

Lucas Poy email: lucaspoy@gmail.com

Hard Times. The Formation of the Working Class in Late-19th century Buenos Aires.

Lucas Poy

This article provides an assessment of labor unrest in Buenos Aires between 1888 and 1896, a relatively short period of time where substantial changes took place and the local labor movement was shaped. We address the formation of the working class with a perspective that moves away from unilateral sociological or economical perspectives, as well as those that understand it as a mere political study of unions and political parties. Instead, our goal is to link the country's economic changes with both the cycles of class struggle and the development of the political currents of the left. We intend to contribute not only to recent labor history scholarship, but also to the education of current labor activists interested in learning about the lessons of past struggles.

By the mid 1880s, Argentina had undergone a process of deep transformation which led to a growing working population. However, trade unions and strikes were still virtually unheard of. A decade later, an observer who had visited the country in the spring of 1896, while a huge strike was taking place, could not help but recognize that the situation had changed substantially. Scores of trade unions, numerous anarchists groups, a newly-created Socialist Party, several labor newspapers and dozens of strikes had placed the working class as a crucial actor in the country's life.

Literature on the history of the labor movement and the left in Argentina has been extensive. However, scholarship about its early stages is less abundant and the last years of the 19th century, specifically, remain under-addressed.¹ Most researchers' assessments of this period are meant as brief analyses of the 'background' of the history of the labor movement rather than as an object of study of its own (Poy 2013: 28-29). This article fills this historiographic gap by providing an assessment of labor unrest in Buenos Aires between 1888 and 1896, a relatively short period of substantial change. We address the formation of the working class with a perspective that moves away from unilateral sociological or economical perspectives, but also of those that understand it as a mere political study of unions and political parties. Our goal is to link the country's economic changes with both the cycles of class struggle and the development of the political currents of the left.

A Tale of Two Cities: Urban and Social Differentiation

While in 1869 the total population of the country amounted to approximately 1,800,000 people, the next census, in 1895, reported that Argentina's population exceeded four million. Although most of the immigrants claimed to have been farmers in their countries of origin, the influx of immigrants resulted in the growth of *urban* areas, given the characteristics of a land regime that, with very specific exceptions, consolidated the expansion of large estates. Economic development based on agricultural exports also meant an expansion of transport and communications, as well as an incipient industrial development. These structural changes led to the emergence of a new type of social contradiction. On the one hand, landowners, merchants, and industrialists, closely linked with British capital, shaped the ruling class that controlled the state apparatus and the country's political life. On the other, the process created the conditions for the formation of a working class of mainly immigrant origin, heavily concentrated in coastal cities.

In this context, the city of Buenos Aires underwent very rapid urban development: in 1850 it had fifty thousand inhabitants and forty years later it hosted over half a million people. This rapid transformation must be analyzed by paying special attention to the differentiation process between neighborhoods of a city that became more heterogeneous as it grew. As José Panettieri suggested in his pioneering work on the situation of workers in this period, in the late 19th century it was possible to distinguish 'two' cities coexisting in Buenos Aires: next to the city of the rich it was possible to find "the 'other' Buenos Aires, which lay buried—the Buenos Aires of the native and foreign poor" (1967: 47). In downtown Buenos Aires it was possible to observe the coexistence of these two 'cities' (Scobie 1977). But as one moved away from the area near the Plaza de Mayo, it became apparent the strong social differentiation of a city that was already divided between the opulence of the northern suburbs and the poverty of the southern slums.

In this rapidly growing environment, with increasing social differentiation between different neighborhoods and worsening living conditions in those which concentrated most of the working class, the huge rise in the price of urban land made it almost impossible for workers to buy a home of their own. The urban poor rented rooms in *conventillos* (tenements): by 1881 the city had more than 1,800 of them, and as the decade progressed the situation only deteriorated further. According to Juan Suriano, "the rise of this type of housing peaked in 1892, when their number rose to 2,192 and the number of people to 120,847, something like 21.8% of the population of Buenos Aires" (1984: 203). The information provided by official institutions in the municipal census of 1887, however, further emphasizes the widening gap; it was reported that at the end of 1887 there were in the city of Buenos Aires a total of 2,835 *conventillos*, housing 27% of the population.

