact regional identity and the search for better socioeconomic conditions, especially in peripheral and Amazonian contexts. Complementing this perspective, Reis and Maia (2009) show that public policies in Science and Technology can transform traditional territories, creating new forms of territoriality and boosting regional development processes.

Territory and territoriality are central dimensions for understanding regional development. Thus, the discussions about the territory as a product of social relations between man and the environment - both physical and social (Dematteis; Governa, 2005), but also, and mainly, as a historical construction, which is the result of a long human and environmental evolutionary process (Magnaghi, 2010) -, advancing to conceptions that delve into the social relations that occur through a set of actions and practices of local subjects in their own territories of life and existence, that is, the territorialities (Dematteis, 2005), will be debated in this theoretical section.

From this perspective, when proposing a discussion of the territory and its territorialities, the importance of these concepts as key components to understanding how society is organized is highlighted; in addition, it also illuminates the path for the debate on the importance of subjects in controlling their actions regarding the space in which they live. To propose a coherent discussion about the territory as the result of the interaction between man and the physical and social environment and territorialities as the set of actions on the appropriation of the territory, it is necessary to explain what space and territory are, emphasizing the relationship between the two (Morais, 2018).

Many times the concept of territory is confused with that of space, which makes a brief discussion that allows us to differentiate them both opportune. As suggested by Eduardo (2006),



several authors begin their discussions on territory by assuming that it is made effective from the social appropriation of space. Although this is the correct understanding, the same author points out that when starting from this assumption, many researchers only treat space as a synonym for ground. Even so, it is evident that there are differences between space and territory, that is, they cannot be treated as synonyms. "Territory is a historical and, therefore, social construction, based on power relations (concrete and symbolic) that concomitantly involve society and geographical space" (Haesbaert; Limonad, 2007, p. 42, our translation), that is, territory exists in space.

Saquet (2009) makes a point of highlighting that space corresponds to the natural environment and the socially organized environment, while territory is a product, that is, a construction made of historical actions that materialize in space at different times, being the result of socio-spatial dynamics. Man acts and interacts in the territory, which is the space of his habitat, to produce and live (Saquet, 2006). These (space and territory) can never be separated, given that if there is no space there are no territories (Haesbaert, 2009); "space is indispensable for the appropriation and reproduction of the territory" (Saquet, 2009, p. 83, our translation).

Summarizing the authors mentioned above, the territory is, therefore, a construction historically carried out by a series of actors who relate to each other in a geographical space. It is the product of the social reproduction of these actors. In this sense, the dimensions of analysis used to study the territory should not consider it as something natural, but a social product that arises from the historical events of society. According to Morais (2018), this conception allows for a reading of the territory, which focuses on the process of territorialization of actors in space. The process of territorialization is not linear, given that it is about the relationship between man and space throughout his life, carrying and reflecting cultural, economic, and political dynamics of society in the course of his existence in the world.

Currently, the concept of territory and the discussions are increasingly found in academic works explaining, in different ways and in a multidimensional way, how the appropriation of space is done, constituting the territory (Fuini, 2017). One of the main conceptions of territory is seen in the work of Raffestin (1993), one of the pioneers of the territorial approach. Although his analysis focuses on the economic dimension, the author recognizes the importance and complementarity

between the spheres of economics, politics, and culture - explored better later in the text. It is then that the territory for Raffestin (1993) is produced by a network of relationships created by individuals or groups of individuals, in a multidimensional way. The territory can be nothing other than the product created by this network, and it is these actors, in the maintenance of relations between themselves and with nature, who create it from the initial reality, space.

This definition of territory given by Raffestin (1993) is in line with others already discussed; however, an aspect to be highlighted in his works concerns the plurality of his approach. As well pointed out in their reflections, Souza and Pedon (2007) conclude that the territory can be analyzed from different dimensions, such as power relations, but also as being the stage for affective and identity connections between social actors and their space. This is also highlighted by Saquet (2006) when stating that the multidimensionality in relation to what this author called territory should not be forgotten - this being the result of power relations of the State, business systems, organizations, and individuals.

Once the importance of evolution in the approach to territory is understood, which begins to consider it as multidimensional, we move on to discussing ways to understand this construction of the territory from its various dimensions. For this, the works of Haesbaert (1995, 1997, 2004, 2007) are of utmost importance. The author states that territory is the result of social interactions between individuals and nature and can only be understood when its dimensions are addressed.

In Haesbaert (1995, 1997, 2004), three main aspects are developed: a) “political or juridical-political”, which is seen as a delimited space, where a certain power is exercised through control, generally related to the power of the State ; b) “economic or economicist”, the territory incorporated into the capital-labor relationship, in the clash of social classes or seen as a source of resources ; c) “cultural, culturalist or symbolic-cultural”, in which a more subjective dimension is prioritized, in which the territory is seen as a product of appropriation, the result of the valorization of a group in relation to the lived space.

