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Abstract
The article analyzes the territorial disputes around the coast between fishermen, urbanism and the new Aquarium of Paraná in Rosario, Argentina. It addresses the inclusion processes of artisanal fishermen in the public space, the scientific, pedagogical and recreational device of the Aquarium of Paraná. This project contemplated the construction of a Fishermen’s Port for the integration of the fishing territory into the riverside space of the Aquarium Park. After reviewing the interventions of urban planning in the revitalization process of the Rosario’s waterfront, considering with particular interest the deterritorialization of fishermen, the analysis focuses on the differences, disagreements and disputes generated around these constructions. The case under study is one of the few freshwater aquariums in Argentina, whose project proposes the integration the fishermen’s work and knowledge. The methodology used has been fundamentally qualitative and guided by an ethnographic exploration, which included participant observation and interviews with different agents and groups involved. The study shows the different ways of thinking about the relationship between the coast and the river of fishermen, urban planners and agents dedicated to the recreational practice. It also proposes the integration of the native territorial knowledge of fishermen in the design of new fishing spaces.
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Resumen
El artículo analiza las disputas territoriales alrededor de la costa entre los pescadores, el urbanismo y el nuevo Acuario del Paraná, en Rosario, Argentina. Asimismo, aborda los procesos de inclusión de los pescadores artesanales en el espacio público, el dispositivo científico, pedagógico y recreativo del Acuario del Paraná. Este proyecto contemplaba la construcción de un Puerto de Pescadores para la integración del territorio pesquero al espacio ribereño del Parque del Acuario. Luego de repasar las intervenciones de la planificación urbana en el proceso de reordenamiento de la franja costera, considerando con particular interés el proceso de desterritorialización de los pescadores, el análisis se enfoca sobre las diferencias, los desacuerdos y las disputas generados alrededor de esas construcciones. El caso bajo estudio es el de uno de los pocos acuarios de agua dulce en la Argentina, cuyo proyecto se propone la integración tanto del trabajo como de los saberes de los pescadores artesanales de la zona. La metodología utilizada ha sido fundamentalmente cualitativa y guiada por una exploración etnográfica, que incluyó observación participante y entrevistas a distintos agentes y grupos involucrados. El estudio muestra las diversas formas de concebir la relación costa-ri o de los pescadores, urbanistas y los agentes dedicados a las actividades recreativas. Asimismo, propone la integración del conocimiento territorial de los pescadores artesanales para el diseño de nuevos espacios pesqueros.
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Introduction
The Deleuzian notion (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994) of deterritorialization, as a process of uprooting subjects and objects, has been applied to the flows of capital, companies and hegemonic groups in the context of globalization (De Mattos, 1989). Some analysts said that deregulation of markets and the withdrawal of states would conclude with the end of territories (Virilio, 2006). Harvey (2004) highlighted the link between this movement of acceleration of time and contraction of space with the processes of accumulation by dispossession. Companies, capitals, and neoliberalism appear to be responsible for the de-territorialization processes, although their “downward” reach has also deserved consideration (Houghton, 2008). Some theoretical inquiries have rethought deterritorialization in correlation with reterritorialization and multiterritoriality. Haesbaert (2007) has explored two different territorialization modalities based on their effects and subjects: one hegemo-
nic carried out “from above” by the dominant classes and another counter-hegemonic, developed “from below” by subordinate subjects. The latter do not fight only for land and housing, but they fight for the definition of alternative territories, which do not involve territorial strategies and/or planning but respond to a collective pragmatism that reconfigures the territory in tension and negotiation with the forces and hegemonic projects (Scott, 2009).

Many of these experiences involve open resistance, but also a practice of persistence, deviation and appropriation of the territory (De Certeau, 1999). In these interactions, the territory is not a simple container or support, but configures a set of relationships-meanings that inform identities and ways of life. Disputes over appropriation and dispossession, rooting and eradication, for installation and relocation, affect subaltern subjects in a traumatic way: losing the territory implies starting to disappear (Bonnemaison, & Cambrèzy, 1996). Thus, the forces of accumulation by dispossession not only wear out the territory and reconfigure it according to the need of the flows that cross them, but they also erode the communal subjectivities that formed in a long interaction with and in that territory.