Urban industries and services emerged as a by-product of the agricultural sectors that represented the core of the country's economic structure (Adelman 1992). The formation of a labor market that could meet the needs of the capitalist economy drew upon two basic mechanisms: first, the incorporation of the local rural population to a capitalist labor market through coercive resources that limited their chances of subsistence, and second, the massive influx of European immigrants. A low skill level was characteristic of this workforce and led to a labor market whose essential feature was the constant movement of workers between urban and rural occupations. Thus, the urban labor market was marked by the needs of agricultural production, the decisive influence of seasonality, the rotation across sectors and the prevalence of a mainly unskilled workforce (Sabato 1985).

Therefore, without access to land due to the predominance of large estates, hundreds of thousands of immigrants sought to earn their living in Buenos Aires. Those who had experience at a certain trade could, at best, collect a small amount of capital and practice their profession independently. Most of them, however, were relegated to procuring jobs in a motley collection of workshops and factories of various sizes, mainly dedicated to the production of consumer goods or the provision of various services required by an ever-increasing population (Rocchi 2006, Poy 2011). The experiences of these workers were heterogeneous: the most skilled could leverage their control of the productive process to impose better conditions to bosses, but they still had to face constant power advances from them, with regulations, piece rates, fines and a growing workshop discipline. Those who were unfortunate enough to lack knowledge of a trade, had to work in a wide range of places that attracted temporary workers, mainly in the building industry and in the docks. Some large factories were major employers of low-skilled, often female, workers: shoe factories, tobacco industries, bags and match factories. For other thousands of unskilled newcomers, the only way to make a living was to work as day laborers in different informal jobs. Most of them would work in rural areas during the harvest season and return to the city for the rest of the year, where they tried to find employment as porters, stevedores, journeymen in the barracks, etc. Thousands of women and children were a vital part of this labor market (Guy 1981, Lobato 2007).

With very few exceptions, workers lacked any kind of protection against diseases and accidents and suffered working days of more than ten hours. Wages varied among different trades according to several factors, such as the worker's skill and the number of days worked per month. Only a small minority received monthly wages—it was much more usual to be paid weekly or even by piecework. On the whole, however, average wages for urban workers in late-19th century Buenos Aires were remarkably low and hardly enough to afford the cost of the basic goods and services needed for the reproduction of the labor force.ⁱⁱ

One of the first consequences of a labor market with such characteristics was the workers' permanent uncertainty about their living conditions, particularly in times of economic crisis. But there was another important consequence. Despite the segmentation caused by the division between skilled and unskilled workers, the aforementioned characteristics of the labor market

created fluid links among all workers. This constant instability and mobility of the workforce connected workers in different occupations, countering the trend towards segmentation typical of the trade's structure (Sabato 1985: 582, Poy 2013: 95).

In sum, the development of an incipient industrialization, in the context of a massive population growth spurred by mass immigration, shaped a workers' city that had little in common with the city of the ruling class. Beyond the attention of the bourgeoisie, thousands of workers were sharing a common experience, suffering exploitation and oppression in factories and workshops, in the docks, in the building trades, in working class neighborhoods. This situation of exploitation and marginalization was a breeding ground for the development of working class consciousness, not only because of the severity of the conditions of material life but also because of the brutal contrast between the actual living and working conditions and the expectations that these workers had brought from Europe. Such a shared experience would shape the strengthening of class identity through a decade characterized by industrial unrest. We shall now direct our attention to the way in which these workers organized to improve their situation.

Economic crisis and labor unrest (1888-1896). The cycles of class struggle.