These definitions are important for understanding that territory is the result of a wide range of factors that move through different dimensions, which give territories different meanings, but which are always in harmony with the whole. According to Saquet (2015), the multidimensional

approach understands that territory is the result of different power relations, conflicts, inequalities, networks, among other economic, political, and cultural aspects. In addition, the author adds a natural/environmental dimension, which concerns the relational dynamics that involve the physical space in question and the impacts caused on the environment (Saquet, 2015). In this sense, it is necessary to establish analytical categories that will cover the different dimensions of the territory and that must be analyzed as a sum. Learning the totality allows one to understand both the general and the more specific and deep aspects that constitute a territory.

Territoriality is addressed especially in the works of Dematteis (2005), Raffestin (1993), Soja (1971), and Sack (1986). The first considers territoriality to be the sum of social, economic, cultural, and political relations that are produced by social actors (Dematteis, 2005). For the second author, territorialities are built in the society-nature relationship, that is, they are multiple and involve the various actors that are part of the territorialization process (Raffestin, 1993). For the third, it is about different social behaviors that add up and are part of the identity construction of agents in the territory (Soja, 1971). Finally, the fourth author understands territoriality as actions that aim to control certain spaces (Sack, 1986).

In the field of anthropology, Little (2004) defines territoriality as an accumulation of the collective effort of a social group to occupy, use, control, identify itself with and belong to a specific portion of their living environment, converting this space into their home, their territory. Returning to Raffestin (1993), when talking about territorialities, the author highlights that men live the territory; this process is seen through a system of existential and/or productivist relations. Territorialities are seen in the daily life of men. On this point, Saquet (2010) adds that territoriality is the translation of the set of everything that is lived daily; they (territorialities) are in the relations with work, with non-work, with family, etc. In this sense, territoriality is also linked to social and cultural relations, in addition to man's daily activities in nature (Ferreira, 2014).

By territoriality, therefore, we must understand how social actors act in the territory based on symbolic, cognitive, and practical mediation. It is understood, then, that territory is a social, historical, and relational construction, and territorialities, which are constituted by the processes of appropriation of a space by the people who dominate it. It results from the process of territorialization

and the territorialities that arise in the relations experienced by subjects, groups, and social agents in space-time. Territorialities are the unfolding of daily activities and relations carried out in the territory; they correspond to the daily life present in work, family, church, stores, banks, schools, rites and customs, organizations, etc. (Saquet, 2006, 2010). It is linked to the daily life and the place of living of individuals and social groups. It is, therefore, the reflection of the political, economic, and socio-cultural dimensions in people's daily lives (Ferreira, 2014).

Some works emphasize methodological aspects of the approach to the territory and its territorialities. Rambo and Filippi (2012) highlighted that the development of the territory refers to the power relations that give it body. According to these authors, these relationships give uses to the territory and should be better observed methodologically. These conceptions refer to Cox (1998), who highlighted, in addition to the power relations themselves, the fact that they occur in a multi-scalar and multidimensional way. More recently, two works by Saquet (2014, 2018) discussed the territorial approach: in the first, the author highlights the relational aspect and adds the historical character, making it clear that the territory is formed in a non-linear way, through the relationships that are built in the different historical moments of individuals; in the second work, the author adds the issues of conflicts and heterogeneity that also make up the territory and must be considered from a methodological point of view.

Among all the more comprehensive issues, the relational perspective is the one that stands out the most. It is necessary to understand the relationships that are formed in the territories. Moura and Moreira (2014) point out some issues that should be observed in studies that use the territorial approach. These points are indicators that must be present in territorial analyses, especially when thinking about territorial development strategies: Which actors are involved and in what? What strategies are used? What is the level of intervention of the different actors? Which actors and resources are most important? How are the actors' spaces of action configured/organized? These points understand both how the actors organize themselves and how they relate to each other in the territory.

Another important characteristic is the multidimensionality of relations. Fuini (2017) proposes multidimensional methodological elements, which consider actors and relationships. The political

dimension refers to the rules of control of the territory and how the different actors involved plan and organize themselves in order to enable structures, regulate actions, transfer resources and income to the population, etc. In the economic dimension, the author includes the set of productive activities that are part of the daily life of the territory and the actors who live in it, it concerns the infrastructure, work, and commercialization flows, etc. In the cultural dimension, a series of cultural manifestations that are (re)created in the historically developed territorialities and are part of the daily lives of the actors are included. And in the environmental dimension, the author refers to the physical section that will be analyzed, how natural resources are used, and what are the impacts of the different actions and routine circulations.

Therefore, it is understood that territory is a social and historical construction, resulting from the relations between subjects and geographical space, manifesting itself through territorialities. These daily and relational practices - economic, political, cultural, and environmental - express how social actors appropriate, transform, and value the territory. In this sense, regional development is not reduced to macroeconomic indicators, but is materialized in local dynamics, social interactions, and practices of space appropriation. Thus, analyzing territory and territorialities allows us to understand how the actions of individuals and groups in the territory influence and promote regional development, showing that the economic, social, and cultural evolution of a region is intrinsically linked to the way its inhabitants live, produce, and interact with the space they occupy.

