INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-20,845

WEINSTEIN, Donald Fred, 1938-
JUAN B. JUSTO: AN ARGENTINE SOCIALIST.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1974
History modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

JUAN B. JUSTO: AN ARGENTINE SOCIALIST

by

DONALD F. WEINSTEIN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

1974

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 22, 1974
date

Barry Bernstein
Chairman of Examining Committee

May 24, 1974
date

Richard C. Wade
Acting Executive Officer

Robert Golden

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to the many people who helped make this work possible. I want to acknowledge my deep obligation to Jacobo Kavadloff, Director of the American Jewish Committee Office, Buenos Airea, for extending to me his friendship and aid. He did all that was possible to insure that my son would enjoy his stay in Buenos Aires. He arranged interviews for me with biographers of Justo.

I am very grateful to those people who granted me interviews and have provided me with valuable printed material as well. Dra. Alicia Moreau de Justo spoke with me on three different occasions on the work of Dr. Justo as well as contemporary events. Dardo Cúneo directed me to people who were of great assistance. Juan Antonio Solari permitted me to use his files on Pablo Iglesias. Américo Ghioldi and Luis Pan were extremely generous with both their time and information. Emilio Corbiere extended to me his friendship as well as material on Justo. I hope that these people are pleased with this work.

I am indebted to all the librarians who helped me in my work. They include: Mr. Luis Maria de Elizalde of the Biblioteca Nacional; Miss Venancia Gimenez of the Archivo General de la Nación and Miss Solena V. Bryant of Queens College.

I am indebted to Professor Harry Bernstein who supervised this work. Were it not for his firm yet tender guidance and efforts in my behalf I would not have been able to complete this work.

Had it not been for the love of my son, Jeffrey Mark Weinstein, I would not have had the strength to complete this work.

Notwithstanding the aid provided by numerous people, the interpretations and opinions are exclusively mine, as are any errors or mistakes in the text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.--ARGENTINE BACKGROUND 1880-1914

With the defeat of Rosas at Caseros in 1852 the political climate was generally propitious for the economic development of Argentina. During the presidencies of Mitre, Sarmiento, and Avellaneda the basis of political stability was established as the country consolidated itself as a nation. In harmony with the wishes of the landed interests of Argentina and the investing classes of Great Britain and Western Europe the various administrations stimulated the economic development of the country.[1]

Although Argentina was not an industrial nation at the start of World War I, nevertheless it had been transformed during the half century that ended in 1914. By 1913 foreign investments in Argentina reached $5,300,000,000 in gold. Where there had been ten kilometers of railroad track in 1857 there were 11,688 kilometers by 1890 and 33,478 kilometers in 1913. Roads were built and ports were constructed. The City of Buenos Aires, which had only 436 three-story buildings in 1887, had 3,252 structures over two stories by 1910 as the population swelled owing to immigrants from Europe.[2]

The first national census of 1869 gave the population of Argentina as approximately 1,800,000 composed of about 1,550,000 Argentineans and roughly 220,000 foreigners. By 1914 approximately 1,750,000 immigrants had entered the country with almost 50 percent establishing themselves permanently in Argentina. Therefore, by 1914 the population was estimated to be 8,000,000 composed of 50 percent first-generation Argentines and 30 percent foreigners.

Attracted by economic opportunities, these immigrants, some 200,000 of whom were laborers, came mainly from Italy and Spain. Approximately 75 percent of the total population was found in the Litoral. With its strategic location Buenos Aires drained off much of this labor force to meet its rapidly rising need for services, construction, and production. The municipal census of 1887 recorded that the foreign element made up 52 percent of the population. The population of other cities such as Rosario, Bahía Blanca, and La Plata increased; Argentina passed from a rural to a more urban country by 1914.[3]

The incorporation of new consumers, as well as the building of railroads, contributed to the growth of industrial activities. In 1853 the City of Buenos Aires had 746 workshops and 106 factories, the latter employing a total of no more than 2,000 workers. The national census of 1869 noted that 280,000 people were involved in manufacturing, 24,000 in transportation, and 40,000 in commerce out of a total population of 1,800,000. For all practical purposes the installations of the period were rudimentary and the number of establishments that could be labelled "factory" was insignificant up to the 1880s.[4]

Owing to mechanization, new methods of production, and the growth of internal markets there was a transition from domestic production to factory production between 1880 and 1890. By 1881, in the province of Buenos Aires, there were twelve saladeros with a total capital of 165 million pesos employing 1,740 workers. At the Continental Exposition of 1882 the Argentinians displayed numerous products developed in the country. Included were foods, clothing, and construction materials. Yet in the City of Buenos Aires there were factories in 1887 that employed 100 to 200 laborers. By 1887 there were 10,349 businesses with a total of 42,321

employees. Meanwhile, statistics for 1890 illustrate that two-thirds of all establishments were artisan workshops and that these employed 60 percent of the manufacturing labor force. It is therefore obvious that by 1890 Argentina's industry was at an incipient stage of development.[5]

Notwithstanding the embryonic stage of industrial development, most of the nation's industries were able to weather the economic crisis of 1890 for several reasons. Included among these were the cheapness of labor costs and Europe's demand for processed food products. However, the total number of workshops and factories in Buenos Aires had decreased bo 8,439 in 1895. Ninety-two percent of these industries were owned by foreigners. The work force in the country which grew to about 175,000, including 105,000 foreigners, was concentrated in approximately 22,000 businesses. Of these enterprises food processing accounted for one-third of the personnel, two-fifths of the capital, and one-half of the horsepower utilized.[6]

Nevertheless, Argentina was still a country of artisans and craftsmen. Whereas factories numbered only 13 percent of the establishments and employed only 23 percent of the workforce, the artisan shop made up 66 percent of the businesses and employed 60 percent of the labor engaged in manufacturing.[7]

However, by World War I there was a qualitative change. The capital in industrial establishments was 1,800,000,000 pesos by 1914. Whereas the workshops controlled 25 percent of the capital in 1895, by 1941 this figure had been reduced to 3 percent. In the meantime factories controlled 34 percent of the capital in 1895 and 44 percent in 1914. Owing to the strategic location of the Litoral, 72.1 percent of the capital was in that

area as was 70 percent of the manufacturing establishments which accounted for 79.7 percent of manufactured goods produced in Argentina.[8]

The national census of 1914 noted that there were 48,779 establishments employing 410,210 workers, of whom 210,570 were foreigners. Food processing made up two-fifths of the establishments, employed one-third of the personnel, accounted for two-fifths of the capital, produced one-half of the goods, and maintained one-fourth of the horsepower. The large-scale establishments of 1914 were the meat-packing plants, tanning factories, flour mills, electricity and gas plants, sugar refineries, some breweries, wineries, paper and lumber mills, and textile plants. Other establishments, which employed less than ten workers, produced for local consumption fulfilling the needs of each barrio. These establishments, which increased by 219 percent between 1895 and 1914, produced such items as shoes, paints, bricks, glasses, and matches. Statistics show that the non-factory shops made up only 35 percent of the establishments and hired only 25 percent of the labor force by 1914, whereas the factory represented 30 percent of the establishments and employed 40 percent of the personnel. Nevertheless, it would be erroneous to consider Argentina an industrialized nation on the eve of World War I.[9]

The first manifestations of the Argentine socialist movement were in the Trade Unions. When management, which unilaterally determined the length of the working day, arbitrarily reduced the salary of the printers in 1877, the result was the formation of the Unión Tipográfica. An offshoot of the mutual aid Sociedad Tipográfica Bonaerense, the Union declared a strike on August 30, 1887, when its petition for shorter hours and higher wages was rejected. Although subjected to political repression, nevertheless the union triumphed. When the strike ended a month later the

the Union had won a number of concessions including salary increases to 1,200 to 1,400 pesos monthly and a ten-hour and twelve-hour working day in the winter and summer months respectively. Although the spirit of this agreement was later perverted by management, it marked the first time that hours and salaries were established by collective bargaining.[10]

In 1881 the bakers of Buenos Aires formed the Unión Obreros Panaderos. Tailors and masons unionized. The Unión Oficiales Yeseros won their demands for higher wages and shorter hours in 1882. However, seemingly spontaneous outbursts by the workers of the Teléfono Gower Bell and the bakers of Rosario had mixed results. The former won pay raises while the latter's strike failed. Yet it seemed to be agreed generally that the Trade Union movement was rather insignificant between 1878 and 1887. As a matter of fact, Jacinto Oddone, noting the lack of adequate information about strikes in the interior of Argentine between 1878 and 1896, mentions that prior to 1887 Buenos Aires witnessed only one strike, that of the Union Tipográfica.[11]

Starting about 1886, the country entered a crisis. Work was limited. Salaries were lowered. The workers realized the need of organization, especially the immigrants. The embryonic labor movement reflected their experiences and ideas.

On June 20, 1887, La Fraternidad was founded among the engineers, firemen, and waterers of the railroad. This organization advocated uniform working conditions, the establishment of tribunals of arbitration composed of representatives of government, business, and labor and the creation of a pension system. With its emphasis on Social Security it meant to use collective bargaining and legislation to better the economic situation of its members.

In spite of this fact, railroad employees did strike a number of times between 1887 and 1890. Although the movements were generally spontaneous, the strikes continually demanded to have salaries based on gold instead of paper money since the value of the paper peso had been reduced to sixty centavos gold. Arrest and mistreatment of the workers by police, and reprisals against individuals by management once the strikers returned to work triggered new strikes. In some instances the workers won concessions. They were granted a 25 percent increase in 1887. In 1888 they were able to force the government to release a colleague and in 1890 management agreed to rehire those men who had been dismissed. Yet they also felt pain and experienced defeat. In 1887 the police, in hopes of breaking a strike, arrested a number of strikers, while in 1888 police shot and wounded several strikers who were attending a meeting in the Plaza Herrera. One hundred-sixty other strikers were arrested and the strike failed. This same brutality was seen in 1889.[12]

The year 1887 signalled the foundation of the permanent resistance movement of the working class to obtain shorter hours and higher pay. On August 4, 1887, the Sociedad de Resistencia de Obreros Panaderos was founded with an anarchist Enrique Malatesta as its guiding spirit. That same year witnessed an unorganized strike by shoemakers who labored ten to fifteen hours daily to earn at most three pesos. In the early months of 1888 the Sociedad Cosmopolitana de Obreros Panaderos, notwithstanding police harassment, won its strike for a 30 percent raise, weekly pay, and the right of the workers to eat outside of the shop. By November 1888, the City of Buenos Aires was the site of conflicts. Workers in metallurgical establishments and carpenters' shops clamored for raises of 25 to 40 percent in order to meet the high cost of living. During 1889 there

were a number of strikes. Some were ill-prepared and failed. The success of the masons is debatable, while that of the 3,000-member Sociedad Internacional de Obreros, Carpinteros y Ebanistas y Anexos was a definite success.[13]

With the formation of the first Trade Unions the idea was nurtured almost immediately of coordinating their various activities. The year 1882 saw the creation of the Club Vorwarts whose methods and goals coincided with those of the German Social Democratic Party. Founded by Terman residents of Buenos Aires, the Club Vorwarts sent Alejo Peyratt to the International Workers' Congress in 1889. This Congress, which met in Paris, resolved to observe May 1 in homage to the martyrs of Chicago and to work for an eight-hour workday. In harmony with this, the Club Vorwarts held a meeting on March 30, 1890, which was attended by representatives of eighteen other organizations. From this assembly there emerged the Comité Internacional Obrero which was to promote the celebration of May Day, create a labor federation, edit a labor journal, and draft a petition to the National Congress soliciting legislation on behalf of the working class.

The work of the Comité Internacional bore fruit when 1,500 to 3,000 workers, in spite of threats from their employers, assembled in the Prado Español to participate in the first May Day celebration in Argentina's history. The objectives of the meeting were the creation of a labor federation and the formation of a petition to the National Congress. Those who were assembled were told, in a multitude of languages indicative of the heterogeneous composition of the working class, that socialism was the ideology of the workers.

As a result of the May Day celebration a petition of approximately 8,000 signatures, but lacking the blessings of the anarchists, was sent to the Cámara de Diputados in June 1890. Among the twelve items were such universal labor demands as an eight-hour day, abolition of child labor, and government inspection of factories. However, the demands for the establishment of accident insurance and the creation of arbitration panels was conditioned by the peculiar Argentine conditions. Nevertheless, Congress, showing its scorn, refused to receive the petition.[14]

By June 29, 1890, the Comité Internacional had created in principle the Federación de Trabajadores de la Región Argentina. However, the formation of this organization was delayed owing to the civic-military movement against Juárez Celman and the ensuing state of siege which virtually paralyzed all labor activity.[15]

The Battle of Caseros, the National Constitution of 1853, the federalizing of Buenos Aires, and the consolidation of Argentina had the end result of attracting foreign investments to Argentina. By the end of 1888 Argentina had become a financial wonderland. It is estimated that in 1888 40 percent of available British foreign investment funds flowed into Argentina. By 1890 Argentina was virtually an economic-financial colony of Europe, dependent upon European nations, especially England, for markets and capital.