It is hardly surprising that the immigrants tried to organize themselves to better face these hardening living conditions. The first objective of their association was to ensure some kind of mutual aid: a wide range of societies were thus created, structured around the national or regional identity of the newcomers. As far as they were not organized around the socio-economic position of its members, the social composition of these societies was heterogeneous, including members of different social strata. In all cases the leadership was, however, in the hands of the elite of each respective immigrant community.ⁱⁱⁱ

During the 1860s and 1870s a different type of mutual benefit society began to develop, grouping immigrants that shared the same trade. In this case, national or regional origin was not the decisive factor that shaped the association, rather the place its members have in the economic structure was more significant. The first such society was the *Sociedad Tipográfica Bonaerense*, founded in 1857 and identified in the literature as the first trade union of the country (Falcón 1984). As a matter of fact, these first trade societies were not trade unions as we know them today. Rather, they were associations that joined both journeymen and small businessmen, characteristic of an early period of capitalist development. Moreover, one of the main features of the origins of the Argentine labor movement is the relatively small influence of this kind of craft societies, as compared to American or European cases. The development of a capitalist economy in Argentina took place in a later period, but it was a much-accelerated process. In the last fifteen years of the 19th century, a new kind of organization, called '*sociedad de resistencia*', was to spread among the different trades, contributing to the making of the working class.

The consolidation of trade unions was a consequence of a decade shaped by very important social conflicts. The years 1888 and 1889 were marked by a strong wave of labor unrest, in a context of rising prices and on the eve of the outbreak of one of the most serious economic crises in the country's history.^{iv} Over a period of less than twenty months scores of strikes took place, involving workers from different trades and industries such as bakers, carpenters, tailors and shoemakers. Worker's agitation was very important in several key areas of the economy, such as the waterfront and the workshops of foreign railway companies. The turmoil rapidly spread to the most important mechanical and metallurgical workshops throughout the city, whose owners were the core of the newly founded *Unión Industrial Argentina*.

Several main features characterized the first cycle of labor unrest. In a context marked by rising prices and the devaluation of the local currency, workers demanded wage increases. Another characteristic trait of the 1888 and 1889 strikes was that, in almost all cases, trade unions did not precede the conflict but actually emerged as a consequence of the struggle itself. It was common to find workers that had no previous organizational affiliations convening preparatory meetings and issuing "manifestos" to the bosses and the public, before declaring the strike. After the conflict, workers sought to consolidate more stable organizations, in order to strengthen solidarity and prevent managerial retaliation.^v

Finally, one of the main features of the strike wave of 1888/1889 was the way in which the conflicts among diverse trades influenced one another. Indeed, many workers saw the first strikes as an example that was to be followed. In many cases this spread can be ascribed to pre-existing links between workers, such as the relationship that existed among workers in the building trades.^{vi} Sometimes it was related to the geographical proximity of workers: at the waterfront, for instance, we find a collectivization of strikes among workers of different trades.^{vii}

The strike wave came to an end in early 1890, when it became apparent that, in the context of economic crisis, labor conflicts had entered a stage of reflux. To contemporary observers, the main symptom of the impact of the economic crisis was the sharp increase in unemployment and emigration. Many of those who had opportunity to do so left the country to escape the crisis, and those who remained suffered a sharp deterioration in their living conditions. In early 1891 a newly formed *Federación Obrera* made a presentation to President Carlos Pellegrini where it stated the main consequences of the crisis imposed on the workers' ranks.^{viii}