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The present research was characterized as exploratory and descriptive, with a qualitative approach. Exploratory research enables the development of concepts in a clearer way to understand the phenomenon, while descriptive research enables the description of the phenomenon or its characteristics (Cooper; Schindler, 2003). In this study, the phenomenon was considered to be the honey produced by riverside residents in the Pantanal of Mato Grosso do Sul - considering that Pantanal Honey has a Geographical Indication (GI) of the Indication of Origin (IP) kind since 2015 (Fernandes *et al.*, 2019). The qualitative approach was chosen because it is a very relevant form of research when the phenomenon is relatively new or little known and also due to the interest in understanding the nature



of the field of study in more detail (Richardson, 2008; Sampieri; Collado; Lucio; 2013).

The research was carried out in two stages, one unstructured and the other structured. In the unstructured phase, small boat pilots, residents of the Pantanal region near the Paraguay River, and people linked to tourism (owner of a tourism company and fishing tourists) were interviewed; notes were made in the research diary. Thus, riverside residents were identified in Paraguai Mirim who produced honey (Interviewees 1, 2, and 3) and offered it to tourists, as well as a Honey Processing Center in Vila do Amolar, which was managed by a riverside couple (Interviewees 4 and 5) and run by an NGO. In the structured phase, three riverside residents from the Paraguai Mirim community and two from the Vila do Amolar community, located on the Paraguay River, in the Pantanal, in Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, were considered as research subjects. A semi-structured script was used on the space, territory, territorialities, and power relations considering the Honey in and from the Pantanal. The interviews were recorded and transcribed; actions were also taken in the research diary and photographic records.

The theoretical foundation on territory, territorialities, and regional development directly guided the methodological choices of this research. The selection of the communities of Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar considered the diversity of forms of space appropriation and productive practices related to honey, allowing the observation of different territorialities in distinct socio-cultural contexts. The semi-structured interview script was developed based on the concepts of power relations and appropriation of the territory, making it possible to capture information about economic, social, and cultural practices that shape regional development.

The interviewees were previously informed about the objectives, methods, possible risks, and benefits of the study, ensuring understanding and voluntary participation. The Free and Informed Consent Form was obtained, respecting the autonomy of the participants and the right to withdraw from the research at any time or not to answer questions if they did not feel comfortable. Anonymity and confidentiality were rigorously preserved through the coding of the information collected, protecting identity and sensitive data. In addition, the research respected the habits, routines, and cultural practices of the communities, avoiding any interference or negative impact on their daily activities.

The analysis synthesizes the data collected in the research according to the theory presented and according to the content analysis and report writing. Bardin (2004) states that content analysis is a set of communication analysis techniques that uses systematized and objective procedures for describing the content of messages. Content analysis was guided by the understanding of the territory as a historical and social construction and of territorialities as concrete manifestations of the interactions of actors in space, allowing the collected data to be interpreted in line with the theoretical framework and to reveal the socio-territorial dynamics present in the production of Honey in/from the Pantanal. Still on the analysis, Eisenhardt (1989) pointed out that it is common to prepare detailed reports that are often pure descriptions but are fundamental for the development of the idea. The raw data collected in the field (research diaries and interview transcripts) were reviewed and corrected, allowing the inclusion of reflective notes. In the process of data collection and analysis, there was a multiplicity of data, information, and content.

RESEARCH FINDINGS: TERRITORY, TERRITORIALITIES AND HONEY

In this section, the research findings are presented, discussing the space, the territory, the territorialities - considering the political, economic, and cultural dimensions - and the power relations around the Honey in/from the Pantanal.

SPACE, TERRITORY AND PANTANAL HONEY

According to Saquet (2009), space is the natural and socially organized environment. The research considered the riverside residents of the communities of Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar, in the Pantanal of Mato Grosso do Sul, in Corumbá. The Pantanal, in its Brazilian portion, is a biome characterized by being a flooded plain in the states of Mato Grosso do Sul (25%) and Mato Grosso (7%) (Silva; Abdon, 1998). Mioto, Paranhos Filho and Albrez (2012) identified the sub-regions in the Pantanal, with Paraguay being one of them, with an area of 3,015 m², which corresponds to 2% of the entire Pantanal plain (of a total of 140,640 km² of Pantanal). The Paraguay River, which gives the sub-region its name, is part of the Prata Basin, covering Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay. The Paraguay River flows from north to south, covering an extension of 2,621 km, of



which 1,693 km are located in Brazilian territory (Steinke; Saito, 2010; Silva; Souza, 2012; Santana; Silva; Silva, 2017).

The human being acts and interacts in the territory, which is his living, production, and dwelling space (Saquet, 2006), which was built and rebuilt historically and socially from power relations (Haesbaert; Limonad, 2007). Along the Paraguay River there are several riverside communities. Therefore, the research considered the riverside residents of Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar, which are nearby communities that share the same territory. It is very common throughout the covered region to produce bait to meet the demand of fishing tourists - which is the most common tourism in Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul. Families see bait production as the main opportunity to generate income; in contrast, we considered honey production.