However, the administration of Juárez Celman (1885 to 1890) was corrupt. Public revenues were disorganized as building programs were carried out without any attempt to evaluate their immediate worth. Therefore, the national treasury was exhausted when the value of wool exports decreased and the service on loans and payments of interests swelled to 100 million pesos. There was a depreciation of paper money. The gap

between the government's obligation and its ability to pay brought a halt to the flow of foreign capital. Ambitious projects were terminated as the government declared the inconvertibility of the paper pesos. These economic events had a marked influence on the emerging middle classes of the coastal cities and triggered the Revolution of 1890.[16]

As noted previously, labor agitation increased during the period of 1887-1890. Real salary had been reduced in the wake of the mounting cost of living. Workers labored eleven to sixteen hours a day to earn a daily wage of $1.50 to $3.00. Yet broad cost $ .40 per kilo, meat $ .25 per kilo, and maise $ .12 per kilo. This desperate situation increased the waves of discontent. One need only recall the several railroad strikes between 1888-1890, or note the successful strike by shoemakers in 1889, or the strike of the tram workers of the Anglo-Argentine Tramways Company to appreciate the situation of the worker.[17]

The government victory permitted the oligarchy and foreign interests to resolve the economic-financial crisis at the expense of the popular and national interests. Thousands of owners of small shops were reduced to wage-earners as English capitalists implanted their hegemony over the Argentine economy. Once the worst difficulties of 1890 were passed big firms continued to expand.[18]

Meanwhile, the worker languished. In 1891, when real wages were at their lowest, 30,000 workers emigrated. However, unemployment increased. Buenos Aires had 10,000 unemployed in 1891. The labor market was glutted. Living conditions were extremely bad.[19]

This was the economic, social, and political picture of Argentina when Juan Bautista Justo appeared on the Argentine political scene. Justo and his biographers do not provide sufficient information for a detailed

examination and analysis of Justo's childhood and youth. Yet, it is possible to reconstruct a general narrative of his life. Justo's grandfather was an Italian who had immigrated from Geneva to Gibraltar and from Gibraltar to Argentina. The altering of his name from the Italian Guisto to the Spanish Justo symbolized the change of residence.

Juan Bautista Justo was born in the Province of Buenos Aires, June 28, 1865, to Juan Filipe Justo and Aurora Castro. Justo's home was not proletarian but neither were the homes of Marx, Engels, Blum, Vandervelde, and Jaurès. Justo descended from families of comfortable economic means. His paternal grandfather owned the most important flour mill of the country. His mother possessed property in the City of Buenos Aires. There had been provincial governors from both branches of his family. Unfortunately, the economic situation deteriorated. However, no reason was given for this misfortune by Justo or his biographers.

Both of Justo's parents were extremely strong-willed. His father, occupied in rural jobs, remained separated from the family. Juan B. Justo assumed the paternalistic role while he lived with his mother. He took care of his brothers and sisters. He developed an early sense of responsibility and maturity which distinguished him in the first years of his professional career and his political life.

Before he died on January 8, 1928, Justo made references in his Programa de acción para las juventudes socialistas to the military revolts that he had witnessed as early as 1874. When he was fifteen years old, he saw the battles which preceded the establishment of the Federation of Buenos Aires. These military events touched his family and left him with an abhorrence of military activity and of revolution.[20]

In 1882, Justo entered medical school at the Facultad de Ciencias Médicas of the Facultad de Buenos Aires. He was a serious and brilliant student. The reversal of the family's economic fortune forced Justo, in his second year of medical school, to get a job as parliamentary chronicler for La Prensa. This put him in contact with the reality of the parliamentary world. He observed and analyzed the pettiness and selfishness of the oligarchs and the latifundistas in whose hands was the destiny of the country. In 1886, Justo went to Tucumàn to fight a cholera epidemic. The next year he witnessed the fraudulent electoral process carried out in Argentina. In 1888, Justo graduated from medical school. His dissertation, sponsored by Professor Pirovarro, dealt with blood clots in the brain that could be operated on. It was a mature, thorough, well-written work that has been called the most exhaustive study on the theme. Upon graduation he was awarded a gold medal.[21]

In 1889, Justo visited the most famous clinics of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland in order to increase his medical knowledge. He was especially impressed by the medical school of Vienna and the surgeon Dr. Kocher Berner, who practiced the antiseptic method. His medical studies abroad taught him the value of a well-constructed theory. His trip to Europe was instrumental in the success of his career as doctor and teacher. Upon his return from Europe, Justo became a surgeon in the Hospital de Crónicos, where he applied the new advances in medical science. Medical statistics of the time indicate that the mortality rate exceeded 50 percent of those operated. Justo, medically speaking, was eclectic since he was not tied to any school of thought. His knowledge of six languages permitted him to acquire information from any source directly.

Justo initiated new practices to diminish the mortality rate of patients. He was the first surgeon in the Americas to use the aseptic method for operations. He was the first to use cocaine as a local anesthetic. He was able successfully to perform hernia inguinal libre operations. He was the first surgeon in America to practice successfully brain operations in line with methods proposed by Wagner. These successful brain operations were first done by Justo on April 29, 1890, after he had researched the problem in detail. His thoroughness of research was seen throughout his political life. As a result of his fight to modernize medicine in Argentina, Justo got the reputation of a rather severe and blunt educator. He severely reprimanded medical students who endangered the lives of patients with unsanitary practices. Yet he was respected by his students.

In the middle of 1890 medical students associated with the Círculo Médico Argentina brought about a revolution when they ousted the directive commission of the group. The activities of the students deeply impressed Justo. The medical students wanted to better the services of the Círculo Médico which by the negligence of its authorities had fallen into a pitiful depression. However, after demolishing the directive commission the students were disoriented. Doctor Justo helped the student revolutionaries. He became provisional governor of the society. His provisional rule lasted a few weeks until the extraordinary assembly elected a new directive commission headed by a young doctor, Julio Méndez. The commitment of Justo in these days may perhaps be best understood by noting that the president of the dismissed commission was Dr. José Maria Ramos Mejía, a man of great political influence.

Justo exercised his profession as a doctor upon graduation from medical school. He had been a brilliant and successful doctor. He made a name for himself in porteño society. By the end of the century, Justo's mother, doña Aurora Castro, had been able to rent a mansion that had been previously the residence of the Brazilian Ambassador. In a speech in 1889 to a medical group Justo extolled the medical profession as the most rewarding and productive vocation an individual could undertake. This innovative, talented surgeon had a glorious medical career in front of him when the crisis of 1890 occurred.[22]

Upon his return to Argentina Justo became a member of the Unión Cívica de la Juventud on August 1889. This party was founded in order to stem the tide of corruption and political immorality that in 1890 threatened to bury the country. This party was supported by the middle sectors, especially those in Buenos Aires. Justo played a brief role in the organization until the end of 1890. He was unable to alter the influences he considered negative. He was unable to get the party to form a program of concrete political and social goals. Conceivably, Justo separated from the movement on April 24, 1890, when Leandro N. Alem became President of the Executive Committee of the Unión Cívica. Alem's replacement of Francisco A. Barroetaveña initiated the conspiratorial stage of the Unión Cívica which culminated in the July 26 revolution. The leaders of the Unión Cívica supported the intervention of the military in politics. Justo opposed this idea. He favored a civil movement, a city-wide strike of municipal taxpayers to topple the government of Juárez Celman.[23]

Justo denied that he had prior knowledge of the revolution. He rejected the idea that he was one of the organizers and key participants in the Revolution of 1890. However, when the revolution erupted Justo

went to the Parque de Artilleria to lend his professional services. Justo served as a doctor. He aided the wounded with great risk to his own life. After two or three days, when the Revolution was just about ended, he attended to the wounded at the Hospital de Crónicos.

Justo evaluated the crisis of 1890 in its international and national context. He saw it as a consequence of Argentina's absorption into the world market and the periodic crises associated with this kind of absorption. The immediate blame was placed on the Argentine oligarchy who depreciated the currency by excessive emissions of money for the squandering and speculation of the governing coteria.

According to Justo, the working class suffered severely in the wake of the deep crisis that followed the monetary disorder. Immigrants, for whose passage the government spent millions, were unemployed. In 1891, 82,000 emigrated from Argentina as the gap between nominal salaries and prices increased. There were eight strikes in 1891. The government prohibited meetings and jailed workers. A commission of the Cámara de Diputados named the previous year to study labor legislation was terminated. Accordingly, the situation hindered the consolidation of the first organs of working class agitation. Nevertheless, Justo credited these short-lived groups and periodicals with giving the first impulse to the movement that was rooted in the fundamental character of Argentina society.

Justo negated the idea that the Revolution of 1890 was one of the great events in Argentine history. To Justo the sterility of the Revolution was obvious. It failed to open a new era in electoral and fiscal practices. Electoral fraud and emissions of debased currency continued. The authorized emissions had the same destructive effect on the

working class. It depressed real salary. Misery intensified and spread. Emigration increased.

In 1893 there were two simultaneous revolts in the Province of Buenos Aires. One was led by Hipolito Irigoyen. The other was headed by Manuel J. Campos. The sterile fights of factions, the inability of the política criolla, the political leaders who represented the oligarchy and were judged by Justo to be corrupt, to work together was made clear to Justo by the revolts of 1893. His abhorrence for the política criolla was complete. The old liberalism seemed impotent to improve the political state of the country. It was now that Justo conceived of the working class as a powerful force to renovate the country. Following these revolutions he joined the Agrupación Socialista. He entered the Social Democratic Movement in August 1893.[24]

Justo's intellectual development prepared him for his entrance into the Socialist Movement. The 1880s were the brilliant years of Argentine positivism. The liberal generation of 1880 imposed its ideas and legislation upon the country. Justo witnessed the heated debates between Catholics and Liberals. Schooled in the natural sciences and universitarian positivism, Justo failed nevertheless to enter, as did the vast majority of the intellectuals, in the school of Comte and Spencer. He rejected Comteian dogmatism and the social organism of Spencer. Nonetheless, the works of Herbert Spencer were the most important political reading that Justo had done at the time he entered the Agrupación Socialista. In 1922, Justo credited the Spencerian theorem of social evolution as one of the ideological reasons for his dedication to socialism. Spencer thought that the evolution of societies was toward the increasing freedom of the individual.

By the time the Socialist Party was created in 1896, Justo was intellectually indebted to many other writers. He was influenced in his formative years by the works of Lewis Morgan, Gustav Schmoller, Thoreau Rodgers, and Augustin Thierry. His knowledge of German, utilized in his medical studies, enabled him to gain an extraordinary knowledge of socialist literature. He read Geschichte des Sozialismus and Die Neue Zeit. Through these works he became familiar with, among others, the ideas of Babel, Bernstein, Kautsky, Lafargue, Liebknecht, Mehring, and Plejanof. Justo was also a vociferous reader of Marx, Smith, Ricardo, Shakespeare, Goethe, Ruskin, Zola, and Shaw. He read El Socialista, the organ of the Spanish Socialist Party. Therefore, he was familiar with the ideas of Pablo Iglesias, the founder of the Party. He read the bulletins and annuals of the United States Department of Labor which permitted him to illustrate statistically subjects of importance to the working class. Throughout his life Justo read the treatises of the most important men of scientific socialism.[25]

By the time Justo became associated with the Agrupación Socialista there were four socialist groups in Buenos Aires. These groups were ethnically oriented and modelled their programs after parties found in Europe. The first socialist group in Argentina, and the most important one at that time, was the German Club Vorwarts founded in 1882 by Carlos Mucke who left Germany under the anti-socialistic laws of Bismarck. According to its constitution its objective was to realize the principles and ends of socialism in agreement with the program of the German Social Democrats. Argentine socialism is indebted to the Vorwarts. It was responsible for the first acts of socialist propaganda in Argentina. It favored the naturalization of foreigners. It founded the first consumer cooperatives

in the country between 1890 and 1898. However, the Vorwarts, which was represented in the Congress of Paris of 1889, was limited basically to the German colony of Argentina. The other two non-Spanish-speaking socialist groups were "Les Egaux," created in 1891 by French immigrants, and "Fascio dei Lavoratori," founded by Italian socialists. Both groups were never numerous although "Les Egaux" edited the periodical L'egalité.[26]

Justo cautiously approached the Spanish-speaking "Agrupación Socialista" after investigating and scrutinizing the working groups in the city. This group grew out of the "sección varia" of the first Federación Obrera of 1892 when Carlos Mauli proposed to establish a Socialist Party. The constituent assembly of the Agrupación took place December 14, 1892. The official name of the group was the Partido Obrero Sección Buenos Aires. The Agrupación Socialista wanted to investigate the possibility of reorganizing the Federación and publishing a newspaper. A notice was published in La Prensa on August 2, 1893, asking representatives of labor groups to meet at 7:30 P.M. in the Café Francés in order to exchange ideas on these subjects. Justo read the notice. Only four men responded to the notice in La Prensa. Three were delegates of the Agrupación Socialista. They were Esteban Jiménez, Augusta Kühn, and Isidro Salomó. Juan Fernández represented the cooper workers. On August 3, 1893, Juan B. Justo approached these four men meeting at the Café Francés and joined the Agrupación Socialista. In this inauspicious setting Justo became a member of the Social Democratic Movement.[27] Justo explained his reason for becoming a socialist.