In those years of crisis, a new type of association appeared. The "Catholic Workers Circles" were promoted by the Church as a result of the *Rerum Novarum* encyclical, issued in 1891 by Pope Leo XIII, which established a new doctrine in relation to the so called 'social question'. The encyclical showed the concern of the Church with the increasing influence of Socialist and Anarchist ideas among labor ranks, and called Catholics around the world to organize workers against those political currents. The *Rerum Novarum* strongly rejected class antagonism and defended private property, promoting capital and labor mutual dependence. The emergence of the Catholic Workers Circles in Argentina, however, also represented a local response against

the strike wave, the organization of the first unions and the emergence of socialist and anarchist groups that had taken place in the preceding years. Besides their religious activities, the Circles offered a significant number of social events —recreational, educational, cultural, etc. — that tried to attract workers and in this way weaken the ranks of unions and radical political organizations within the labor movement. Moreover, they provided workers with different kinds of financial assistance in case of unemployment, sickness or death, which young trade unions were still unable to provide due to the economic crisis.^{ix}

By 1894, the economic situation had slowly begun to improve. With decreasing unemployment and renewed economic activity, a new cycle of labor unrest was about to take place. Workers in the building trades took the first step, carrying out a long strike in 1894. Even though they failed to meet their objectives, the strike incited the action in one of the city's largest industries and brought to the fore the demand for reduction of the working day. Soon thereafter, strikes were carried out by other building trades, such as plasterers, painters and marble workers. The demand for a shorter working day helped strengthen ties between the local working class of different trades and crafts, as the struggle for the eight-hour day became a unifying vector to consolidate their collective action beyond their corporative differences. This trend towards the unification of the working class as a collective was also to be found in the form of joint activities, demonstrations and political rallies.

Labor unrest continued throughout 1895 and reached a climax in mid-1896, when a widespread agitation, known as 'the big strike' (*la huelga grande*) electrified the city. The 1896 strike stands out primarily because of the number of workers involved. It started out as a mechanics and railway workers strike, but soon expanded to other trades, covering virtually the entire spectrum of the labor market. In some cases it was clear that the outbreak of a new strike related to pre-existing links between the workers of different trades, because they shared a common experience at a certain workplace or neighborhood or due to the existence of political or union relations between its members. In other cases it was possible to observe that the general climate of strike agitation was so strong that masses of unorganized workers joined the wave of unrest and walked off their jobs.

Although the strikes were not announced in a coordinated manner by a joint organization representative of all workers — as it would happen a few years later — the demand for a shortened work day and the end of piecework acted as a common axis that articulated the struggle of thousands of workers. In this sense, regardless of the result of the conflict, the 1896 strike played a key role in the formation of the working class of the city and the country. It had a strong impact on trade unions and political currents, shaping some of the most important characteristics of the Argentine labor movement of the following decades.

The consolidation of trade unions

In 1887, before the first wave of workers unrest that we have just sketched, it would have been almost impossible to find unions in Buenos Aires that organized the members of different trades with the aim of struggling against the bosses. However, in the mid-1890s times had changed: any review of workers' newspapers, or even the pages that the commercial press devoted to the labor movement, showed a strong and lively organizational life, with dozens of permanent trade unions organizing thousands of workers of diverse trades.

So, what instigated this unprecedented collaboration? The dynamics of workers organization during this conflictive period followed a distinct pattern. After a few meetings, a group of workers would decide to promote a propaganda campaign directed at their fellow workers, designed to encourage them to join preparatory activities and present their grievances to the bosses. These activities usually included sending a 'circular' to the employers, stating their demands, and also printing a 'manifesto', directed to all workers and the public opinion. These materials played an important role in forging a common worker identity and also contributed to strengthen ties among workers of different trades. The 'manifesto' would not only list the demands that led the workers to walk off their jobs—it also traced a picture of the intolerable exploitation suffered by all workers and thus called them to unite and organize. The organizing workers would appeal to put an end to the 'slavery' and 'submission', considered inappropriate of human beings. It was also common to find a heavy moral denunciation of the well-being, luxury and comfort enjoyed by employers, in contrast with the workers' living conditions. Taken together, these 'manifestos' and appeals, often published during strikes, were intended to convince workers that their situation was intolerable and to encourage them to collectively struggle against such conditions. It was unacceptable that the 'vast army of workers' suffered 'so many hardships for the welfare of the privileged few.' It was thus imperative for workers to be aware of their situation and unite to fight the status quo.^x

Another prominent feature in the dynamics of trade union formation was the impact generated by the agitation of workers from other unions. Throughout the entire period, the mobilization of some trades acted as a strong impetus for the organization of workers in others: in some cases this feature was related to the geographic vicinity of workers or a common experience within the trade, in some other cases it was simply the impact generated by the labor unrest throughout the city, echoed by public opinion and the press, which reinforced and promoted agitation among workers.