Honey was chosen due to some factors; the main one is that Pantanal Honey is an initiative of Embrapa Pantanal, which obtained the registration of a Geographical Indication (GI) of the Indication of Origin (IP) kind, granted by the National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) in 2015, and can be used as a great differentiator for the territory (Reis; Bijos; Menegazzo, 2015). Embrapa Pantanal defined the criteria with the minimum procedures that must be adopted for beekeeping production in the Pantanal (Fernandes *et al.*, 2019). There are approximately two thousand beekeepers in Mato Grosso and Mato Grosso do Sul who can benefit from the GI of Pantanal Honey (Mel [...], 2015).

The GI guarantees the protection of the geographical name and obtains a differentiation of the product with exclusivity in the market (Joia, 2021). The production of Pantanal Honey is certified with the seal for commercialization and other purposes when the activity occurs in the area delimited as the Pantanal of the states of Mato Grosso and Mato Grosso do Sul. The apiary is certified as a producer of Pantanal Honey only after inspection by the Management Committee. It is necessary to follow Good Beekeeping Practices, and the processing must be carried out in a unit with some type of inspection service (municipal, state, or federal) (Reis; Bijos; Menegazzo, 2015).

Despite this initiative, the idea of Pantanal Honey does not seem to be widespread among the riverside communities, and divergent discourses were perceived in the unstructured phase. Considering the Pantanal as a territory and honey as a starting point, the research was structured in order to describe the territory and the territorialities around honey production - even if it is not Pantanal Honey. The community of Paraguai Mirim is conducive to fishing, so there is a large flow



of tourists. A riverside resident who produces honey (Interviewee 1) and a riverside couple who produced honey (Interviewees 2 and 3) were identified - "Honey in the Pantanal". In Vila do Amolar, which is an area for fishing and experience tourism (it seems to be a new modality), is where a Honey Processing Center is located, linked to an NGO and managed by a riverside couple (Interviewees 4 and 5) - Pantanal Honey.

HONEY, TERRITORY AND TERRITORIALITIES

The territory is a construction, a product of the social reproduction of actors (Morais, 2018), which occurs from the complementarity between the economic, political, and cultural dimensions (Haesbaert; 1995, 1997, 2004). The intrinsic relationship with tourism was perceived in the studied territory, the Pantanal; thus, what drives the economy in the communities are the tourists, who previously acquire complete travel packages with transport/stay and food included. The main economic activity in the territory takes place around fishing tourism. The riverside residents turn their production to serve this public (offering bait) and, secondarily, offer other goods and services, one of which is honey.

In political terms, the existence of communities with delimited controls is perceived. In Vila do Amolar, there is the presence of a tourism agent with a private space and infrastructure to receive tourists. In this environment, there is the space of the Honey Processing Center, which is managed by an NGO and serves interested tourists. There are a few riverside residents - there are masonry houses in this place. The Paraguai Mirim community seems to be egalitarian: there are riverside residents, most living in stilt houses, and they are all made of wood. However, a lot of connection (or dependence) was seen with external people - with the president of the NGO (the same as Vila do Amolar) and with another tourism agent who explores the region and partnered with only one family of riverside residents. In both communities described, the strong power of the State in the communities was not noticed.

The relationship between the riverside residents and honey in the cases analyzed differs. The riverside residents of Paraguai Mirim use means of production that are tied to the historical form of the relationship between man and nature: direct contact, in the "middle of the woods". The riverside



residents of Vila do Amolar appropriate the name Pantanal Honey; they meet the requirements to have the GI, but still do not have the seal, and all the dynamics around honey assume a more sophisticated form. The distinct dynamics are territorialities that differ and that seem to bring with them a content of power relations from the installation of the Processing Center - that is, the production of honey is done differently by the riverside communities, and, in general, what was perceived in the territory are human relations around two realities, “Honey in the Pantanal” (a name to identify the production of honey that does not appropriate the GI) and Pantanal Honey (honey production that can use the GI).

“HONEY IN THE PANTANAL”, PANTANAL HONEY, TOURISM AND POWER RELATIONS

“Honey in the Pantanal” in Paraguai Mirim is a rustic, homemade, cultural, and manual production, which uses beehives in nature - or “*cachopa*”, as they themselves put it. The riverside resident demonstrates a relationship with the environment when he talks about the importance of controlling the burning, but, contradictorily, uses smoke to handle the bees. It is not possible to guarantee the safety of the product offered, due to the working and processing conditions, but it is understood that the income generated is directed directly to the riverside family that produced it.

There is another agent that is part of the power dynamics around honey and that also contributes to the development of new territorialities. Tourism is a very strong practice in the studied region, and tourism agents are inserted in the territorialities around honey. There is a tourism agent who formed a partnership and included a honey-producing riverside family on the tourist itinerary - this partnership was restricted to one family. Other families that want to (or return to) produce honey should seek commercialization means, which can be with this agent or occur at fairs and retailers in Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, as has been done previously. The “Honey in the Pantanal”, regardless of the riverside family that produces it, has no label; the bottle in which the product is sold is reused, and the producers are unaware of the issue of the seal, GI, and concrete information about Pantanal Honey.