> There was a time in my life when I would leave the hospital, every morning, after spending a half day among the sick, the crippled, the invalids, the various victims of misery, fatigue, exploitation and

> alcohol. . . . One certain day, when I went to bed fatigued I began to wonder if that fight against sickness and death that absorbed all of my strength was the wisest, most intelligent thing I could do. The hospital always was overflowing with suffering flesh. The patients came one after another in the row of beds . . . cured, they would . . . immediately fall among the gears of a social organization which with the ignorance and vice of the masses justifies privilege and oppression. How often was I pained and did not take my eyes off some servile beggar who, by saving his life when he came to my hands as a victim of work, had I led to the same situation. Was it worthwhile to save those lives fatally condemned to a vile suffering? Gradually I understood that there was a great deal of sterility and unworthiness in my task, that attention to the care of crippled and pained human bodies had in itself something fanatic and unilateral. Was not it more humane to be concerned in avoiding wherever possible so much suffering and degradation? And how can it be achieved without enlightening the mind of all the people, without nourishing them with scientific truth, without educating them for higher forms of social intercourse? And the human work, the necessary work, came to me like an infinite sowing of ideas, like an immense germination of customs, that would end the sterile pain and would give to each human being a life worthy to be lived. And soon I found in the workers' movement the atmosphere propitious to my new and most fervent aspirations.[28]

The men who met at the Café Francés wanted to form a labor newspaper. Such periodicals had been founded in Argentina before 1893. The first socialist newspaper in Argentina was the Vorwarts published from October 2, 1886, until March 15, 1901, in the Federal Capital. Directed by A. Uhle, it actively advocated the naturalization of immigrants. El Socialista was the publication of the Agrupación Socialista. Published in 1892 it survived for only six issues. Other labor periodicals included Unión Obrera of the railroad workers of Sola, L'Amico del Popolo of the Italian Mezzinists, and El Perseguido of anarchist tendencies. Between 1890 and 1914 there was a proliferation of socialist periodicals.

However, El Obrero, founded December 12, 1890, by Germán Avé Lallement, a German engineer, was the first Argentine newspaper to publish cohesively and systematically the doctrines of Marx. This was the first Spanish language newspaper that sowed the socialist seeds in Argentina. It became the official organ of the Federación. It was a weekly that

published eighty-eight issues. It lasted until September 24, 1892. In the first issue of La Vanguardia, April 7, 1894, the paper that became the official newspaper of the Argentine Socialist Party, the editors acknowledged both El Obrero and El Socialista as its predecessors in advocating the proletariat cause. Justo reiterated this point in an unpublished article written in 1910 for La Nación.[29]

The group lacked money to publish a newspaper. The necessary funds were obtained when Justo sold his medical car and Augusto Kühn donated 300 pesos. The socialists were able to buy printing materials at an auction. Justo was a member of the Comision de Prensa when La Vanguardia was founded.

The guiding spirit of the newspaper, Justo proposed the name of this scientific socialist periodical as a symbolic representation of the significant concept of socialism. Throughout Justo's life La Vanguardia served as the mouthpiece of the working class and provided the method and discipline to the embryonic socialist movement. La Vanguardia, a reflection of the ideas of Justo, instructed the first generation of socialists for the great tasks that awaited them. It put the Argentine proletariat in contact with the thoughts of the great theoreticians of international socialism such as Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Bernstein, Plejanof, Turati, Valdevelde, Kier Hardie, and Pablo Iglesias.

La Vanguardia was a long sheet, four-page, four-column newspaper that appeared as a weekly until 1905. In the first edition of La Vanguardia appeared an editorial written by Justo entitled "Este País se Transforma." It set the tone for the paper. It provided the readers with an economic interpretation of Argentine history and formulated a plan of action to improve the situation of the working class in Argentina. It

claimed that the paper represented the intelligent and prudent proletariat. La Vanguardia was to spread the economic doctrines of Smith, Ricardo, and Marx. It was to prepare the working class for the approaching social transformation of Argentina.[30]

In 1894, the Agrupación Socialista, Les Egaux, and Fascio dei Lavoratori resolved to form the Partido Socialista Obrero Internacional. The program, drafted by Esteban Jiménez, showed an understanding of the economic and political problems of Argentina.[31]

Justo's familiarity with this program can be inferred from an article published May 1, 1894, in La Vanguardia. This article championed the formation of a Labor Socialist Party in all countries under a capitalist regime. It emphasized that the program of an Argentine Socialist Party would be similar in many ways to the programs of socialist parties throughout the world. The effects of capitalism were essentially the same as were the most urgent demands of the proletariat. The article criticized immigrants who failed to become Argentine citizens for hindering the development of a socialist party in Argentina. Noting that the three groups lacked political power because they were made up almost totally of foreigners, Justo concluded with the positive observation that they had formulated, for the first time in Argentina, a program that was essentially the program of European socialist parties.[32]

In March 1895, Justo made a second trip to Europe, after first stopping in the United States. Here he wrote his observations about the United States in a series of articles published by La Vanguardia. In Europe Justo met the leaders of and saw the accomplishments of the proletarian movement. In Madrid, Justo established relationships with the men of Spanish socialism. Notwithstanding Justo's remarks to his

closest collaborator on socialist doctrine, Esteban Jiménez, about his difficulties with translating Das Kapital, Volume I, into Spanish, Justo, at age 29, presented a fully translated version of this work to Antonío Garcia Guejido for publication. It was published in 1898. It was not until this work was published that the Spanish-speaking world had a complete translation of Volume I of Das Kapital. As a matter of fact, at this time Marx was a virtual unknown in Argentina. His death in London was not even mentioned in the porteño papers.

Justo remained free of Marxist dogmatism throughout his life. However, his translation clarified the ideas of Marx for Spanish readers. Possibly Justo undertook this task because he thought there was a great interest in reading Marx in Spanish. In the meantime Justo sent a letter to his close friend Nicolás Repetto relating that he hoped to establish a socialist party when he, Justo, returned to Argentina. In Belgium, where the workers' Co-operatives had taken great strides, Justo visited the Maison du Peuple of Brussels and spoke with its founder Bertrand. He conversed with the paladins of Belgium socialism Émile Vandevelde and Ansele. At the time Vandevelde was re-evaluating Marx's premises. In Paris he listened to Juarès speak in Parliament. His European trip made Justo aware of the use of parliamentary action to bring about a social transformation. In the most advanced countries the working people had used parliament as the scene of their fights and the instrument of their progress.[33]

Justo returned to Argentina in September 1895, on the eve of a convention of the International Workers Socialist Party. He chaired the convention made up of delegates from eleven groups. His influence was felt immediately in the group. Symptomatic of his European experience and

intellectual maturation the party's name was changed to the Partido Socialista Obrero Argentino. He wanted to create an organic socialist party international by ideals but Argentine by its characteristics and immediate aims. Previously the party had international orientation as seen in its propaganda, the name of its groups, and the idioms used in debates. Now, in October 1895, the party's orientation was more national. Symptomatic of this change was the decision of the Executive Committee, which included Justo, over some opposition, to make Argentine citizenship compulsory for a person to be a member of the Executive Committee. Furthermore, in his role as Secretary of the Interior of the Executive Committee, Justo played the key role in the two most significant events for the party and country that took place in 1896: the election of 1896 and the creation of the Argentine Socialist Party.[34]

Justo was instrumental in getting the party to participate for the first time in the national elections in 1896. The socialist organization in Buenos Aires put up candidates for national elections. The selection of candidates caused a split in the party. Lacking statutes to determine the procedure to select candidates for national deputies, the Executive Committee decided that each group would nominate five candidates and that citizens, those people allowed to vote in national elections, would then select the final five candidates. The Centro Socialista Revolucionario de Barracas al Norte, which eventually left the party, took the position that all members of the party should select the five socialist candidates. Justo was nominated by more socialist groups than any other candidate. Justo pressured the party into accepting all candidates unanimously by threatening not to run for office unless this was done. The members

agreed to this demand and Justo headed the party slate which included Germán Avé Lallemant, Adrián Patroni, Juan Schaeffer, and Gabriel Abad.

The socialists, who never expected to win the election, conducted an active campaign in all parts of the city. This was unique, given the corruption of the period, and surprised the porteño population. Eight thousand posters were pased on the walls of the city. Twenty thousand fliers, which included the program and slate of the party, were distributed throughout the city.

The electoral program of the party was divided into two parts: one political and the other economic. The political platform called for universal suffrage, including rights for women, permanent voter registration for citizens, the right of recall, municipal autonomy, the end of clerical privileges as well as the confiscation of clerical property, the end of a permanent army, and the general armament of the people.

The economic program called for an eight-hour workday for adults, a six-hour workday for minors between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, and prohibited work for children younger than fourteen years of age. It called for the regulation of female labor, urged the prohibition of unhealthy and immoral work, demanded equal pay for equal work for both men and women, obligatory weekly rest of thirty-six hours without interruption, urged that commissions be created to inspect factories and houses of workers, that arbitration tribunals be established, owners be held responsible for accidents, and that indirect taxes be abolished and replaced by a direct, progressive tax on income.

On the eve of the election, the Executive Committee issued a manifesto to the nation in which it dismissed the other parties in Argentina as petty and personalistic, divorced of programs and ideas. To the

Socialist, these parties of wealthy parasites increased the profits of the capitalists at the expense of the working people and thereby compromised the development of Argentina. Emphatically it called the Socialist Party the only party which represents the working people against the parasitic and oppressive capitalistic class. Reiterating its aim for the nationalization of the means of production and exchange, the Executive Committee explained the reason for the party's program by emphasizing that until this occurs the party will work to better the immediate situation of the working class.

The party claimed that the elections were fraudulent. Socialist poll-watchers were ejected from voting areas. The non-socialist press such as La Prensa and La Nación verified that in many cases, such as in the parish of San Cristobal, socialists were not permitted to vote. Hindered by both anarchists and the política criolla, the socialists registered 138 votes or approximately 1 percent of the 12,793 votes cast in the election. Although the socialists regarded their candidacy as nothing more than a symbol, nevertheless they wanted to put an end to this corruption and lead the population by the democratic path to the solution of the great social problems of the day.[35]

Following the national elections, the Executive Committee prepared for the first congress of the party which was considered the constituent congress of the Argentine Socialist Party. By 1896 Argentina had a population of approximately three million people. With the exception of the Socialist Party of Russia, all the European socialist parties had been founded. Marx and Engels were dead. The First International had disintegrated. The Argentine Socialist Party was born after Europe spent half a century of trial and error in the development of socialist

doctrine and action. Unquestionably, this experience benefitted Justo who at thirty-one years of age was instrumental in the creation of the Argentine Socialist Party. However, this was not a mere reproduction of European parties. Through the efforts of Justo, the Argentine Socialist Party adopted the methods and ends of socialism to a different means than that envisioned by Marx and Engels. Although inspired by the ideas of Marx, the Argentine Socialist Party differed from the European parties by its critical attitude. At the Constituent Congress, June 28, 1896, Justo stressed that, since the Argentine Socialist Party began thirty years after the European parties, it ought to benefit from the accumulated experience in the universal labor movement.[36]

The invitations to the Congress were edited by Justo in his function as Secretary of the Interior of the Executive Committee. Socialist groups and unions were invited to attend a congress on June 28 to 29, 1896, that would consider the reorganization of the party and economic questions of interest to the working class. Groups were urged to send the proposals they wished to present to the Congress to the Executive Committee prior to April 25.[37] Prior to the Constituent Assembly, there appeared in La Vanguardia the draft of statutes, the declaration of principles, and the minimum program which the delegates to the Congress would vote upon. On the eve of this Congress, Justo emphasized the historic importance of this Congress, and its future importance for the working class and country, in an article in La Vanguardia. The Congress was the crowning of a long and fertile preparatory labor. It reflected the mature judgment and intelligence of Justo.