The concept of deterritorialization applies to subjects and subaltern territorializations, given that they entail a marked precariousness. However, this weakness in territorialization (material roots) is offset by a power of territoriality (symbolic roots), since subaltern identity is linked to the territory in a significantly more powerful way than the hegemonic one. Consequently, it can be affirmed that, although subaltern territorialization is precarious compared to hegemonic, hegemonic territoriality is usually volatile and weak, while the subaltern has a more persistent link (Beverly, 2003). It is necessary to reflect on the territory from the knowledge and subaltern cultures, in the interior and in the reconstruction of their own local dynamics, in correlation with political power and analyzing their ambivalences and contradictions. Subaltern struggles question limited recognition, subordinate inclusion, the demarcation that the State or hegemonic groups develop over their collective territories. In these dynamics, it is not only sought to resist but also to negotiate the modes of inclusion and their degrees of subordination (Scott, 2000).

The structure of the article deals, initially, with the transformation cycle of the north bank of the city of Rosario. In this context, it is shown how between 1977 and 1998 artisanal fishermen had to resign part of their living spaces, fish marketing and berthing of vessels due to road infrastructure, landscaping, and territorial reorganization work. Subsequently, it is analyzed how
these processes were exacerbated from the real estate and recreational value of the coastal landscape. Finally, the work proposes a critical counterpoint between the forms of design and production of the Paraná Aquarium and the Fishermen’s Port, to show the cultural clash of two differentiated ways of thinking about the production of space at the urban frontier.

**Materials and methods**

The coastal edge of Rosario has been affected by the construction of a chain of public spaces. The advance of urban planning collides with prior territorialization processes developed by artisanal fishermen. The work shows the disputes between these forms of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization. The analytical core addresses the processes of inclusion of artisanal fishermen in the public space of the Paraná Aquarium. This project contemplated the construction of a Fisherman’s Port for the integration of the fishing territory into the Aquarium’s research and exhibition apparatus. The problem focuses on the differences and disagreements generated around these constructions. The case under study is one of the few freshwater aquariums, whose project proposes the integration of both the work and the knowledge of artisanal fishermen in the area. The methodology used has been qualitative and guided by an ethnography developed through fieldwork that involved numerous instances of participant observation consisting of periodic visits to the site, where the constructions were developed and where artisanal fishermen work. There were in-depth interviews, tours aboard the boats and observations of the coastal area and fishing days. Likewise, we conducted some interviews with key informants in their homes to collect complementary data. The names of our interviewees have been modified to protect their identity. With less intensity, we conducted interviews with officials and members of sports clubs. Finally, we review secondary sources composed of official publications and newspapers from the city to triangulate the interviews.

From a historical-anthropological perspective, the article reconstructs the process of deterritorialization of fishermen on the north coast of Rosario. Starting from the first episodes recorded at the end of the 1970s, we reviewed a deterritorialization that is recorded in three planes: housing, landing points, and spaces for commercialization. The process was developed based on the pres-
sure exerted by the municipality that sought to establish territorial planning criteria, produce public space and increase the recreational use of the riverside, favoring the proliferation of nautical clubs and recreational ports. The last part analyzes the interactions and disputes between artisanal fishermen, public authorities and the developers of the Paraná Aquarium.

**Urban interventions on the north coast: discontinuous developments**

Within the framework of contemporary urbanism, areas near water ways have received much attention. In part, this phenomenon is due to the real estate valuation of closed residential developments (Ríos, 2017), but also of the open configuration of waterfronts (Marshall, 2004). In Rosario, the second port city of Argentina, these types of transformations produced high urban capital gains from the change in the land use regime and the design of landscape environments, specific public and environmental spaces (Cuenya, 2009). At the same time, they made available to the wider public access to the coast and the Paraná River (Levin, 2012). This recovery of the riverbank was driven by the construction of a chain of parks, conceived as “river balconies” that replaced the old railway facilities (Galimberti, 2014). Between 1992 and 2005, this process was particularly successful on the central coast. The northern zone received a different treatment, due to its less bulky preexistence and topography with beaches that differs from the canyons of the central coast.