Pantanal Honey, in Vila do Amolar, is a kind of mini-agroindustry, with the honey produced from bees raised in boxes and the productive process being carried out in an adequate environment



(Honey Processing Center), in accordance with sanitary standards, with machines and equipment for this production - including access to drinking water. Despite all the structure, honey production is low. The riverside couple who manage the center also demonstrate a relationship with the environment; they talk about the importance of trees and flowers, but the discourse does not go deep, and they point out that the location, Vila do Amolar, is not the most appropriate for honey production.

In this sense, the riverside couple is training the women of the Canal do Bonfim community to produce honey from bees raised in boxes - a proposal from the NGO. The people from this community will be able to use the Processing Center, subject to scheduling and a commitment to follow good practice protocols, and thus be able to use the Pantanal Honey GI seal - however, they have not yet appropriated it. The product produced at the Center has a label (it does not contain all the food information); the container is standardized (hermetic jars and lids), and the income generated is partly for the producer, partly for the NGO.

Based on what was presented and agreeing with Souza and Pedon (2007), the territory can be analyzed from power relations, and Saquet (2015) complements by including conflicts and inequalities. Considering the position of the riverside residents themselves, some judgments are perceived considering the honey production method. Some say that "Honey in the Pantanal" is impure and others even claim that "Pantanal Honey is not even honey", since the bees are fed with sugar and water. These divergences can be considered power conflicts. Power relations are fundamental to understanding socio-territorial dynamics.

A brand, like the GI, or a tourism sector agent can assume a role of imposing power on the territory, which helps to understand the non-adherence to the brand or the low participation of tourism in relation to the riverside residents who adhere to the GI. However, they do not realize that everyone could gain (in economic terms) if they united knowledge and practices, if they shared spaces - especially the Processing Center - offering quality and safe honey and generating income for the riverside residents of the entire territory. Together, they would have more voice and visibility, being able to negotiate with tourism agents and even demand support from public power. A possible solution and alignment of strategies and power dynamics can be associated based on collective actions and decisions.

In addition to the riverside communities, as Rambo and Filippi (2012) reinforce, the territory refers to power relations, and here they highlight other actors in the territory, but who have a strong relationship with the riverside community. Embrapa Pantanal seems to hold the knowledge about the process of appropriating the Pantanal Honey GI, being, therefore, a relevant actor for the development of honey production in the territory. The NGO can be a partner of Embrapa in this process, even involving the entire riverside community, informing/facilitating access to the Honey Processing Center. The tourism agents can also be partners of the riverside residents, thinking about marketing strategies with tourists and working together with members of the tourism trade. Finally, the local public authority could get involved in activities and mobilize actors, these and others, around honey, generating positive externalities beyond the quality of life of the riverside residents of the territory. All these agents can get involved with the socio-territorial dynamics around honey, however, power conflicts also have the potential to increase.

Experiences in other regions, such as the Amazon, Serra Gaúcha and Urussanga-SC, show that the GI can be a vector of regional development by promoting productive inclusion, quality tourism and greater revenue, but it can also generate social exclusion if there is a concentration of power and income (Flores, 2007; Velloso, 2008; Farias, 2022). Carvalho, Pereira and Ferraz (2017) reinforce that the success of the GI depends on sociocultural relations, the competence of the actors and integration into consumer markets.

In this way, the present study shows that regional development is intrinsically linked to the social, economic, and cultural practices present in the territory. The different forms of honey production and appropriation reflect the territorialities of the riverside residents, who interact with the space and with other actors in relations of cooperation and conflict. The Pantanal Honey GI emerges as an instrument capable of articulating these practices, creating opportunities to increase income, strengthen local identity and promote social inclusion, as long as the actors share knowledge and resources. Thus, understanding the territory as a social and historical construction, mediated by power relations and territorialities, allows us to perceive that regional development is not just an economic dimension, but a complex process, shaped by the interaction between individuals, institutions and spaces, reflecting the social and historical dynamics of the Pantanal.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The objective of this article was to analyze the territory, territorialities and power relations in honey production from the perspective of the riverside residents of the Pantanal. For this, a selection was made considering two communities: Paraguai Mirim and Vila do Amolar. Starting from the description of the space and territory (Pantanal and the Paraguay sub-region) and the explanation about Pantanal Honey, we sought to understand the territory and the territorialities around honey production to then analyze the power relations.

The main finding of the research is that, despite being in the same territory, two realities were identified: “Honey in the Pantanal” and Pantanal Honey. The differences are cultural, social, political and economic; they are based mainly on the appropriation of the Geographical Indication (GI) and the relationships that the communities have with other actors. “Honey in the Pantanal”, in Paraguai Mirim, does not appropriate the GI, but the culture. The production does not follow good practices; they use beehives from nature, have a partnership with a tourism agent and have a relatively high productivity. Pantanal Honey, in Vila do Amolar, meets the technical requirements to appropriate the GI, but with a low production, and the beekeepers try to follow the sanitary norms in the Honey Processing Center. It was also seen, in the course of the research, that tourism, as an agent, has dynamics and power relations in the territory.