Nineteen socialist groups plus eleven Trade Unions attended the Constituent Assembly. Justo and Domingo Risso represented the Centro

Socialista Obrero. Officers of the Congress were President Antonio Pinero, Vice President Domingo Risso, and Secretary Nicanor Sarmiento. From the first, the evolutionist and antidogmatic nature of the party was affirmed. The debates were spirited. Thirty years later Justo recalled that he had been unable to sleep on the night of June 28 as a result of the arguments. Furthermore, he remembered that he was surprised and mortified by the opposition to the Statutes; so much so that he did not accept any elective post in the Congress.

The Declaration of Principles, Statutes, and Minimum Program had been edited by Justo. These were the three columns that supported the party. They defined from the beginning the fundamental characteristics of the Argentine Socialist Party. The Declaration of Principles expressed the modern conception of the socialist revolution and the philosophy of Justo. Interwoven are labor interests and contemporary ideals of justice. The Statutes, which Justo drafted for the Socialist Party, reflected the belief that internal democracy was necessary in a true labor party. All issues were to be resolved democratically, especially suspensions and expulsions. Although the founding Congress reflected the gamut of socialist thought, the Statutes provided for discipline, a discipline voluntarily accepted by all and indispensable for the development of the party.

Justo stressed the equalitarian and democratic character of the party when he urged the delegates to approve the Statutes. To illustrate this, Justo pointed out that the party had mandated a general vote of the membership on any important issues and had given women the right to vote on any internal questions. Furthermore, there were no restrictive clauses on the actions of the various constituent groups.

The Minimum Program of the Socialist Party was made up of concrete and realizable economic and political goals. Justo's purpose was to provide the Socialist Party with a viable means to realize the technical, economic, political, and social progress of the Argentine people. In arguing for the approval of the Minimum Program, Justo told the delegates that the program was to be modest and represented only the reforms easily understood by all the people and most easily realized. Characterizing the party in its dual role of a class movement and an economic movement, Justo recognized that the first prerequisite was to improve economically the proletariat, and then liberty and justice would follow. Justo did not promise an immediate revolution. The socialists were revolutionaries by the truth they sustained. Justo noted that the program was not limited to purely economic clauses because there were other factors, such as the intellectual state of the people, that affected the economic state of the working class. The Minimum Program paid attention only to the urban-industrial problem, since the socialist movement was born and nurtured in the Federal Capital by industrial workers.

In spite of Justo's presentation, tactical and doctrinaire differences surfaced. A spirited debate took place on the issue of electoral alliances with bourgeoisie parties. Justo supported such alliances. However, this position was rejected as Article 8 of the Statutes was substituted by a statement which expelled those who entered into alliances with parties other than the Socialist Party. Justo labelled the article a sign of sectarianism and needless, since the Socialist Party was qualitatively different from other parties. Likewise, the position supported by Justo, that the selection of candidates by the Socialist Party be made by socialists who were citizens, was hotly contested by the delegates of

the Centro Socialista Revolucionario de Barracas al Norte who repudiated all national tendencies of socialism. Justo dismissed these objections to the Statutes as manifestations of romanticism and noted that the method of action approved was substantially the one he outlined for the party.[38]

In an article written July 1, 1896, Justo regretted that the Congress appeared so insignificant that some porteño newspapers failed to mention it. Justo thought the Congress reflected the changes that had taken place in Argentina, most significantly the class conflict. This Congress signified to Justo economic, intellectual, and political progress. According to Justo, it was indispensable that the working class entered the socialist movement especially when it did not control the means of production. Otherwise, the working class would be "crushed" by the technological progress of industry and commerce which increased the wealth and power of the capitalists at the expense, well-being, and freedom of the workers.[39]

Justo wanted Argentina to have a modern Socialist Party. It was to differ in its internal organization, means, and ends from the other political organizations in Argentina. The Argentine Socialist Party proclaimed the need of principle and morality in politics. Throughout the party's formative years, 1896 to 1912, this was evident. It was during these years that Justo played a key role in the development of the Party.

INTRODUCTION

FOOTNOTES

[1]Henry S. Ferns, Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 453; Ricardo Levene, A History of Argentina, trans. William Spence Robertson (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1937), pp. 484-487; Luis V. Sommi, "La estructura económico-social de la argentina en 1890," Revista de Historia, 1 (1957), 19; James R. Scobie, Argentina: A City and a Nation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 5, 82, 115; Rafael J. Urruela, Argentine Journey (New Orleans: Inter-American News Association, 1948), p. 41.

[2]Rubens Iscaro, Origen y desarrollo del movimiento sindical argentino (Buenos Aires: Editorial Anteo, 1958), p. 90; Robert Conde Cortes and Ezequiel Gallo, "El crecimiento económico de la argentina," Anuario del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas Universidad Nacional del Litoral, VI (1962-63), pp. 300-301; Adolfo Dorfman, História de la industria argentina (Buenos Aires: Escuela de estudios argentinos, 1942), p. 93; Levene, op. cit., pp. 466, 479, 518; Albert Martínez and Maurice Lewandowski, The Argentine in the Twentieth Century (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1915), pp. 92, 212; Alfredo Palacios, La legislacion del trabajo en la argentina (Buenos Aires: Imprenta de la Universidad, 1926), pp. 132, 167-168.

[3]Ernesto Tornquist and Company, The Economic Development of the Argentine Republic in the Last Fifty Years (Buenos Aires: 1919), pp. xvii, 22-23; Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 102; Levene, op. cit., pp. 480-489; Sebastian Marotta, El movimiento sindical argentino: su génesis y desarrollo (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Lacio, 1960, I), pp. 31-32; Martínez, op. cit., pp. 114, 120; Scobie, op. cit., pp. 5, 132; Sommi, op. cit., p. 90.

[4]Cortes, op. cit., p. 320; Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 63; Iscaro, op. cit., p. 34; Martinez, op. cit., pp. 235-236, 250.

[5]Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, pp. 63-65; Dorfman, Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la argentina (Rosario: Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 1941), pp. 9-10; Iscaro, op. cit., p. 37; Sommi, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

[6]Cortes, op. cit., pp. 320-321; Dorfman, Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la argentina, pp. 9-12; Iscaro, op. cit., pp. 36, 41; Sommi, op. cit., pp. 22, 31.

[7]Dorfman, Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la argentina, p. 12; Cortes, op. cit., p. 31.

[8]Dorfman, Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la argentina, p. 13; Cortes, op. cit., p. 324.

[9]Dorfman, Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la argentina, p. 13; Ernesto Tornquist and Company, op. cit., p. 30; Iscaro, op. cit., p. 39; Scobie, op. cit., pp. 178-179.

[10]Alberto Belloni, Del anarquismo al peronismo: historia del movimiento obrero argentino (Buenos Aires: A. Pena Gillo, 1960), p. 13; Jacinto Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino (Buenos Aires: Editorial La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 26-27; Marotta, op. cit., I, pp. 17-23.

[11]Oddone, op. cit., p. 39; Marotta, op. cit., I, pp. 35-40.

[12]Louis Cerrutti Costa, El sindicalism, las masas y el poder; historia del movimiento obrero argentino (Buenos Aires: Trafac, 1957), p. 47; Iscaro, op. cit., p. 47; Marotta, op. cit., I, pp. 51-53, 72-73; Oddone, op. cit., pp. 28-30.

[13]Belloni, op. cit., p. 13; Cerrutti Costa, op. cit., p. 47; Oddone, op. cit., pp. 28-31; Marotta, op. cit., I, pp. 43-46, 56, 63-65.

[14]Belloni, op. cit., pp. 13-14; Dardo Cúneo, "Las dos corrientes del movimiento abrero el 90," Revista de Historia, I (1957), p. 62; Iscaro, op. cit., pp. 50-52; Marotta, op. cit., I, pp. 26-27, 77-83; Oddone, op. cit., pp. 40-42, 50-54; Palacios, op. cit., p. 9.

[15]Belloni, op. cit., pp. 14-15; Cerrutti Costa, op. cit., p. 48; Marotta, op. cit., pp. 85-86; Oddone, op. cit., p. 58; Luis Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista (Buenos Aires: Ediciones La Vanguardia, 1956), p. 20.

[16]Cerrutti Costa, op. cit., p. 47; Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 145; Ferns, op. cit., pp. 435-437; Iscaro, op. cit., p. 43; Palacios, op. cit., p. 9; Scobie, op. cit., pp. 200; Sommi, op. cit., pp. 33-35.

[17]Belloni, op. cit., p. 13; Cerrutti Costa, op. cit., p. 47; Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 191; Ferns, op. cit., pp. 445-447.

[18]Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 191; Ferns, op. cit., pp. 482-483; Sommi, op. cit., p. 35.

[19]Belloni, op. cit., p. 13; Dorfman, Historia de la industria argentina, p. 149; Ferns, op. cit., pp. 445-447; Marotta, op. cit., I, p. 86; Palacios, op. cit., p. 9.

[20]Juan B. Justo, La relizición del socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 399-401. (Hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas VI); Alejandro Castiñeiras, "Impresiones y recuerdos," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 467-469; Emilio J. Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestión nacional," Todo es Historia, LXII (June 1972), 15; Americo Ghioldi, "La formación de Justo," Anuario Socialista (1938), 47; Angel M. Giménez, "El sembrados," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 455-456; José Guevara, "Algunos aspectos de la vida y obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 513-517; Luis Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1956), pp. 33-34; Luis Pan, Justo y Marx: El socialismo en la argentina (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Monserrat, 1964), pp. 87-90, 119-123. Professor Robert Alexander told the author that Juan B. Justo was a cousin of President Augustín P. Justo (1932-1938).

[21]Ghioldi, op. cit., p. 48; Avelino Gutiérrez, "Justo, Maestro Integral: En la Ciencia Médica y en la Acción Social," Anuario Socialista (1938), 64-65; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 34-36.

[22]Ghioldi, op. cit., p. 48; Guevara, op. cit., pp. 513-517; Gutiérrez, op. cit., pp. 65-75ñ Luis Pan, Visión socialista de medio siglio argentino: La obra parlamentaria del partido socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 67-70; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 88-92; Nicolás Repetto, "Recuerdos de juventud," Acción Socialista (15 Feb. 1928), 450-451; Juan Antonio Solari, "La labor periodistica de Justo," Acción Socialista (15 Feb. 1o28), 499-505.

[23]Enrique Dickmann, "El pensamiento vivo de Juan B. Justo," Anuario Socialista (1948), 1-6; John J. Johnson, Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 98; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 20, 37-40; Pan, Juan B. Justo y Marx, p. 84; José Rodríguez Tarditi, "Juan B. Justo," Semblanza de tres líderes (Buenos Aires: Bases editorial, 1960), pp. 49-50; Repetto, "Recuerdos de juventud," 450-451; Nicolás Repetto, Hombres y problemas argentinas (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1945), pp. 51-54; Antonio Sobral, Hipólito Yrigoyen: Pueblo y Gobierno (Buenos Aires: Editorial Royal, 1956), I, 91-92. Three future leaders were involved in the Revolution of 1890. They were Juan B. Justo, Hipólito Yrigoyen, and Lisandro de la Torre, founder of the Partido Demócrata Progresista.

[24]Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 317-318; Juan B. Justo, Socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1920), pp. 32, 105-108; La Prensa, 17 Nov. 1963.

[25]Juan B. Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 318-319; José P. Barreiro, Socialismo teórico y socialismo práctico (Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1966), pp. 166-167; Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestión racional," p. 17, La Vanguardia, 23 June 1965, p. 8; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 40-42; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 29-30; Johnson, op. cit., p. 96. At this point Argentina's claim to

cultural superiority in Latin America could not be challenged. Professor Johnson did not include Justo on the list of the generation of the 1890s.

[26]Enrique Dickmann, Democracia y socialismo (Buenos Aires: Serafin Ponzinibbio y Cía., 1917), pp. 141-142; Jacinto Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), I, 196-198; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 21-22. At this time a large number of workers went to Brazil which was experiencing a period of extraordinary prosperity.

[27]Enrique Dickmann, "Justo y Marx," Pensamiento y acción (Buenos Aires: Sociedad Amigos del Libro Rioplatense, 1937), pp. 9-11; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 15, 23; Pan, Justo y Marx, p. 26.

[28]Juan B. Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 272-273.

[29]Juan B. Justo, Socialismo, p. 103; Mario Bravo, "Organización, programa y desarrolla del partido socialista en la argentina," Revista Argentina de Ciencias Políticas, X (1915), 138-140. This work contains a listing of socialist newspapers published between 1890 and 1914; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, 215-220; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 24-26; Solari, "La labor periodistica de Justo," pp. 499-505; La Vanguardia, 7 April 1894, p. 1.