Since the years 1920-1930, the northern area of Rosario has been occupied by yacht and sports clubs. In 1932 a public beach was built: the “La Florida” watering-place (Roldán, 2012). During the last decades, the recreational use of the riverbank intensified due to the recovery of the coast from its port uses. The area was intervened early, although by designs that were isolated from the narrative recapitulated by urban planning in Rosario (Riggotti, 2014). On the occasion of the preparations for the XI Argentine Football World Cup 1978, the last military dictatorship (1976-1983) developed a Riverwalk and, in 1977, the area surrounding the Alem Park and the Rosario Central Stadium was reconditioned. There, the breakwater Maciel was built, a tourist viewpoint, the route of Costanera Avenue was extended and paths that emulate those of Copacabana in Rio de Janeiro were placed. These works involved the eradication of some fishermen’s homes located near the coast and of fish unloading and commercialization spaces.
In the fishermen’s memory, these coastal remodeling experiences are associated with violent episodes of deterritorialization. In 1977 there was a forced eradication that marked the loss of numerous spaces. The context of the military dictatorship limited the possibilities of resistance.

In 1977, with the World Cup, when they made the Costanera and the Paseo Ribereño they eradicated a large community that was in the Bajada Puccio and what is today Carrasco Avenue. Many ranches were demolished. The military expanded the park, came over to the coast ... and fishermen elsewhere. (Fermin, 2018a)

Deterritorialization, too, was associated with commercialization and affected the local fish stalls. First, this operation took place in a circumscribed area and then expanded. The extension of Costanera Avenue and the construction of the Bajada Escariza promoted the eviction of the stalls located near the “La Florida” watering-place. The fishermen remember that the arguments of the officials weren’t different from those of the dictatorship. The biggest difference was that the demolitions were not carried out on homes, but on the stalls and that the procedure did not involve tanks but bulldozers.

In 1985 they put some small stalls. And a short time later, they told us: get everything out of here. Those stalls were by to the coast ... they took everything out of us with the bulldozer ... like the army, but in democracy, softer ... they took the stalls to the Ludueña Stream. (Fermin, 2018b)

Shortly after, the municipality’s policy was nuanced by a willingness to integrate. The center of this procedure was an induced cooperativization of artisanal fisheries, complemented by the granting of subsidies for the acquisition of equipment. The latter involved two financing lines, on the one hand, the purchase of fishing tools (boats, engines, nets, etc.) and, on the other, the acquisition of equipment for cooling and conservation of fish (rooms and freezers). In spite of the selective inclusion, the objective of the first policies persisted: to clear the area of the coast from the fish stalls that affected the aesthetics of the riverside landscape and made the environment for recreation less conducive.

They threw us into Alem Park (...) We kept selling from the canoe on the tables. You could resist, before it was more difficult, with the army you had to have ... in the long run they took us out and threw us inside the Stream. They concentrated us all there and isolated us from the city. (Fermin, 2018a)
Through these interventions, it can be seen how territorial displacement has three faces. The first consists of the eradication and restriction of the fishermen’s housing settlement near the coast. The second is the relocation of the stalls for reasons of hygiene and land use. This deterritorialization of trade causes the loss of fisherman’s contact with merchants. The third is the restriction of the places to embark, unload the fish and store canoes and tools. In summary, the deterritorialization of the trade disrupts the social ties of exchange with the city. For fishermen, the city is a direct selling market and a way to avoid fish collectors, who buy at differential prices and establish paternalistic relationships with fishermen (Mascheroni, 2012).