As part of this delimitation of a class identity, workers in late 19th century Buenos Aires tried hard to distinguish themselves from other social sectors. First of all, they made increasingly clear that small businessmen and employers were not welcome in union ranks. They stressed that unions were 'purely labor and resistance', as was common to read in contemporary union statements. It was also important to prevent workers from joining societies dominated by other social classes. Indeed, the emerging unions had to compete with other associations, namely mutual benefit societies, ethnic-based societies or Catholic Circles, that tried to organize

workers. Many unions thus proclaimed themselves ‘cosmopolitan’, in order to make clear that they intended to attract all workers of a given trade, regardless their national or ethnic origin.^{xi}

Usually, unions were preceded by the creation of a ‘commission’ made up by the most active workers of a certain trade. They would carry out the first preparatory activities, organize meetings and set up the basic rules of the society. The first step was the appointment of a board of directors, generally integrated with the members of the original ‘commission’. The board of directors originally consisted of about a dozen members, with a president, vice president, secretary and treasurer. Board members were generally elected annually or sometimes even more frequently. Unions usually moved relatively quickly to enact a statute, which set out its aims, objectives and operating mechanisms.

Ordinary meetings—which usually aimed to elect the board of directors, discuss the finances, etc—and extraordinary assemblies—convened especially in the context of labor strikes—provided an opportunity for workers to take part in the life of the union, strengthening common action and discussing political differences. Its dynamics, however, was strongly cyclical—more active in times of conflict and weaker in times of economic crisis. While weaker unions could be virtually dissolved after a defeated conflict, unions became more stable with the union activity of the 1890s, and many of them managed to maintain a permanent vitality.

The basis for successful ‘resistance’ was, in this period, basically pecuniary, as the ability of workers to win a strike was directly proportional to their ability to resist without working longer than the bosses could bear. In this context, the key task for a union was to have enough money to face long strikes. Its main source of income was the contribution of its members and special donations of other unions in times of conflict. The unions would set up a low monthly fee—roughly half of a daily wage. Many societies established that workers could remain members even if they lost their jobs, provided that they paid their debt when they found occupation. The meetings and assemblies were an opportunity for members to pay their dues and to fundraise in order to support striking workers of other trades.

Throughout this period unions in different trades soon tried to form relationships with one another. Not only because of the precedence set by prior conflicts, where the most advanced trades instigated the actions of workers in other trades, but also because the question of establishing organizational ties between workers across the city was raised early on. As early as 1891 a small group of Socialist militants attempted to create a “*Federación Obrera*” (Labor Federation) that grouped together the emerging societies of different trades. Even though the experience was not successful, new attempts would take place by 1894-1895, and several years later, in 1901, a *Federación Obrera Argentina* was definitively established.

Shaping working-class politics: the consolidation of Socialist and Anarchist groups

The wave of strikes in 1888-1889 allowed early anarchist groups, influenced by the ideas of Bakunin and Kropotkin, to establish closer links with the labor movement, and even to collaborate with socialist activists during various conflicts. Italian anarchist Errico Malatesta, who acted as an agitator and propagandist to merge the local libertarian groups with the emerging worker's organizations, played a key role in this process (Zaragoza 1996). However, after he left the country, in 1889, another anarchist faction, the 'anti-organizers', came to a dominant position. They strongly opposed strikes and worker's unions, as they understood that any attempt at organizing the exploited would limit their revolutionary energy. The hegemony achieved by this anarchist current had to do not only with the departure of Malatesta but also with the context of the economic crisis and receding labor unrest that took place, as we have seen, between 1890 and 1893.