[30]Barreiro, op. cit., p. 170; Enrique Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 61, 83; Guevara, op. cit., p. 515; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 30-31; La Vanguardia, 7 April 1894, p. 1; Comision de Prensa del Partido Socialista, La Vanguardia (Buenos Aires: 1948), p. 27. From 1894 to 1905, La Vanguardia appeared on Saturdays. The editors were designated by the Executive Committee.

[31]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, 225-243.

[32]La Vanguardia, 1 May 1894, p. 1.

[33]Barreio, op. cit., pp. 164-165; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 43-45; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 19-22, 27-28, 94-96; Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la politica: De Roca a Yrigoyen (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1956), pp. 20-21; Juan Antonio Solari, Pablo Iglesias (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1951), pp. 115-129; Pablo Iglesias was in jail when Justo visited Spain. However, he sent a letter to Justo dated September 14, 1896. In this letter Iglesias pointed out the positive accomplishments of the Congress of London. Thereafter the two men wrote to each other regularly. Unfortunately, these letters have been destroyed or lost. Nevertheless, it was clear that the men enjoyed a warm and cordial relationship. When La Revista Socialista de Madrid advertised El Método científico it said that Justo's name was the best guarantee of the quality of the work. Justo also corresponded with Juan José Morato, Antonio García Quejido, and Mariano García Cortes. There was not any other correspondence available between Justo and Spanish socialists than those indicated in Solari's work.

[34]Dickmann, Democracia y socialismo, p. 114; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, 198-201; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 4-26.

[35]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 101-105; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, pp. 245-260; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 33-45.

[36]Juan B. Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 29-31; Barreiro, op. cit., pp. 167-170; Dickmann, "El pensamiento vivo de Juan B. Justo, p. 3; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 101; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 27-30; Pan, Justo y Marx, pp. 16, 70; Dardo Cúneo, Juan B. Justo y la declaración de principos del partidos socialistas (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 5-6.

[37]Juan B. Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 26-27.

[38]Cúneo, Juan B. Justo y la declaración de principos del partido socialista, pp. 6-31; Dickmann, "El pensamiento vivo de Juan B. Justo," pp. 2-3; Guevara, op. cit., p. 513; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, pp. 195-214, 261-277. Oddone's work contains a listing of the groups that attended this assembly plus the Declaration of Principles, Statutes and Minimum Program; Alfredo Palacios, Estadistas y poetas (Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1952), p. 36; Pan, Juan B. Justo y la fundación del partido socialista, pp. 48-56; Partido Socialista, Juan B. Justo (Buenos Aires: 1950), p. 6. Juso constantly urged that women be granted equal political, social, and economic rights.

[39]Juan B. Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 126-128.

I.--THE FORMATIVE YEARS OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY 1896 TO 1912

In the years immediately following the Constituent Congress, socialist centers were organized in the capital, in various interior provinces, principally those of the Litoral. This was an extremely difficult task, especially in the interior where socialists engaged in cruel battles with the traditional political forces. Organizers were persecuted, thrown out of work, and boycotted if they were artisans or small businessmen. The Socialist Party used the tactics of the Salvation Army. Socialists preached in the streets and plazas of the cities. They attracted small crowds and were subjected to verbal and physical attacks. They were tenacious. In 1896 there were ten socialist centers in the capital and nine in the interior. By 1903 there were a total of thirty-six centers in Argentina; fifteen were in the capital and twenty-one in the interior. However, the number of socialist voters hardly increased. The socialists claimed that this was due to the state of political corruption in the country. Whereas the socialists got 135 votes on March 8, 1896, they got only 165 votes by 1902.[1]

Shortly after the creation of the Socialist Party, the Unión Industrial Argentina was founded in November 1896. It was composed of the most powerful industrialists, who were mostly foreigners. The Unión Industrial Argentina blamed foreign agitators for the disruptions of business. It asked the President to expel from Argentina those who disturbed the social order.[2]

The Socialist Party participated in the national elections of April 10, 1898. The party slate did not include Justo. He did not run in the election because he objected to Article 36 of the Statutes which required candidates to sign blank resignations and submit them to the Executive Committee. To Justo this was an unnecessary and humiliating clause. He reasoned that the only guarantee of the loyalty of the deputies was the good sense of the electors. The 21-point program of the party demanded an eight-hour workday, equal pay for equal work, separation of church and state, universal suffrage, secret ballot, the abolition of the death penalty, and citizenship for those who lived in Argentina for one year.[3]

The election of April 1898 was scandalous. It was marked by a great deal of fraud. La Prensa, La Nación, and El Diario recorded the corrupt state of Argentine politics. Drunks voted in all parishes of the Federal Capital. One person voted 108 times. The socialist got 105 votes. On Sunday, April 17, the Socialist Party organized its first protest meeting against electoral fraud. Such protest meetings continued until 1912 when Justo was elected as a National Deputy.

Justo addressed the crowd that assembled at the Plaza San Martin. He lashed out against those responsible for the dishonest farce. Although the Socialist Party was not the first party to protest against electoral corruption it was, Justo told the crowd, the first to educate people to participate in free and honest elections. According to Justo, people vote for the purpose of passing beneficial laws. He emphasized that the people needed sound currency, higher salaries, better working conditions, shorter hours, and the abolition of indirect taxes among others. Forcefully he declared that free and honest suffrage was needed.

The socialist demanded the secret ballot, permanent registration, minority representation, and universal suffrage. It was the obligation of the socialist, Justo yelled to the crowd, to show the working class how to use their votes and thus deprive the política criolla from living off the misery of the masses.[4]

However, if this were the situation in the City of Buenos Aires, the most civilized center of the country, where 50 percent of the party's 1,500 members lived, it was much worse in the interior where a barbaric and ignorant caudillismo controlled the elections. The socialists of the Province of Buenos Aires were the first to face the traditional factions in the election of March 23, 1900. The Comité Socialista de La Plata ran Justo for the provincial senate. Justo did not get one vote even though some socialists did vote. Socialist poll-watchers were not admitted to the elections tables, socialist voters were prohibited from voting, ballot boxes were stuffed. Even in this atmosphere socialism triumphed briefly. On November 23, 1903, the first socialist alderman in Argentina was elected to office in the City of San Nicolás de los Arroyos, Province of Buenos Aires.[5]

During this period Justo, Nicolás Repetto, Celindo Castro, and Julio Arranga founded El Diario del Pueblo. Justo wanted a daily newspaper in order to spread socialist ideas more effectively.[6] In the first issue, published October 1, 1899, the editors proclaimed:

> We will combat the política criolla of the inept and rapacious oligarchy that burdens the country--We will defend the working people of the cities and country--We will be against the advances of the State, against the political parasitism of the provinces that monopolize the great public roads, against the mercenary press--We will support a foreign policy of free and peaceful trade, the democratization of military institutions, the entrance of the foreign population in national politics and the equality of all creeds before the law.[7]

Unfortunately, the paper did not have a large enough circulation to pay for its upkeep. It cost the editors personally 200 pesos daily to keep the press going. Therefore, El Diario del Pueblo stopped publication on November 30, 1899. However, in the two months that it existed it contributed to the socialist cause. It planted, discussed, and analyzed the most important questions of the present and future.

Meanwhile, with the passage of time the Argentine Socialist Party identified more with national problems. Its leaders felt compelled to develop a program that dealt with all the social problems of Argentina. Therefore, the party had to develop an agrarian program. It was the Socialist Party and specifically Justo who made the first study of Argentine agrarian problems and stated the needs of the rural worker. The fact that Argentine socialism was not a simple transplant of European socialism was illustrated by the fact that in order to develop an agrarian program Justo went to Junín to live and observed the agrarian situation first-hand in 1899. Therefore, his agrarian program was typically Argentine.

Justo lived in Junín for approximately four years. He selected Junín because he thought it the best area to study the problem and develop a powerful socialist movement. These were eventful, productive years for him. He studied the rural problems. He had direct contact with workers, tenants, and landowners. Justo studied the contracts between tenants and owners in which the owner received the lion's share of the wealth produced. He observed the terrible living and working conditions of the rural working class. The wealth of knowledge gained was shared with the party and illustrated throughout the years in lectures, publications, and

parliamentary debates. Justo's agrarian program was adopted at the Party Congress at La Plata, July 7, 1901.[3]

In a little over three years Justo accomplished monumental works in Junín. Justo was one of the founders of the Centro Socialista de Junín (Buenos Aires), on August 26, 1900. The program of the Centro Socialista de Junín demanded the abolition of municipal and provincial taxes on cereals, direct progressive taxes on land, compensation to tenants who improve the land, suppression of provincial patents on threshers used by farmers, and hygienic working conditions. This program, which noted all the legislation necessary to improve the living conditions of the form workers and to encourage production, was incorporated into the Socialist Party.

At the same time that the Centro Socialista was founded, the first Socialist Library in the interior was established in Junín thanks to the effort, in part, of Justo who was a member of the organizing commission. The library, which was annexed to the Centro Socialista, grew through the years aided and encouraged by Justo. Whereas the library had 150 books and 7 members in 1900, it had 3,220 books and 10,000 pesos of invested capital by 1928. From 1909 it was located in the first Casa del Pueblo constructed in South America.

Justo was one of the founders of the Cosmopólita de Trabajadores, a mutual aid society, on June 29, 1901. By 1928 it had 2,300 members and spent more than 40,000 pesos on social services for its members. He was instrumental in the creation of the Co-operativa Obrera de Consumos, February 15, 1902. Justo was the first director of this Co-operative. Shares cost ten pesos paid in monthly sums of 2.50 pesos. Items were sold for cash at a price of 10 percent above cost. The Co-operative was

opened evenings and Sundays 8:30 - 11:30 P.M. Furthermore, Justo encouraged the active Trade Union movement in Junín by his counsel, actions, and writings.

When in Junín, Justo was very practical. The programs did not mention the social revolution nor the socialization of the means of production. Justo was simply implementing those reforms that were advantageous for the working people and that were compatible with the situation of the community. The action of Justo had been an experiment in "integral socialism"--a socialism he wished free from dogmas which suffocated the spirit.[9]

The mutual respect between Justo and the people of Junín continued through the years. When they wrote to Justo, in 1905, while he was professor of surgery in the Hospital San Roque, on legal matters, Justo requested that Enrique del Valle Iberlucea[10] deal with them because of his recognized legal ability. In 1913 when Justo returned to Junín as a National Deputy he was given a warm reception by the workers. He was greeted with a band. Manuel Palacin, present at that time, related that when Justo addressed the crowd it was as if it were a room full of friends.[11]

His stay in Junín was of great personal and intellectual importance. His first wife, Mariana Chertkoff, gave birth there to his first two sons, Andrés and Daniel.[12] There he wrote some of his most important theoretical studies. El Socialismo and El Impuesto sobre el privilegio were written in 1902. Estudios sobre la moneda was given as a lecture in Buenos Aires. "Lo técnico-económico es sintetico" and "Lo técnico-económico fundamento de la historia," published in Nueva Era de Madrid,

in 1901, are the essence of some chapters of his Teoría y Práctica de la Historia.[13]

Justo applied the methods of the biological sciences to the study of social phenomena. Man as an animal had to see in biology the base of his history and, therefore, the history of humanity was a branch of biology. Moved by basic necessity man intentionally reacted to his physical-biological atmosphere and superimposed upon it the technological-economic world with which history properly begins. Without an awakened intelligence there was not any possible development of technology which was the synthesis of man in nature, the joining of the material and the spiritual. Justo affirmed that technology was the proper base of history and repudiated the designation of "materialists" as a complete theoretical concept. History was a universal and continuous process whose theory was the general theory of human activities.

In Del Método Científico Justo credited the Greeks with the development of the scientific method for the systematic study of natural phenomena. Justo stressed that scientific hypotheses were only useful when their truths were doubted and we plunged ourselves into verifying them. This was especially true for sociologists since Justo maintained that the world was their laboratory to verify their hypotheses. In this discipline more than any other science, the doctrines and methods were interwoven as illustrated by Karl Marx, author of Capital and founder of the International Association of Workers. However, "scientific law" was modified continuously as new "mysteries" were revealed and the sage por excelencia was he who stated new problems. The "scientific theory of history" saw in the manner of production, the base of social organization and modifications, the point of departure of all new phases of the

social evolution. Such economic transformations of society created the groupings of individuals in new social classes, from whose antagonisms resulted political progress. Conceiving the historical theory to be spontaneous surging of facts put in logical order, Justo emphasized that the class struggle was the dynamic of history.[14]

Within this context, Justo was the first person to examine Argentine history in economic terms. He applied the scientific method to Argentine history and stressed the economic base of the revolutionary movement of 1810. He cited comments by Hipólito Vieytes in 1802 in Semanario de Agricultura, Industria y Commercio to illustrate that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the bourgeois owners of the soil recognized the productive capacity of the country. They spoke about the inexhaustible treasures that the land could produce. The native proprietary class became aware of their economic interests which were also the interests of the country in general. Economic progress, understood, gave place to the fight for independence, which eventually led to a new progress.