However, the coast reconstruction process was not only linked to public entities. The clubs have also slowly appropriated the riverbank and made modifications to its edge. Most of these transformations are the construction of slopes and retaining walls for horizontal ports of small and medium-sized vessels. In addition, fishermen report that the towpath was appropriated and unstructured by the clubs. The legal representatives of the clubs argue that the original towpath has is behind their facilities, exactly where Avenida de la Costa runs and that, therefore, it has a public character. In this line of thought, the location areas of the clubs would constitute a “gained” land, construction of the clubs and their private property (Yacht Club, 2016). However, fishermen dispute with these assessments.

If we enforced our rights here, we would have the towpath ... From the Sorrento Usina to the north, everything they gain from the river. Those clubs would have to go to trial and they would have to be evicted, like us. And they should be forced to take back everything they did to the river and to normalize the watercourse. (Sergio, 2016)

In the last two decades, recreational activities grew and new users of the river appeared. The park of small (kayaks and canoes) and medium-sized boats (boats and sailboats) increased along with the need to build storage places.

The fishermen, historically, in the Bajada Escajada stopped a lot and even sold (fish). Then came a port, río Marrón, full of dugouts, and ran them. (...) The fisherman is losing space, with modernity, with the changes that the coast has had. (Sergio, 2016)

The problem of the loss of territory and the difficulties that fishermen encounter in conserving it shows how certain community strengths can also be
weaknesses. The long-term roots in coastal areas made them assume that the land belonged to them and that the places they occupy lacked interest for other actors. At the beginning of the coast renewal process, they assumed that their territorialization was a definitive fact. However, this began to change with the precarious fishing activity that resulted from a convergence of forces and phenomena. In terms of commercialization, the loss of commercial contact of fishermen with the city, the escalation of the unemployment rate and the drop in consumption resulting from the economic crisis of the second half of the 1990s were fundamental. In the field of production, the introduction of large-scale fisheries for export from 1998, and the imposition of a three-month protectionist closed seasons, between 2007 and 2013, was decisive. This set of factors in addition to weakening artisanal fisheries made fishermen and their organizations more willing to accept short-term and tangible monetary subsidies than to embark on uncertain and long-term territorial struggles.

They went after the subsidy, instead of going after the earth. You had to go for the land. There were other urgencies. (...) real estate and sports ventures were winning. The clubs of the coast occupied all the spaces. (Fermin, 2018a)

What remains is what fishermen call “El Espigón”. In that area, the remodeling of the Aquarium was projected. When the plans of the Paraná Aquarium were formulated, the fishermen participated in the preliminary discussions and achieved the inclusion of a Fishermen’s Port.

The Aquarium and the fishing port

The project began to be considered in 2008, covering 2.5 hectares, whose urban front was bounded to the south and west by Costanera Avenue and Alem Park. Its realization meant the removal of the Old Aquarium. The New Aquarium of Paraná was developed in four phases between 2010 and 2018. It was announced as a theme park, but its design turned to scientific research, training, and dissemination of knowledge about the water system of Paraná and its fauna. Thus, the Aquarium became a dual-purpose apparatus. On the one hand, it should serve as a field for innovation, experimentation and scientific development. On the other, it needed to be a public space with pedagogical and recreational functions.
Image 1
North zone of Rosario where the Paraná Aquarium was built
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The project accompanies the slope of the land. One portion contains an open park and, another, a theme park. In the route of the experiences of the central coast, the park offers the visitor direct contact with the river. The Autochthonous Park of the Wetland recreates, in scale and under certain conditions, the flora of the Paraná ecosystem and includes viewing the fish fauna of the aquarium. Despite its large volumes, the building does not block the view of the river. It has been conceived as an elevated concrete prism on a set that is assembled with glass, the different mirrors-courses of water, the park’s vegetation and urban furnishings. The building seems to be suspended in a hollow over the horizon of the coast. Achieving that weightlessness
effect was complex. To solve the tension of the large concrete plates, the building was placed on elastic supports. Thus, the absorption of contraction, dilation and oscillation movements was favored. The greater complexity of the Aquarium, however, lies not in its implementation, but in the systems of circulation, filtering, conditioning, and recovery of water both for living spaces of the exhibition (fish tanks and sinks) and for areas of scientific experimentation (laboratories and hatcheries). In fact, a lagoon located in the Wetland Park, in addition to recreating the lake and forest flora, seeks to recover the water used in laboratories through remediation and stabilization systems. An artificial riverbank was planned on the coast, with a consolidated edge of articulated concrete pieces and a more rugged natural riverbank that preserves the native vegetation. Also, the construction of a public promenade and a pier on the river was planned. In the final versions, these liminal parts of the project underwent modifications.