When around 1894 a new cycle of labor unrest began, the anarchist individualist groups faced serious challenges in merging with a labor movement that prioritized strikes and union organizing. As a result, a shift took place within the anarchist ranks, dictated by the emergence of a series of groups and newspapers that argued the individualistic approach would alienate them from workers in a period in which strikes and unions were gaining momentum. Newspapers such as *El Oprimido*, *L'Avvenire*, and *La Questione Sociale* began to shape the 'organizationist' current, which was to become dominant among the local anarchist movement by the end of the century. While 'organizationists' shared a 'communist-anarchist' point of view and stressed that economic struggles were neither the ultimate goal nor the means of emancipating the oppressed, they promoted a reorientation towards labor ranks and unions. Moreover, they viewed strikes in a more positive manner, arguing that anarchists had to be part of the unions and tried to push them forward towards a general strike of all trades. With this reorientation, local anarchists were in a better position to challenge the influence of the Socialist Party.

Socialist militants, for their part, also played a prominent role in the formation of the Buenos Aires working class. Through their agitation and propaganda, they contributed to spread Marxist ideas and insisted on highlighting the class antagonism that arose as a result of capitalist development. And also at the organizational level, they contributed to the creation of trade unions and the establishment of a socialist political organization as early as the first half of the 1890s. Moreover, as occurred with the anarchist groups, the cycles of class struggle impacted this nascent political movement, and contributed to shape some of the main features that characterized the local Socialist Party for several decades. At first (1890-1891) socialists sought to merge a political party and a federation of trade unions in the same organization, but they soon realized that a more complex alternative had to be developed. By the middle of the decade, they made clear that while trade unions and labor federations should address the 'economic struggle', a political party had to be organized in order to represent workers in the political arena. This distinction, however, instigated a debate regarding the importance assigned to each field of activity: indeed, the economic struggle was considered an 'archaic' and backward way of

struggle. Thus, the stance of local socialists was characterized by a strong appeal to organize workers in a party of their own, away from the influence of bourgeois politicians, and a severe criticism of strikes and economic struggles. Political action was to be understood basically as electoral participation—and, for this reason, the Socialist Party strongly encouraged their militants to gain Argentine citizenship in order to be able to participate in the polls.

Conclusion

In a short period of time, between the late 1880s and the mid 1890s, the workers of Buenos Aires developed a common class identity while consolidating a number of organizations that made them a decisive factor in the economic, social and political life of the country.

This process took place in the broader context of the capitalist development in the last third of the 19th century. The structuring of a capitalist labor market, the proletarianization of the local and migrant population and the narrowing of social mobility were a reality by the mid- 1880s. The analysis of these structural changes, however, is not enough to explain the formation of a working class—it is also essential to study the social conflicts through which these workers began to forge a collective class experience.

Certain features of the uneven and combined development of the country, such as the strong role played by seasonality and the distinct levels of mobility between jobs, left their imprint in the labor market. These features, in turn, had an impact on the characteristics of the formation of the working class, weakening the influence of guild and corporate traditions that characterized the early stages of the labor movement in Europe or the United States. Indeed, in Buenos Aires workers tended to overcome the limits of different trades and engage in broader collective action as a class, throughout the period. If the 1888-1889 strike cycle showed the workers of different companies coming together to struggle against management by asking for wage increases or defending their first organizations, in 1894-1896 we can already find a broader unity among workers of different trades, struggling together for the reduction of the workday and the end of piece work. The 1896 general strike shows the outcome of these common actions.

Under the impact of this intense class struggle, dozens of unions were formed spanning almost every trade. Most of them made clear in their names and statutes that they intended to organize all workers of a particular trade, regardless of their skill, in order to prepare the ‘resistance’ and defend the rights of its members through open conflict with employers. In addition to the role played in strikes and labor conflicts, these societies were active in other aspects of the labor movement’s social life.