Justo charged that the best men of the period, armed with exact and clear ideas of the situation, wanted to exploit and develop this wealth. They wanted to withdraw it from the Spanish monopoly and manage it for themselves. Although groups favored giving free land to those who wished to work and populate the land, condemned excess money as unproductive wealth, denounced slavery as the cause of economic backwardness, and honored manual occupations, nevertheless, according to Justo, the bourgeois character was revealed by the continuous criticism of rising salaries. The limitation to Argentine commerce became more evident as a result of the English invasion in 1806 when they temporarily saw the benefits of free trade. When the opportunity was presented the

burguesia decente led a revolution for their genuine aims. They were not concerned with dreams of liberty nor democracy. They desired the economic autonomy of their country. Practical and realistic, the revolutionaries of 1810 were not occupied with destroying dynasties nor proclaiming constitutions. They established the commercial independence of the country. Upon increasing the monetary sources for the estancieros and merchants, the authors of the revolution of 1810 provided the proper political atmosphere for the technological-economic development of the country.[15]

Notwithstanding its bourgeois character, the May Revolution had important consequences for the masses. Unconscious of all historic necessity and lacking political aspirations, the masses served simply the ends of the aristocratic bourgeoisie whose enrichment had been hindered by Spanish obstacles to foreign trade. The masses were needed to fight for the revolution. It was necessary to make them enthusiastic supporters of the Revolution. To Justo this explains the fact that in 1816 two-thirds of the slaves of Cuyo were manumitted and incorporated into the armies of the Andes; many died in Chacabuco. Desirous of industrial progress and inspired in new historic notions, the new regime abolished slavery completely on January 31, 1816, as the Revolution took a more decisive step in the formation of the modern working class.

The Revolution had an immediate and traumatic effect on the campesinos. With the increased value of the produce of the country the lords of the city dedicated greater attention to exploitation of the soil and the cattle bred on it. The bourgeoisie were alarmed by the rural population who roamed the land freely. The bourgeoisie wanted to monopolize and exploit the land according to new rules. The gauchos were

incapable of adjusting to the new conditions of capitalistic production. They saw their existence menaced. They rebelled against the bourgeoisie in order to defend the soil on which they lived from the plunder and absolute domination of the señores.

To Justo, this explained the civil wars that laid waste to the country beginning in 1815. Justo viewed these as truly class struggles. The mounted revolutionaries fought against the señores of the city and the hated bourgeois government of Buenos Aires. Although numerous and strong, the gauchos lacked any economic and political power, according to Justo. Therefore, their triumph was ephemeral. Their insurrection was purely instinctive. They favored an impossible status quo that signified the economic stagnation of the country and its isolation from the rest of the world. They lacked all political aptitudes, as ideas of liberty were euphemisms for the absolute rule of each caudillo in the zone that recognized him as chief. The perversion was complete as the caudillos became proprietors and the federation, the League of Caudillos, became a leage of bourgeois governments similar to that of Buenos Aires.

Justo rejected them as the precursor of the Socialist Party. Nothing remained of this movement, not even glory. The wars and the resulting despotism stagnated the development of the country without benefiting the masses in any appreciable way. Rivadavia's reforms were not continued. Incapable of establishing small farms, gauchos iadvertently created the despotism which strengthened the rule of the landowners.[16]

Thereafter, following the ouster of Rosas, the tempo of economic developments increased. In the first editorial of La Vanguardia Justo noted the changes in the economic and social reality of Argentina within the past fifty years.

> This country is becoming transformed. The open and undivided plains . . . which were common property, have been succeeded by enclosed fields, soon to cover the entire surface of arable land. Large-scale agriculture developed where twenty years ago farmers had cultivated a few small holdings. The railway has killed off the carts. The large ports have to a great extent made the tramp steamers obsolete. The Central Fruit Market has taken the place of the old stalls. And industry, though in its rudimentary state, has undergone the same modifications. In Buenos Aires the shoe and hat factories, the large metal works and furniture factories, have largely done away with the small workshops; in Tucumán the old presses are replaced by vast sugar-mills, while in Santa Fé the flour mills proliferate where before there had not been even any ovens.[17]

Justo noted that Argentina now had exploited wage-earners. He maintained that their wages were geared to mere subsistence levels that enabled them to continue as beasts of burden. Their wages were lowered continuously as a result of capitalistic manipulations. Justo noted that the laws in the post-Celman period, the epoch of the millionaire candidate, had a marked class character. He declared that from the antagonism between the capitalists and working class, social progress would result. In other words, Justo showed that in less than one hundred years Argentina experienced conditions which developed over centuries in Europe.[18]

Within this context Justo presented his rationale for socialism. It was the expression of an irresistible social force. More than a historical theory, economic hypothesis or political doctrine, Justo thought that socialism was a continuous fight in order to defend and improve man's life, morally and materialistically. It was a method capable of adjusting to any situation. The working people guided by technology desired a free and intelligent human society based upon the collective ownership of the means of production.

However, in his scalding response to Max Nordau, a critic of socialism, Justo wrote that socialism was continually developing, it was

a process without an end. Nevertheless, it was coherent and free from contradictions. It did not impose dogma but divulged theories and ideas. Rejecting the concept of historical fatalism, Justo noted that with the beginning of the Socialist Party the practice of popular discussions and free inquiries by the people were initiated. He emphasized his concern for concrete problems instead of abstract ideas. He saw the value of the doctrine in its application, not in its abstraction. The idea of the collective ownership of the means of production and exchange was presented by Justo as a hypothesis, never as dogma.

Justo emphasized the national ties of socialism. He recalled that the problems which immediately occupied the socialists were problems of a national order. To illustrate this he cited Lallement's article in the first issue of La Vanguardia on the depreciation of the Argentine peso. Socialism worked for the naturalization of immigrants and elimination of prejudice so that immigrants and natives were able to work collectively to build a stronger nation. To the working people, the state did not appear merely a simple agent of oppression at the service of the privileged class. It was a powerful agent to be influenced by the vote in the regulation of man's economic relations. Therefore, socialism educated the working people to gain political power as an essential condition for their economic emancipation. It was necessary for them to control the state in order to moderate and eventually abolish capitalistic exploitation. Socialism, as a movement of resistance to capitalistic exploitation, social education, and to increase the political and economic capacity of the workers, was before all a national movement.

Justo negated the effect of a revolution that expropriated the means of production and exchange from the capitalists. It was not difficult to abolish the legal right of ownership. However, it was difficult to firmly establish a social ownership which was based on the capacity for the free and conscious cooperation. Justo reasoned that the problem was to pass into the hands of the entire nation this directive function that was monopolized by the capitalists. Maintaining that the necessity for technological progress and the aspirations of the workers for economic independence led to socialism, Justo reasoned that the free Co-operative movement and political action prepared the working people for the directive function.

Justo argued that the results of socialist action were measured not by the numbers of socialists, but by the material, intellectual, and moral betterment of the people determined by this action and registered by statistics. The statistics Justo had in mind included the increased consumption by the working class, rise of real wages, increased percentage of children in school and the decrease of mortality and criminality.

Justo noted the changed situation of the working class since Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. He spoke about the class struggle in revisionist terms as he modified the theory and practical aspects of Marx and Engels. The explanation for the class fight was sought by Justo in biological and not metaphysical terms. Motivated by hunger, the initial blind and destructive actions of the working class were replaced as the proletariat became more knowledgeable and viewed the individual ownership of the means of production as the cause of their slavery. The socialization of the means of production and exchange was

the only way that the workers could return to be the owners of the elements of work and insure equality and justice in the social economy.[19]

However, Justo did not believe that the modern class fight had to be violent. The capitalist class, alerted by the proletarian movement, satisfied demands of the workers. The incorporation of some sons of the ruling classes in labor ranks freed the proletariat from class prejudices. He cited the industrial legislation, legal institutions, mixed tribunals, and arbitration in New Zealand and Australia in order to emphasize that these measures normalized social progress and made this progress possible without destructive clashes between the classes. His views on this point were expressed clearly much later in June 1926 while he toured northern Argentina. When Justo addressed the sugar workers in Tucumán, he described the class fight as a daily methodical action. It improved the material conditions in the life of the working class and enabled the working class to develop its culture, intelligence, and habits of association that would make it capable for a social order free from all exploitation.[20]

Therefore, Justo favored the participation of the working class in the political fight. It magnified the strength of the working class. The political struggle required a higher aptitude than union activity. It withdrew the worker from the area of direct violence. Justo reasoned that if history were susceptible to a scientific interpretation, politics ought to be applicable to the knowledge so acquired. Justo reasoned that the Socialist Party was the most advanced party. It did the most to elevate the working people. Only collectively could workers be owners of the modern means of production. It was inconceivable that workers could defend themselves against capital without an international organization.

Principally, labor Socialist Parties were to safeguard and expand basic civil liberties which were necessary for all collective movements. The political action of the proletariat was strengthened when a Socialist Party supported the modern class fight in the legal field. Justo characterized a socialist party as a party of class but not opposition. He reasoned that the Socialist Party was the best agent to achieve a policy of order and progress. Consequently, he urged all social groups to become knowledgeable about their political interests in order to improve Argentinean politics. He wanted the Argentine bourgeoisie to be an intelligent bourgeoisie in order that it become the conscious leader of the capitalistic evolution of the country.[21]

Because of the sectarianism that poisoned the labor movement during his life, Justo urged continually that the Socialist Party not intervene in the operations of Trade Unions. The initial, instinctive, and fundamental form of the modern class struggle, the autonomous action of Trade Unions was not to be suffocated by the Socialist Party. However, the relationships between the Trade Unions and the Socialist Party ought to be very close.

From the first days of the Socialist Party, the party worked for a strong and intelligent Trade Union movement. The party's press, meeting halls, and speakers were at the service of the Trade Unions. The initial issue of La Vanguardia stated that the columns of the paper were at the disposition of the unions which wished to send information to the paper. The paper would publish notices of management abuse in order to insure that the workers were aware of the cruel exploiters. Socialists were urged to join unions. They were to form unions when workers were not organized.[22]

Justo held that those workers who demonstrated in May 1, 1890, gave birth to the labor and socialist movements in Argentina. The Socialist Party was born from the body of the labor movement. Therefore it was bound to the labor movement. Immediately, the founders of the Labor and Social Movements understood that for the most efficient development of both of these movements, the unions and party should parallel each other without intervening in each other's respective organization. Justo argued that a union, managed by a political party, deviated from its specific functions. The socialists, according to Justo, aided union activities and defended the basic civil liberties necessary for the development of unions. However, socialists were not to intervene in the internal matters of each union. Justo's attitude was reflected in the resolutions of the Socialist Congress of Avellaneda of 1918. Collectively, the Socialist Party served the Trade Unions by influencing governmental activities that affected Trade Unions. To Justo, the coefficient of historical progress was the measurable improvement of the situation of the working class. Forces that tended to increase the productivity of labor contributed to such improvements. When the state provided equitable working conditions for governmental employees and respected the rights of labor in dispute with management, it improved the lot of the working class. So did workers who acquired habits of association and who fought for needed reforms.[23]

According to Justo, the function of the modern Trade Union was to regulate working conditions and salaries; it stimulated the development of social legislation; and it controlled employer-employee relations, an indispensable complement of labor legislation. With the incorporation of superior technological and administrative personnel in unions, the

labor movement acquired greater power. To Justo, unions were the most fundamental way of classifying people in a socialist republic. He reasoned that the union was an exclusively proletarian movement, simple in both its objectives and means of action. It was indispensable for the immediate questions which law could not regulate.

The legal action that socialists wished to exercise over management was prepared by the direct coercion of the proletarian Trade Unions. Trade Unions made workers fit for political action by improving their standard of living and preparing them mentally in this area. It helped the immigrant assimilate, as it fulfilled an important nationalistic role. Justo verified this by noting the virtual disappearance, by 1910, of foreign language, revolutionary periodicals, and of the segregation of political groups by nationality.

As the highest expression of historical consciousness, the Socialist Party sought to incorporate the Trade Union movement even though the Trade Union movement did not incorporate the Socialist Party. According to Justo, the party was more complex than the Trade Union movement. He thought that the party's moral was more liberal than the proletarian moral. It was not feasible that the Socialist Party would degenerate into a common political coterie as long as an active Trade Union movement existed. Therefore, Justo urged the party to support and encourage the Trade Union organization.