The building generated a modern architectural-scientific piece and the park produced a harmonious resolution with the riverbank. The whole set implies the creation of a public space without preexistence. On the coast of the Park, the beach-landing area was replaced by a sturdy cabin-lookout with a retaining wall of steel-paved mobile cobblestones, suitable for absorbing the energy of the water dynamics of the Paraná.

The biggest debt of the project is the Fishing Port. This site was advertised as a social collaborative workspace, where artisanal fishermen communities and scientists could interact, exchange knowledge of the species and their ecosystem through encounter and mutual respect. In addition, the Fishermen’s Port would boost the development of artisanal fisheries and strengthen food sovereignty. Del Gerbo engineer of the company Dinale SA was responsible for directing the integral execution of the project. Its description of the “really existing” Fishing Port is enlightening.

On the south side, a building was made to integrate the fishermen that were there. These people were also preserved so that they would not be excluded from the place because it was their place. The municipality integrated them making them a building that is a little hidden, with cool storage to make them progress. (Del Gerbo, 2019, italics were introduced by us).
The paragraph is symptomatic. It elaborates on the roots of a historical territorialization of fishermen in “El Espigón”, making clear the limits of the Aquarium project to exclude this population from the area. However, it also shows the hidden and/or invisible location that defines the fishermen’s workspace. It also manifests the good intentions of inclusion-progress through the construction and provision of cooling equipment. However, in the precariousness of the Fishing Port, the failed integration of fishermen to the Aquarium Park becomes visible. The fishermen demanded 100 meters from the coast of the Aquarium and an entrance to the Ludueña Stream. This would involve committing almost the entire front of the Park to the fishing port. They wanted to store a hundred boats and work tools. This propo-
was rejected by the executors of the work and the fishermen left it aside when they observed the progress of the park on the front of the aquarium. The idea involved the construction of sheds for boats and a possible cool storage room to conserve fish. One of the referents clarified that the storage was a complement, the most important was the port and the place of storage for the boats.

In the Aquarium we have been fighting for they to give us entrance to the Ludueña Stream. We want 100 meters in front of the aquarium to make shed-storage of fishermen’s tools and if they wanted to put us some cool storage rooms so that we could keep the fish well and if not, we would not settle for less. (Sergio, 2016)

This design was centered on a port for fishermen. Other referents privileged the pier, without emphasizing the storage of vessels, and added the possibility of building a place for the commercialization of fish.

We wanted to do a pilot test here, a Fisherman’s Market. We put it forward to the provincial government. If we have a model place that works, it can be copied elsewhere. (Fermin, 2018a)

This proposal was more open to negotiation and sought in the Aquarium a place to promote the visibility of artisanal fishing. From the construction of a port and a market, fishermen would reestablish the commercial relationship with the city. This link had been fractured by the entry of refrigerators into fishing activity, the privilege of cooling and collection systems over the sale of fresh fish. In addition, the successive advances in the territorial planning of the coastal area favored the recreational uses of the riverbank over the productive ones.

We wanted a space where a door to the river could be opened, where there was an empirical-scientific confluence. If it is an Aquarium, who better than fishermen to help make something better, something broader (…) Many things were done behind our backs, they did not consult us. With the port, the idea was to raise an income for the people of the island … (Fermin, 2018a)

One of the most effective lines of approach between artisanal fishers and the Aquarium project outlined a meeting between two orders of knowledge: one built through experience and practicality and the other through research
and scientific logic. Although this articulation promoted recognition of artisanal fishermen and their ecological knowledge, it proved to be very complex to establish the link between the knowledge of fishermen and scientists at the level of a non-hierarchical difference.