As the formation of the working class took place in Argentina later than in other countries, in the context of massive European immigration, the political currents that had spurred this action within the international labor movement influenced the process in Argentina from its very outset,

and need to be considered a key player that contributed to the rapid delineation of a class identity. In turn, as we have shown, the intense class struggle of these years left its mark both in local anarchist and socialist groups, which by the end of the 19th century had become active forces in the labor movement.

In sum, as Ricardo Falcón pointed out in his pioneering work, “the experience of the 1890s [created] the conditions for the later period.” During those years, when “the manifestations of class struggle definitely became a widespread and permanent fact”, a decisive step in the history of the local labor movement was made (1984: 90-91). In subsequent years, this development would deepen and the first decade of the 20th century showed a strong working class presence, whose actions brought into question the stability of the political regime. We have shown here that the first steps in this development were made in the previous period, when in the midst of the first great crisis of Argentine capitalism, the working class became an undisputed protagonist of the country scene.

Dr. Lucas Poy is a professor and researcher at the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina. He has finished his Ph.D. dissertation on the origins of the Argentine labor movement in late 19th century and has published articles on the subject in *Science & Society*, *Socialist History*, *Historical Materialism* and different Latin American academic journals. He is part of the Editorial Board of *Archivos de historia del movimiento obrero y la izquierda*, a journal on the history of the labor movement published in Buenos Aires. He is also part of the Advisory Board of *Working USA*. Address correspondence to Avenida José María Moreno 1270, 9° B (1424), Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina. Telephone number: +0054 911 6613 6664. Email: lucaspoy@gmail.com.

References

Adelman, Jeremy (1992) “The Political Economy of Labour in Argentina, 1870-1930” en Adelman (ed.), *Essays in Argentine Labour History, 1870-1930*. London: Macmillan Press.

Baily, Samuel (1982) “Las sociedades de ayuda mutua y el desarrollo de una comunidad italiana en Buenos Aires, 1858-1918”, *Desarrollo Económico*, número 84, pp. 485-514.

Cortés Conde, Roberto (1976), “Tendencia de la evolución de los salarios reales en Argentina, 1880-1910. Resultados preliminares”, *Económica* núm. 2-3.

Devoto, Fernando y Eduardo Míguez (eds.) (1992) *Asociacionismo, Trabajo e Identidad Etnica. Los italianos en una perspectiva comparada*. Buenos Aires.

Falcón, Ricardo (1984) *Los orígenes del movimiento obrero (1857-1899)*. Buenos Aires: CEAL.

Falcón, Ricardo (1989) “Problemas teóricos y metodológicos en la historia del movimiento obrero en Argentina”, en Carlos Zubillaga (ed.) *Trabajadores y sindicatos en América Latina*. Montevideo: CLACSO.

Gerchunoff, Pablo, Fernando Rocchi y Gastón Rossi (2008) *Desorden y progreso. Las crisis económicas argentinas, 1870-1905*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa.

Gutiérrez, Leandro y Luis Alberto Romero (1991) “Los sectores populares y el movimiento obrero en Argentina: Un estado de la cuestión”, *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana Dr. Emilio Ravignani*, Tercera Serie, núm. 3.

Gutiérrez, Leandro (1981) “Condiciones de la vida material de los sectores populares en Buenos Aires, 1880-1914”, *Revista de Indias*, vol. X-LI, núm. 163-64.

Guy, Donna (1981) “Women, Peonage, and Industrialization: Argentina, 1810-1914”, en *Latin American Research Review*, vol. 6, núm. 3, pp. 65-89.