The Socialist Party welcomed all who shared its legislative and governmental aims. Justo proposed that Trade Union groups be admitted to the party since this was the case in England, Norway, Hungary, Denmark, Belgium, and the Australian states. However, Justo did not want the adhesion in mass of the Trade Union workers. He thought that this would

be a constant source of difficulty for both union and party. It would hurt the union much more than it could benefit the party. Instead, Justo proposed the admission of groups formed by persons of the same occupation who individually adhered to the aims and principles of the party. He did not want the adhesion of the printing Trade Union but the establishment of socialist centers of printers. They would favor political-electoral action and would counterbalance the anti-electoral attitudes of unions and defend the party from the "sects" that meddle in the labor movement.[24]

From the time the Federación Obrera de la República Argentina (FORA) was established sectarian preoccupations weakened the Argentine Trade Union movement. Initially Socialists and Anarchists struggled for control of FORA. By 1902 anarcho-syndicalist delegates seized control of the organization. The name of the organization was changed to the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina (FORA). By 1905 FORA was committed to the philosophy of anarchist communism.

When the anarcho-syndicalists took control of FORA the socialist Trade Unionists withdrew from FORA and formed the Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT). However, the UGT came under the control of syndicalists. In 1909 the Confederación Obrera Regional Argentine (CORA) was formed in an attempt to unify FORA and UGT. UGT merged with the syndicalists of CORA. As a result of this merger the Socialists were without any control over the Trade Unions for nearly two decades.[25]

Justo denounced sectarianism in the labor movement. This "lacerated" the trade union movement. It was, he believed, exploited by the most reactionary bourgeoisie. He especially denounced the sterile actions of Trade Unions that opposed political action and cited the

weakened position of the French and Spanish labor movement to illustrate this point. On Labor Day 1922, Justo announced his regret that labor was divided into socialist, communist, and anarchist organizations which lacked reciprocal tolerance. He deplored the sectarian fanaticism that plagued the labor movement. It offered a vast field for spies and provocators. Justo predicted that this condition would disappear when the proletariat became more knowledgeable.[26]

He denounced the brutal treatment of unions in Latin America by the governments. To Justo, these governments were protectors and allies of the capitalists. They violently suffocated labor groups. Argentina, itself, was a perfect example of the collusion between the government and capitalists. Labor organizers were expelled from the country. Meeting halls were closed arbitrarily. Spies infiltrated the movement and provoked strikes whose purpose was to discredit Trade Union action. In a speech to socialist delegates, December 7, 1910, Justo emphasized that partly because of the cruelty and corruption of the oligarchy, the electoral fight faced obstacles so unusual that only the most intelligent and tenacious Trade Union workers could be seriously occupied in politics.[27]

Throughout, Justo served the working class. He contributed notably to the moral and political elevation of the working class through his parliamentary actions. According to Justo, in labor relations, laws had a greater and more uniform result than collective bargaining. Benefits reached workers, especially ignorant immigrants, unable to do anything in their own defense. Justo reasoned that legal coercion was the most efficient and secure method for the general regulation of industry. It also was the least costly for the proletariat. Therefore, socialist

legislators, influenced by Justo, struggled for the passage of laws that covered the entire gamut of labor legislation. Whichever labor laws were passed was due to the work of the Socialist Party.[28]

Although he emphasized the importance of labor legislation, Justo did not deny the positive features of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining enabled workers to develop their economic capabilities. It enabled them to address problems with more efficacy. When all unionized workers learned to recognize the importance of the technical-economic functions of management, collective bargaining systematized the modern class struggle and made it more intelligent. By virtue of the fact that collective bargaining improved the situation of the workers and reduced the privileges of capital, it transformed the conditions of the class fight.[29]

However, Justo recognized that the primordial manifestation of proletarian solidarity was the strike. It was the first collective form of the modern class fight. The strike indicated that men understood their situation as an exploited class but were incapable of abolishing the exploitation. Justo observed that generally strikes preceded the formation of Trade Unions. Nonetheless, Justo emphasized the negative results of strikes. They were destructive conflicts which paralyzed labor. Workers were hurled into acute misery. Profits were removed and consequently strikes led to a retarding of the accumulation of capital.[30]

Therefore, it was with mixed emotion that Justo viewed the strikes in Argentina. He reported that they had become more frequent since 1894. Hitherto all strikes, with the exception of that of 1878, were to obtain higher salaries or to avoid salary reductions. However, a strike for shorter hours by the masons in 1894 triggered other strikes by cabinet

makers, tanners, glass blowers, tin workers, plasterers, tram workers, painters, and dock workers for either higher wages or shorter hours. In 1895, the year in which plasterers won an eight-hour day as a result of a strike, there were nineteen strikes which involved 23,978 workers. Seven of these strikes had been for a shorter workday. By 1896 the Federal Capital had forty-seven Trade Unions. That year there were twenty-six strikes in which 24,000 workers participated.

The most important strike of this period was that of the railroad workers. The workers of Tolsa had demanded an eight-hour day without a reduction in pay. When management paid no heed to these demands the workers left their jobs. This strike spread throughout the Republic and involved thousands of workers. These strikers were abused by both business and the government. The strike lasted for a few days in the interior while in the Capital, Tolsa, Campana and Junín, it lasted for up to 120 days. However, the unions were not coordinated. Management contracted European laborers as strike-breakers. Section after section of strikers fell. Thereafter workers suffered reprisals.

Following the outcome of this heroic but futile action, there were sporadic strikes. Nevertheless, the situation of the worker remained deplorable. He still labored ten to sixteen hours daily for at most three pesos a day. He worked between eighteen and twenty-five days a month and earned a salary of between $45 and $80 monthly. However, it was estimated that a family of five needed a minimum income of $88.40 a month to meet their basic needs by the late 1890s. In spite of the misery and repressive measures, many unions were organized during the period 1892 to 1900.[31]

Justo reasoned that the general strike, the strongest manifestation of the proletarian will when unable to express its energy in a more efficient form, was the modern equivalent of the ancient insurrection. From its beginnings in England in 1842 the general strike had political ends. Justo judged that the general strike did not need preparation as much as it did atmosphere. However, Justo observed that the general strike was hardly seen in democratic countries where strong Trade Union and Co-operative organizations existed. Contrarily, the general strike had spread rapidly in Italy with its mass of illiterates, in South America with its oligarchical government and Russia where it had the sympathy of every social class.

Nevertheless, Justo warned that the general strike was in all cases an extreme procedure. It was accompanied by grave inconveniences for the people. The general strike hurt the working class more than any other group, especially when the work stoppage extended to the food industry and caused an immediate price increase that the working class found difficult to pay. The general strike was always a coercive, destructive action usually accompanied by blood.

Furthermore, Justo argued that in the best instances when a new law or right was obtained by use of the general strike, the form and application of the law were entrusted to the governing classes. Notwithstanding the positive aspect of class sentiment that the general strike taught, there was nothing done in a creative sense for the people. The working class did not, he felt, advance in its technical-economic education. Justo stressed that the view of a sudden social transformation, implicit in a general strike, lost ground in the minds of the working class as they became more intelligently occupied with daily problems.

They discovered that suffrage and protective labor laws were easier to attain and more efficient for their ends than violent coercion.[32]

As a result of this view the socialists were attacked by anarchists. The Spanish and Italian immigrants brought from their respective countries the anarchist doctrine of Bakunin and Malatesta. Some French workers, who professed the anarchist doctrines of Eliseo Reclus and Jean Grave, added to the anarchist propaganda in Argentina. By 1895 Argentine anarchists no longer accepted the idea of individual action that had been favored by Max Stirner.

Owing to the efforts of Enrico Malatesta and Pietro Gori, both of whom temporarily lived in Argentina, Argentine anarchists came to favor collective organization and entered labor unions. L'Avenire, written in Italian, and La Protesta Humana, written in Spanish, favored the need for Trade Union organization. Anarchists established labor federations, celebrated congresses, and gained control by 1901 of the Trade Union movement which they had repudiated earlier. Incorrigible sectarians, they used the Trade Unions as a means to spread their ideological propaganda. They attacked the Socialist Party which favored labor participation in political disputes. Extremely individualistic, hostile to all government, anarchists rejected the technical progress that displaced them and longed for the return to the age of gold. They conceived of unions as societies of resistance and viewed the general strike as the basis of the economic struggle. Thus, anarchists differed with socialists, whose meetings the anarchists attempted to destroy. They attacked speakers such as Justo who supported the Co-operative movement.[33]

Justo explained the reasons for the spread of anarchism in Argentina. He noted that large numbers of immigrants came from Catholic

Spain and Italy where anarchism flourished. These workers lacked a social education. Their mental development was sufficient for them to feel oppressed but it was insufficient to defend them from the dogmas that promised immediate universal emancipation. Furthermore, the literature of the política criolla conditioned workers for the simple, empty phrase. The corruption, violence, hate, and envy embodied in Argentine politics explained the existence of working class preachers of class hatred and violence.

Nevertheless, Justo recognized some positive contributions of the anarchists. He recalled their contribution to the sentiments of collective solidarity through demonstrations and general strikes. Recognizing violence as the logical outgrowth of oppression, Justo did not condemn outright all the destruction wrought by anarchists, especially when this destruction was a genuine manifestation of resistance to political oppression. Therefore, although Justo condemned violence as a waste of energy and at times counterproductive, it was nonetheless better than no reaction. However, Justo concluded that if any anarchists were popular heroes it was not for their work but for their suffering.[34]

From the time of the formation of the Socialist Party Justo became actively involved in Argentine politics. His personality and ideas shaped the party. He played a key role within the party as a member of the Executive Committee or as Director of La Vanguardia once elected to the Cámara de Diputados in 1912, or as a member of the Parliamentary Socialist Group. His disciples, Nicolás Repetto and Enrique Dickmann, served on the Executive Committee. Justo was the guiding force of the Socialist Party. This was illustrated by his role in party congresses,

national elections, strikes, and demonstrations during the formative period of the Socialist Party which ended in 1912.

Justo was a delegate from the Centro Socialista Obrero to the Second Ordinary Congress of the Argentine Socialist Party, which met June 12 to 13, 1898. The party opposed any war with Chile over a boundary dispute. It emphasized that the Argentine working class did not hate the Chilean people. The sensationalist press in Chile that pushed for war was denounced. On the issue of Cuba, the party favored its independence from the tyranny of the Spanish government. Prior to the congress, Justo had published a letter in La Vanguardia from Pablo Iglesias, the founder of the Spanish Socialist Party, in order to support Justo's position on Cuban independence. Given the large number of Spaniards in Argentina, the letter had great significance.[35]

The Third Congress, which met June 28 to 29, 1900, seemed to indicate hopes of better things for the party. First, it was agreed to designate a representative to the International Socialist Congress of Paris. This was the first international congress in which the Argentine Socialist Party was represented by its own delegate, Aquiles Cambier, an old French resident in Argentina who at the time lived in Paris. This marked the first adventure of international relations of the Argentine Socialist Party.[36] However, the issue that dominated this congress and played an important role in the Fourth and Fifth Congresses centered on the role the Executive Committee was to play in the party. This issue was tied in with the solution of differences that occurred in the party in 1899 over the role of aliens in the selection of party candidates. The difficulties between the schismatic Federación Socialista Obrera

Colectivista and the Socialist Party were resolved with the creation of a National Council which directed the party for several years.

Article 26 of the Statutes was modified to give the National Council control over the Socialist Party as permanent representative of the groups of the party. It was composed of one delegate from each group and directed all party functions. The Executive Committee was relegated to a secondary role. It administered or implemented resolutions of the party congress and of the National Council. By 1903, the delegates to the Fifth Congress voted to eliminate the Executive Committee which was seen as the cause of the aburguesamiento of the party. Justo, who had been a member of the special commission that studied this issue, opposed the recommendation of the commission and the action of the congress which by a vote of 815 to 814 approved the suppression of the Executive Committee after long debates.

However, if this issue illustrated the democratic organization of the party, it nonetheless demonstrated Justo's ability to manipulate the organization so that it coincided with his views. The one vote majority was held to be insufficient to resolve the issue. At the urging of the minority, the congress decided that the issue was to be resolved not by the delegates but by a vote of the general membership of the party. By October 2, 1904, the majority of the party voted for an Executive Committee composed of nine members to direct the actions of the party. Included in the Committee were Justo and three of his disciples, Nicolás Repetto, Enrique Dickmann, and Francisco Cúneo.[37]

In the meantime, the Fourth Ordinary Congress met in the City of La Plata, July 7 to 8, 1901. Justo and Santiago Balbi represented the Centro Socialista de Junín. Dr. Justo was designated to preside over the

congress. This congress adopted the agrarian program developed by Justo. Under his guidance the party approved a minimum program that called for tax reform, indemnity to tenants for improvements to the land, suppression of artificial immigration, hygienic lodging for farm workers, legal recognition of unions, naturalization of foreigners who lived in Argentina for two years, minority representation, and the secret ballot.[38]

However, while the Socialist Party experienced growing pains and developed a more national program, a series of events occurred that had traumatic effects on the labor and socialist movement. On November 19, 1902, after management had rejected demands for a minimum daily wage of four pesos and a nine-hour day, the members of the Sociedad Trabajadores de la Barracas de Mercados Centro de Frutos went on strike. Repressive measures by the government caused this to turn into a general strike as other workers in Argentina left their jobs in sympathy with the workers. The government then declared a state of siege for sixty days, the first time such an action was taken against labor, and the first of five such actions against the labor and socialist movements between 1900 and 1910.