On the part of the Aquarium, there is a need to promote attractive exhibits to encourage visits, given its dual purpose (recreational-pedagogical and scientific). On the one hand, Argentina’s inexperience in the construction, operation and maintenance of freshwater aquariums boosted consultancies with Australia. On the other, the still incipient articulation between scholarly knowledge and practical knowledge about the river was conducive to generating instances of training of interns in which some fishermen intervened. This favored the recognition of fishermen’s knowledge, which improved the relationship of some long-standing fishermen with the institution.

However, the Aquarian-Fishermen link expressed disagreements regarding the way in which the Fishermen’s Port materialized. The testimonies highlight an inverted planning process that privileged the industrial aspects of fishing over artisanal and configured cold storage chambers as the heart of the fishing port.

According to artisanal fishermen, the planning process for the fishing port began from the end to the start, but halfway it lost momentum. The design advances from the cold storage room to the shelter, through the toilets and meeting room, but is interrupted when it reaches the coast. Thus, the port is reduced to a fisherman’s house.

The design of the building that is there was not what we wanted. They have an obsession with the cold storage room. What we wanted was an improvement of the coast, that is to say that we could be land without breaking the boats. A gallery or fair type of construction. With a roof, so you can stay on rainy days, in the open, with a roof, but without walls. A table to gut the fish, two or three sinks to wash and two electronic scales. Make a place for the collectors to come and as the last thing a cold chamber and a space where the fisherman can take refuge, in case of inclement weather, take a bath if you have to ... But first you have to make a port, that’s why called fishing port, a place where we could leave the boats charging a minimum fee to fishermen to pay someone to care for it. (Fermin, 2019)
In disagreement with what was executed, the fishermen insist that the priority for them is what was not done: coast infrastructure to embark, a pier, a place to dock, lower the fish, store the boats and tools and as a complement a space to protect and preserve the fruit of their work. The fisherman prefers a port and a market and not the refrigeration delivered to a, rather, uncertain and conflicting community management.

They did everything backwards. The cold storage first, they fight over the storage, to see who stores the fish and who does not, whose fish is saved. (Vivi, 2019)

The process of building fishermen’s space operates in the opposite direction to the planning of public spaces. The conception of fishermen marks an extension direction in the river-city direction, while urban planning is oriented in the opposite direction city-river. The planners want to extend the urban over the coast, fishermen want to take the river and its islands to the same place.

The historical territorial roots of the fishermen in “El Espigón” made them immovable. While moving them was no longer possible, as was the tonic in previous moments, it is still feasible to establish a perimeter around their space with the objective of preserving it against the deterritorializing forces. But this implies restrictively reterritorialization, that is, accumulating territory in the form of public space at the expense of the territorial dispossession of the fishing production-reproduction space. Within this framework, a certain desire for exclusion can be realized, linked to the aesthetics of the landscape and the hegemonically recreational use of the river. This trend can be subverted without losing effectiveness through concealment, segregation and invisibility strategies. As stated by Gerbo, the Fishing Port in relation to the large structure of the Aquarium and the Parks is a bit hidden, and we would add that it is a bit small and is very neglected.
In the architectural-scientific-pedagogical-recreational apparatus of the Aquarium, artisanal fishing has been subject to subordinate inclusion. It is reduced to the technological modernization of economic orientation, from the construction of a minimal, although multipurpose, cabin and the placement of a cold storage room inside. The installation of the cold storage, in theory, would provide a competitive advantage to the fisherman, who would have greater room for negotiation on the price of fresh fish from the possibility of storing it. However, the social relations woven between fishermen make the collective use of the chamber succumb to high levels of under-usage. The modernization of the infrastructure for the conservation and more favorable intervention of fishermen in the value chain becomes a socially conflicting and economically dysfunctional factor.

In the case of fishermen, not any procedure can be adopted to build penetration structures on the river. The urban-architectural formulas that try to
take the city to the river are not quite suitable to make a reverse path. In the city-river and river-city links, the order of the factors alters the product: the same type of infrastructure is not useful for enjoying the riverside landscape and to enter with boats loaded with fish to the city.