Given this brief context and considering the power relations, some points arise: 1) It would be interesting for the riverside residents of Paraguai Mirim to be sensitized/trained on good honey production practices and the Pantanal Honey GI; 2) The Honey Processing Center of Vila do Amolar could adapt and appropriate the Pantanal Honey GI and perhaps even train the riverside residents of Paraguai Mirim, including enabling the use of the place; 3) The tourism agents and the local public authority are interested, in addition to fishing tourism, in the development of Pantanal Honey and could support and publicize this product; and 4) The consumer market seems to recognize the Pantanal Honey GI with a possible willingness to pay more for this product with the seal.

The power relations analyzed throughout the text hinder the process, but they can turn to developing the territory from Pantanal Honey, with coordinated and articulated actions among all the actors in the territory. A solution is not proposed here, but the points mentioned above can be the



beginning of reflections in this regard.

The territorialities of the riverside residents, manifested in the different forms of honey appropriation, reveal how the geographical space is lived, produced and transformed historically. The GI, as an instrument for valuing the product and recognizing the territory, has the potential to articulate these practices, promote social inclusion, strengthen local identities and boost the regional economy. In this way, understanding territory, territorialities and regional development as interdependent dimensions allows us to perceive that local progress is the result of complex processes of interaction between individuals, communities, institutions and spaces, reflecting the social and historical dynamics of the Pantanal.

The present study has limitations, since it focused on the territory, territorialities and power relations in the production of Honey in/from the Pantanal from the perspective of some riverside residents; thus, the findings should not be generalized - remaining restricted to the time, space and subjects of the research. Despite the limitations, the study brings theoretical and social contributions. The theoretical contributions involve the territory in honey production, considering the existing power relations in this reality. The social contributions are in the sense of promoting a reflection on honey production and the appropriation of the GI.

Future studies could propose qualitative research on the other actors in the territory that have a strong connection with the riverside residents in honey production: Embrapa Pantanal, tourism agents, NGO and local public authority. It would also be interesting to understand more about the diffusion and obstacles to the appropriation of Pantanal Honey by the riverside residents, among other studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was carried out with the support of the Fundação Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS) and the Fundação de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento do Ensino, Ciência e Tecnologia do Estado de Mato Grosso do Sul (FUNDECT).



REFERENCES

- ABREU, Deivy Batista; BRAGA, Marcos. Territórios e territorialidades em Vista Alegre e o contexto de desenvolvimento regional. *Somanlu: Revista de Estudos Amazônicos*, Manaus, v. 19, n. 1, p. 147-168, jan./jun. 2019. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufam.edu.br/index.php/somanlu/article/view/6372>. Accessed on: Sep. 6, 2022.
- BARDIN, Laurence. *Análise de conteúdo*. 3.ed. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2004.
- CARVALHO, Ícaro Célio Santos de; PEREIRA, João Pedro de Castro Nunes; FERRAZ, Marcelo Inácio Ferreira. Indicação geográfica e desenvolvimento local: Uma análise sob o enfoque da dinâmica territorial. *Revista Espacios*, v. 38, n. 9, 2017. Available at: <https://www.revistaespacios.com/a17v38n09/a17v38n09p27.pdf>. Accessed on: Sep. 3, 2022.
- COOPER, Donald R.; SCHINDLER, Pamela S. *Métodos de Pesquisa em Administração*. 7. ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2003.
- COX, Kevin R. *Spaces of globalization: reasserting the power of the local*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1998.
- DEMATTEIS, Giuseppe. Geografia democrática, território e desenvolvimento local, *Formação*, n. 12, v. 2, 2005, p. 11-26.
- DEMATTEIS, Giuseppe; GOVERNA, Francesca. *Territorialità, sviluppo locale, sostenibilità: Il modello SLoT*, Franco Angeli, 2005.
- DORNELES, Tathiane Marques; BINOTTO, Erlaine; SILVA, Heloiza Cristina Holgado; RODRIGUES, Wesley Osvaldo Pradella. Análise dos atributos das transações e estruturas de governança do setor apícola de Mato Grosso do Sul. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v. 10, n. 2, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54399/rbgdr.v10i2.1349>. Available at: <https://www.rbgdr.com.br/revista/index.php/rbgdr/article/view/1349>. Accessed on: Feb. 3, 2023.
- EDUARDO, Márcio Freitas. Território, trabalho e poder: por uma Geografia relacional. *Campo-Território*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 173-195, ago. 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/RCT1211790>.
- EISENHARDT, Kathleen M. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, Briarcliff Manor, v. 14, n. 4, p. 532-550, 1989.
- FARIAS, Ana Priscila de Souza. *Indicações Geográficas na Amazônia Paraense: para além do desenvolvimento territorial da IG do Queijo do Marajó, na microrregião do Arari (PA)*. 2022. Thesis (Doctorate in Human Geography) - Faculty of Philosophy, Literature and Human Sciences, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, 2022.
- FERNANDES, Ana H. B. M.; CATELLA, Agostinho C.; SORIANO, Balbina M. A.; URBANETZ, Catia; CARDOSO, Evaldo L. Cardoso; FERNANDES, Fernando A.; BERGIER, Ivan; COMASTRI, José A.; SALLIS, Suzana M.; TOMAS, Walfrido M. Bioma Pantanal: oportunidades e desafios de pesquisa para o desenvolvimento sustentável. In: VILELA, Evaldo Ferreira; CALLEGARO, Geraldo Magela; FERNANDES, Geraldo Wilson (Org.). *Biomass e agricultura: oportunidades e desafios*. Rio de Janeiro: Academia Brasileira de Ciência: FAPEMIG, 2019.
- FERREIRA, Denilson da Silva. Território, territorialidade e seus múltiplos enfoques na ciência geográfica. *Campo-Território*, v. 9, n. 17, p. 111-135, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/RCT91719883>.
- FLORES, Murilo Xavier. *Da solidariedade social ao individualismo: um estudo sobre o desenvolvimento do Vale dos Vinhedos na Serra Gaúcha*. 2007. 311 f. Thesis (Doctorate in Political Sociology) - Center for Philosophy and Human Sciences, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2007.
- FUINI, Lucas Labigalini. Construções teóricas sobre o território e sua transição: a contribuição da Geografia brasileira. *Cuadernos de Geografía: Revista Colombiana de Geografía*, v. 26, n. 1, p. 221-242, jan./jun. 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.15446/rcdg.v26n1.56791>.
- HAESBAERT, Rogério C. A desterritorialização: entre as redes e os aglomerados de exclusão. In: CASTRO, Iná Elias de; GOMES, Paulo Cesar da Costa; CORRÊA, Roberto Lobato. *Geografia: Conceitos e temas*. 5. ed., Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1995, p. 165-206.