Iñigo Carrera, Nicolás (2006) “La historia de los trabajadores” en Jorge Gelman (comp.) *La historia económica argentina. Balances y perspectivas*. Buenos Aires: Asociación Argentina de Historia Económica- Prometeo Libros

Lobato, Mirta Zaida y Juan Suriano (1993) “Trabajadores y movimiento obrero: entre la crisis y la profesionalización del historiador”, *Entrepasados*, núm. 4-5.

Lobato, Mirta Zaida (2007) *Historia de las trabajadoras en la Argentina (1869-1960)*. Buenos Aires: Edhasa.

Martínez, Pedro Santos (2000) “El R. P. Grote, los "Círculos de obreros" y el doctor Alfredo Palacios”, *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia*, núm. 72-73.

Munck, Ronaldo (1988) “Mutual Benefit Societies in Argentina: Workers, Nationality, Social Security and Trade Unionism”, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, vol. 30, núm. 3, pp. 573-590.

Panettieri, José (1967) *Los trabajadores*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Jorge Alvarez.

Poy, Lucas (2011) “No tan Buenos Aires. Desarrollo urbano y situación de los trabajadores en la ciudad del ‘orden y el progreso’ (1880-1890)”, *Quid 16. Revista del Área de Estudios Urbanos del Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani*, Buenos Aires, vol. 1 págs. 92-103.

Poy, Lucas (2013) “Tiempos difíciles. Huelgas, sociedades de resistencia y militancia política en la ciudad de Buenos Aires, 1888-1896”. Ph.D. dissertation. Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Rocchi, Fernando (2006) *Chimneys in the desert: industrialization in Argentina during the export boom years, 1870-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sabato, Hilda (1985) “La formación del mercado de trabajo en Buenos Aires”, *Desarrollo Económico*, vol. 24, núm. 96.

Scobie, James R. (1977) *Buenos Aires, del centro a los barrios, 1870-1910*. Buenos Aires: Solar/Hachette.

Suriano, Juan (2009) “¿Cuál es hoy la historia de los trabajadores en la Argentina?” en *Mundos do Trabalho*, año I, núm. 1.

Suriano, Juan (1984) “La huelga de inquilinos de 1907 en Buenos Aires”, en Diego Armus (comp.) *Sectores populares y vida urbana*, Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Zaragoza, Gonzalo (1996) *Anarquismo argentino 1876-1902*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.

Notes

i

For historiographic assessments of Argentine labor history, see Falcón 1989, Gutiérrez and Romero 1991, Lobato and Suriano 1993, Iñigo Carrera 2006, Suriano 2009.

ii For a discussion on the living conditions of workers see Cortés Conde 1976 and Gutiérrez 1981.

iii On the history of mutual benefit societies, see Baily 1982, Munck 1988, Devoto y Míguez 1992.

iv For a recent assessment of the economic crisis of 1890, see Gerchunoff, Rocchi, Rossi 2008.

v “La huelga de los obreros del ferrocarril del Sud”, *La Prensa*, October 27, 1888. “Ein Arbeitertag in Buenos Aires”, *Vorwärts*, December 1, 1888.

vi “La huelga de los obreros de albañilería”, *La Prensa*, September 21, 1889.

vii “La huelga del Puerto”, *El Nacional*, August 3, 1889. “La huelga de la Boca”, *La Nación*, August 7, 1889.

viii “La cuestión social. Federación Obrera. Exposición al presidente de la República. Nuevos impuestos”, *La Prensa*, January 16, 1891.

ix “Los obreros católicos en Luján”, *La Prensa*, October 31, 1893. On the history of Catholic Circles, see Martínez 2000.

x Some examples, among many others: “A los obreros marmoleros”, *El Obrero Panadero*, August 11, 1895; “Appello ai pittori”, *La Unión Gremial*, August 15, 1895; “A los obreros”, *La Unión Gremial*, May 16, 1895.

xi See, for instance, “Lo que nos interesa”, *El Obrero Panadero*, September 20, 1895; “El ahorro del obrero”, *La Unión Gremial*, October 17, 1895.