**Discussion and conclusions**

The article reconstructs some key moments in the history of the relationship between development in urban planning, territorial planning, and small-scale fishing activities. A first finding has been that fishing activities collided with urban planning that sought the production of riparian public spaces. Most of these advances in coastal planning have had a clear direction: to intervene in the river from the city, to integrate the river into the city, this being the most important. Only in the port areas and in the clubs, the river enters the city or the city goes out to the river (materially and not only landscape), but in both cases, it is the river that imposes the conditions of that exchange. In public spaces, on the other hand, the city transformed into a domestic viewpoint to the river turning it into a landscape. Through the landscaping, urbanism transforms the river and the coast into an aesthetic-symbolic landscape and, therefore, freezes it as a flat image, without depth, without conflicts and without other uses other than aesthetic or recreational (Cosgrove, 1998). Evading environmental and productive issues, the river appears as a fluid continuation of the play-grounds. The urban planning of the public space and the landscape extends the city over the river and colonizes its coasts, the urban grid will attempt to stretch over the river’s edge.

Secondly, we can observe some asymmetrical relations of public entities regarding the various occupants of the coast. While public developments often involve the perimetration and shrinking of the spaces available for artisanal fishing, it can be seen that the irregularities committed by the clubs are barely noticed and do not affect their concessions. We attend a selective regulation of the uses-practices and users-subjects of the river that tends to favor some interests over others. Clubs and sports-recreational practices are favored, while fishermen and their productive-trade activities have weak support.

The construction of the Paraná Aquarium was a condition for a participatory exchange. However, proposals to modernize and include the fishing activity redeployed recipes whose failure had been made patent (Mascher-
ni, 2012). Although they did not propose a cooperative structure, the construction process of the fishermen’s refuge was similar to those experiences. The biggest equipment provided to the fishermen is a community cold storage room that generated serious difficulties for its collective administration and remains underutilized. All in all, this architecture advanced in the construction of bathroom space with showers so that fishermen could stay in hygienic conditions and a refuge from bad weather conditions. The fishermen demand that another type of intervention be carried out in the area: the construction of a fishermen’s port with a berth for berthing and storage of vessels and a space with the necessary infrastructure for the cleaning and the sale of fish to collectors and direct consumers. This type of construction is the reverse of the planning established for the coast. They propose a relation- ship with the river similar to that of the port, although expressed on a smaller scale, but that privileges the entry of vessels and the fruits of fishing into the city and the arrival of the inhabitants to that space in the form of not only of walkers but also of potential consumers.

The construction of the pier, the cabin, the stalls for the sale of fish could form a territorial relationship where fishermen are integrated based on their knowledge, their culture, and their needs. Thus, its precarious territorialization could be attenuated. Even when such a project still suspends the residential issue and the possibilities of building a fishing district.

Both the concept of deterritorialization (Haesbaert, 2007) and the concept of disputed territory (Janoschka, 2019) represent violence generated from the processes of accumulation by dispossession. These processes involve residential displacements (accumulation by habitat removal), of practiced spaces (accumulation by inhibition of popular uses and appropriations of space), of aesthetic-environmental situations (accumulation by neo-hygienist, environmental and aesthetic landscape criteria) and of forms of practical knowledge (accumulation by eradication of traditional cultural forms). Artisanal fishermen have historically suffered the effects of the violence of these forms of accumulation and territorial dispossession on their residences and their production, commercialization, and logistics activities. More recently, the Paraná River Aquarium proposed the possibility of generating a non-hierarchical confluence of scientific and artisanal knowledge and practices. Every encounter to be possible needs space. While the Aquarium appears firmly located, its counterpart, the Fishermen’s Port has been postponed. Artisanal fishermen expect works that would restore a place and territory where they can, with ad-
vantages, deploy they daily lives. Those who live in the river and know it in such a profound way as a practice yearn for the formation of that territory of artisanal production and knowledge collaboration.
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