HAESBAERT, Rogério C. Des-territorialização e identidade: a rede gaúcha no Nordeste. Niterói: Eduff, 1997.

HAESBAERT, Rogério C. Definindo território para entender a desterritorialização. In: HAESBAERT, Rogério C. O mito da desterritorialização: do “fim dos territórios” à multiterritorialidade. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2004, p. 35-98.

HAESBAERT, Rogério C. O mito da desterritorialização: do “fim dos territórios” à multiterritorialidade. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2007.

HAESBAERT, Rogério C. Dilema de conceitos: espaço-território e contenção territorial. In: SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio; SPOSITO, Eliseu Savério. Território e territorialidades: teoria, processos e conflitos. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009, p. 95-120.

HAESBAERT, Rogério C.; LIMONAD, Ester. O território em tempos de globalização. Etc: Espaço, Tempo e Crítica. Niterói, UFF, v. 1, n. 2, p. 39-52, Aug. 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12957/geouerj.1999.49049>.

JOIA, Paulo Roberto. Efetividades e possibilidades de industrialização no município de Aquidauana-MS. Revista Pantaneira, v. 19, p. 79-94, 2021. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufms.br/index.php/revpan/article/view/13708>. Accessed on: May 5, 2022.

LITTLE, Paul E. Territórios sociais e povos tradicionais no Brasil: por uma antropologia da territorialidade. Anuário Antropológico/2002-2003. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 2004, p. 251-290. Available at: <https://periodicos.unb.br/index.php/anuarioantropologico/article/view/6871>. Accessed on: Jul.15, 2022.

MADUREIRA, Eduardo Miguel Prata. Desenvolvimento regional: principais teorias. Revista Thêma et Scientia, v. 5, n. 2, 2015.

MAGNAGHI, Albert. Il Progetto Locale: verso la coscienza di luogo. Bollati Boringhieri, Torino, 2010.

MEL do Pantanal vira referência Nacional. SEMADESC - State Secretariat for Environment, Development, Science, Technology and Innovation, Government of Mato Grosso do Sul, Mar. 18, 2015. Available at: <https://www.semagro.ms.gov.br/mel-do-pantanal-vira-referencia-nacional/>. Accessed on: Apr. 29, 2022.

MIOTO, Camila Leonardo; PARANHOS FILHO, Antonio Conceição; ALBREZ, Edilce do Amaral. Contribuição à caracterização das sub-regiões do Pantanal. Entre-Lugar, Dourados, MS, ano 3, n. 6, p. 165-180, 2012. Available at: <https://ojs.ufgd.edu.br/index.php/entre-lugar/article/view/2453>. Accessed on: Apr. 21, 2022.

MORAIS, João Rafael Gomes de. Territorialidade(s) Camponesa(s): por uma abordagem socioambiental. Praça, Recife, v. 2, n. 1, 2018, p. 151-177.

MOURA, Joana Vaz; MOREIRA, Ivaldo Sousa. A abordagem territorial do desenvolvimento a partir da perspectiva relacional: uma proposta teórica preliminar. Redes, v. 19, n. 1, p. 58-73, Feb. 20, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17058/redes.v19i1.2454>.

RAFFESTIN, Claude. Por uma geografia do Poder. SP: Ática, 1993.

RAMBO, Anelise Graciele; FILIPPI, Eduardo Ernesto. A abordagem territorial e escalar nos estudos sobre o desenvolvimento rural: uma proposta teórico-metodológica. Ambiência (UNICENTRO), v. 8, p. 699-719, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5777/ambiencia.2012.03.06>.

REIS, Márcio Carneiro dos; MAIA, Marcelo Maciel. Trajetórias tecnológicas tradicionais, novas territorialidades e desenvolvimento regional por meio de políticas em C&T. In: CONGRESO DE LA ASOCIACIÓN LATINOAMERICANA DE SOCIOLOGÍA, 27.; JORNADAS DE SOCIOLOGÍA DE LA UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES, 8., 2009, Buenos Aires. Anais [...]. Buenos Aires: Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología, 2009. Available at: <https://cdsa.academica.org/000-062/21.pdf>.

REIS, Vanderlei Doniseti Acssio dos; BIJOS, Gustavo Nadeu; MENEGAZZO, Márcio Alexandre Diório. Caderno de Normas do Regulamento de Produção da Indicação do Mel do Pantanal. Corumbá: Embrapa Pantanal, 2015. (Embrapa Pantanal. Documentos, 137). Available at: <https://www.infoteca.cnptia.embrapa.br/infoteca/bitstream/doc/1037107/1/DOC137.pdf>. Accessed on: May 11, 2022.

RICHARDSON, Roberto Jarry. Pesquisa Social: métodos e técnicas. 3. ed. Altas: São Paulo, 2008.



- SACK, Robert David. Human territoriality: its theory and history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- SAMPIERI, Roberto Hernández; COLLADO, Carlos Fernández; LUCIO, Maria del Pilar Baptista. Metodologia de Pesquisa. 5. ed. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2013.
- SANTANA, Lígia Lopes Teixeira de; SILVA, Aguinaldo; SILVA, Beatriz Lima de Paula. A importância das “freteiras” para as comunidades ribeirinhas do Pantanal. *Revista GeoPantanal*, Corumbá/MS, n. especial, p. 247-264, 2017. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufms.br/index.php/revgeo/article/view/4558>. Accessed on: Apr. 21, 2022.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. Campo-Território: considerações teórico-metodológicas. *Campo-Território*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 60-81, Feb. 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/RCT1111780>.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. Por uma abordagem territorial. In: SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio; SPOSITO, Eliseu Savério. (Org.) *Território e Territorialidades: teorias, processos e conflitos*. 1ª ed. São Paulo; Expressão Popular, 2009, p. 73-94.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. *Abordagens e concepções de território*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2010.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. Territorialidades, relações campo-cidade e ruralidades em processos de transformação territorial e autonomia. *Campo-Território*, v. 9, n. 18, p. 1-30, jun. 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/RCT91826896>.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. Por uma geografia das territorialidades e das temporalidades. Uma concepção multidimensional voltada para a cooperação e para o desenvolvimento territorial. 2. revised and expanded edition. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Consequência, 2015.
- SAQUET, Marcos Aurelio. A descoberta do território e outras premissas do desenvolvimento territorial. *Rev. Bras. Estud. Urbanos Reg.*, São Paulo, v. 20, n. 3, p. 479-505, Sep.-Dec. 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22296/2317-1529.2018v20n3p479>.
- SILVA, João dos Santos Vila da; ABDON, Myrian de Moura. Delimitação do Pantanal brasileiro e suas sub-regiões. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira*, Brasília, v. 33, Special Number, p. 1703-1711, Oct. 1998.
- SILVA, Rosimeire Vilarinho da; SOUZA, Célia Alves de. Ocupação e degradação na margem do Rio Paraguai em Cáceres, Mato Grosso. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v. 8, n. 1, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54399/rbgdr.v8i1.587>.
- SOJA, Edward W. *The Political Organization of Space*. Washington, D.C: AAG Comission on College Geography, 1971.
- SOUZA, Edevaldo Aparecido; PEDON, Nelson Rodrigo. Território e Identidade. *Associação dos Geógrafos Brasileiros, Três Lagoas*, year 4, v. 1, n. 6, p. 126-148, Nov. 2007.
- STEINKE, Valdir Adilson; SAITO, Carlos Hiroo. Avaliação geoambiental do território brasileiro nas bacias hidrográficas transfronteiriças. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v. 6, n. 1, 2010. Available at: <https://www.rbgdr.net/revista/index.php/rbgdr/article/view/267>. Accessed on: Apr. 14, 2022.
- VELLOSO, Carolina Quiumento. *Indicação geográfica e desenvolvimento territorial sustentável: a atuação dos atores sociais nas dinâmicas de desenvolvimento territorial a partir da ligação do produto ao território (um estudo de caso em Urussanga, SC)*. 2008. 166 f. Dissertation (Master's in Agroecosystems) - Center for Agricultural Sciences, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2008.



Esta obra está licenciada com uma Licença Creative Commons
Atribuição 4.0 Internacional.