On November 22, 1902, Congress enacted the Law of Residence which empowered the President to deport any foreigner whose conduct injured the national security or disturbed the public order. This law proposed in 1899 by Senator Miguel Cané was approved by the Congress in one hour in this charged climate. The law was applied intensely and brutally. Workers were placed outside the law. Strikes were crimes. Union headquarters were raided. Union leaders were arrested and deported. Labor periodicals were prohibited. There were numerous deaths, as the military's sole function was to protect the interests of the capitalists.[39]

The socialists argued that a strike did not signify the kind of internal turmoil that justified a state of siege. Furthermore, they denounced the measures as arbitrary punishments and argued that the President had exceeded the limitations imposed in Article 23 of the Constitution.[40]

The following day, the Executive Committee explained its actions in the movement and protested against the application of the Law of Residence. Initially the socialists tried to avoid a general strike because they had foreseen its disastrous effects. Later they had tried to convince the government not to approve the Law of Residence. Subsequently they protested its approval and the intervention of the army against the strikers. Finally they called for a public demonstration to take place after the state of siege ended.

The Manifesto, issued November 24, 1902, placed the responsibility for the strike on the owners who failed to negotiate with the workers. The situation was aggravated further by the Federaciones Obrera Argentina, de Estibadores y Rodados, who had joined the strike and called for a general strike on November 30. At this point the Executive Committee intervened in order to get the government and unions to become more reasonable. Unfortunately, before the socialist could make their views known to the President, Congress approved the Law of Residence.

The Executive Committee called for an essentially political act to protest and obtain the repeal of the Law of Residence. It characterized a general strike as a futile and self-destructive act. The government, it warned, would crush such a movement with all its force. This attitude was defined further by the party on November 24, 1902. The party emphasized that the Party would morally and materially aid the strikers,

protested against the government's use of soldiers and sailors as scabs, deplored the attitude of anarchist dominated unions which went on strike as a sign of solidarity. The socialists reasoned that the best way to insure the success of the strike was for the membership of other unions to continue working in order to donate part of their salaries to the strikers.[41]

On January 11, 1903, with the state of siege ended, the socialists organized a demonstration against the Law of Residence and all the alleged atrocities suffered by the working class since its enactment. The crowd, estimated to number twelve thousand by El Pais, heard speeches from such party notables as Francisco Cúneo, Manuel Meyer González, Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, Alfredo 1. Palacios, Luis Boffi, Adrián Patroni, and Juan B. Justo. Justo denounced the Minister of Interior who, Justo claimed, frightened Congress into approving the state of siege by pointing out the dangers of social revolution.[42]

In the aftermath of this situation, the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Party met July 8 and 9, 1903, in Buenos Aires. Among the forty-nine delegates was Justo, who represented the Centro Social Democratico de Junín, one of thirty groups represented in the congress. The congress, presided over by a troika of Enrique Dickmann, Francisco Cúneo, and Justo, denounced the Law of Residence. It directed the National Council to request that other socialist parties oppose immigration to Argentina as long as the Law of Residence remained in effect. In addition, the party made it mandatory that party administrators be citizens, a position supported by Justo and necessary because of the recent deportations of labor leaders. The party opposed artificial immigration. Specifically, it denounced a pact signed by the Argentine government with a group of

"white slave traffickers." The pact required that 100,000 immigrants be brought to Argentina from Italy. The government was to pay these "slave traffickers" ten pesos gold per immigrant. The congress urged joint action by the Argentine and Italian socialist parties to neutralize this action if the pact was ratified.[43]

The year 1904 was a memorable one for the Argentine socialist labor movement. The violent suppression of the strikes of 1902 and 1903 had a marked impact on President Julio A. Roca and his Minister of the Interior, Joaquín V. González. In order to provide for some sort of legal safety value for the growing social agitation, they decided to implement the electoral reform enacted by congress at the end of 1903. The system of lists and elections determined by a simple plurality of votes was replaced by uninominal elections. The Federal Capital was divided into twenty districts. In the election of 1904 the City of Buenos Aires was to elect ten deputies for ten districts. Furthermore, the voting procedure was changed. After presenting his identification passbook, the voter now verbally named the candidate of his choice. The vote was then recorded in a register and the register was sent to the Cámara where an electoral commission declared the winners of the election. Although the reform was fundamental, it stimulated neighborhood caudillismo. It led to the buying of votes.

When the law was replaced in 1906 by the system of lists and simple plurality of votes, the more venal practice of buying votes was incorporated in the electoral customs of Argentina. Carlos Pellegrini, elected in 1904 to the Cámara de Diputados, responded, when accused of buying votes, that there was not a freer vote than one that was bought and sold.

Prior to the election there was a strong voter registration drive. It was necessary for a person to be inscribed each year in order to vote. The candidates of the Socialist Party were:

District 2: Dr. Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, a lawyer, received 39 votes.

District 4: Dr. Alfredo L. Palacios, a lawyer, received 840 votes.

District 6: Adrian Patroni, a painter, received 14 votes.

District 8: Francisco Cúneo, a mechanic, received 119 votes.

District 10: Dr. Juan B. Justo, a physician, received 110 votes.

District 12: Victor Kuen, a businessman, received 18 votes.

District 16: Enrique Dickmann, a student, received 15 votes.

District 18: Bartolomé Bosio, a pharmacist, received 17 votes.

District 19: Alejandro Mantecón, a bookbinder, received 82 votes.[44]

The total socialist vote was 1,254. However, the professions of these candidates indicated the lack of widespread working-class membership in the Socialist Party. The party stalwarts were members of the intelligentsia and professional groups with some concept of noblesse oblige. Nevertheless, according to the Socialist Party, the policies of the socialists were defined clearly and representative of the interest of the working class.

This was proclaimed when the people of La Boca, in the City of Buenos Aires, elected Alfredo L. Palacios, the first socialist deputy in Argentina, to represent them in the national congress. This victory was explained by the fact that the people of La Boca were of Italian background, basically Genoan, with a liberal Mazzinian and Garibaldian tradition. Therefore, in spite of money and personal promises offered by the política criolla candidates, Palacios defeated his rivals.[45] The March

19, 1904, edition of La Vanguardia printed a picture of the firm-jawed Palacios, with his handle-bar mustache, and proudly proclaimed the victory. The headline read:

Socialist Victory

The election of March 13, 1904, in Buenos Aires had given to the labor classes the first socialist deputy in South America. Viva el Partido Socialista Internacional[46]

However, the election of Palacios did not ease the situation for the Argentine socialists. Clashes between the government and working groups continued. On May 1, 1904, anarchists, singing revolutionary hymns, but marching peacefully, were savagely attacked by the police. Two people were killed and twenty-four were wounded.

The government denied that the massacre was premeditated. It pointed to a project that the Minister of the Interior, Joaquín V. González, had submitted to congress. The Código Nacional de Trabajo provided for an eight-hour day, accident insurance, the abolition of night work, and a day of rest each week. Undoubtedly, it was the most advanced piece of labor legislation that had ever been proposed in Argentina.

The bill also prohibited workers from inducing others to strike on penalty of fine and arrest. The President was able to dissolve all groups who opposed the laws of the Republic. Seemingly, it provided the State with the legal means needed to react violently against labor in any moment and in any circumstance. Therefore, labor organizations and the Socialist Party denounced this as an attempt to end labor agitation by destroying the independence of labor unions. Labor allied with management, who thought the proposal to be socialistic, to block the passage of the Código.[47]

Justo verbally attacked the motives of González and the proposal. To Justo, the project was to compensate for the drastic meddling of the government in labor conflicts, actions for which Justo held González responsible. Justo stressed his dislike of violence. However, he cited González's justification for the proposal as the disruption caused by the labor movements in 1902 to illustrate the point that violence could occasionally hasten the social evolution by forcing recalcitrant governments out of their ignorance or drowsiness. Justo noted that the proposal included all the principal points regulated by law in advanced countries. He criticized the sections on accident insurance as insufficient and noted that the project had been inspired by Spanish law--a country hostile to labor. He denounced the hateful restrictions to labor.[48] Justo recalled:

> That voluminous work, presented when its author's influence was already declining in the congress (because Roca was nearing the end of his term as president), remained because of its own weight hidden away in some ministry's portfolio, never stimulated any debate, was never studied seriously, and can be considered as a mere summary and academic contribution to social legislation. One can think that by presenting an entire code of labor law to the parliament of a country which had never dictated a single law on the subject, Mr. González did not intend so much to play the part of a legislator but to gain more recognition so that he may become president of the University of La Plata.[49]

These views were reflected by the sixth party congress which met July 2 to 3, 1904, in the City of Rosario. The congress then labelled the code Draconian and denounced it. It designated a commission of Juan B. Justo, Nicolás Repetto, Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, Juan Schaeffer, Aquiles S. Lorenzo, Gabriela de Coni, and Alejandro Mantecón to study the labor laws and to advise Palacios as to his action in this regard.[50]

During the end of 1904 and through 1905, there was no bloodshed. When workers in Rosario's electric factory struck for better conditions

the government sent the military to serve as scabs. On November 22, 1904, the police in Rosario shot at strikers who were leaving the union hall. One man was killed. The Federación Obrera Regional Argentina called for a general strike on December 1 and 2.

The Executive Committee of the Socialist Party wanted to know the causes of the strike and to avoid, if possible, the painful consequences of the strike. It delegated Justo and Enrique Dickmann to go to Rosario. They went directly to the Socialist Center where the anarchist-controlled committee on the general strike met. They arrived while a secret session of the strike committee discussed such revolutionary aspects of the strike as the interruption of public services and the destruction of water, gas, and telephone lines. The presiding officer prohibited them from attending the meeting. Justo refused to leave. He was not to be bullied by an individual nor intimidated by the atmosphere. He claimed that he was a delegate of the Executive Committee and noted that they were in a Socialist Center. When the anarchist officer still refused entry, Justo shrewdly suggested that the issue be decided by a general vote of those assembled. When the anarchist leader responded cockily that anarchists did not believe in either the law or the vote, Justo conningly replied that since anarchists did not vote he and Dickmann would remain by their own will. His attitude was decisive and he displayed personal strength and wit. He received a noisy round of applause from the group and was able to attend the meeting.

Thereafter, the Socialist Party prepared a meeting for November 27, 1904. Invitations were sent to the working class that condemned the government's action. The invitations characterized the state as a docile servant of capitalism. When the meeting was prohibited, the Socialist

Party joined the strike called by the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina. The strike was to demonstrate the scorn that the working class felt for the actions of the government which favored foreign business interests at the expense of the Argentine workers.[51]

On October 12, 1904, Dr. Manuel Quintana became President of Argentina. Quintana, an ex-lawyer for a British-controlled railroad, was elected President fraudulently. Within five months there was an unsuccessful attempt to oust him from office. On February 4, 1905, the Unión Cívica Radical, which usually abstained from elections, led a civil-military revolt against Quintana. This mutiny was not to usher in any fundamental reform. It was to gain power. Therefore, it was not supported by the Socialist Party. When the revolt erupted the Executive Committee issued a manifesto which urged the working class not to get involved in this revolt which it characterized as nothing more than the acting out of petty ambitions.

Although the revolt was squashed promptly the government seized the opportunity to declare a state of siege for three months. During this time, the Socialist Party and Trade Unions were brutally persecuted. Labor locals and socialist centers were closed by the police. La Vanguardia and other labor publications were sequestered. Militants were arrested and deported in a campaign of especially severe persecution. The socialists viewed this as a premeditated attempt to destroy the socialist movement which had begun to be a force in Argentine politics. At the same time, the Executive Committee bitterly criticized the bourgeois press which urged clemency for the revolutionaries but failed to utter a word in defense of the working people who built the country and suffered from the persecution of those who roled it. The socialists

reasoned that the governmental atrocities were part of a deliberate attempt to insure the failure of strikes in progress.

When the state of siege ended on May 21, 1905, a mass demonstration was held to protest the disgrace during the three months of suspension of constitutional guarantees. Francisco Cúneo spoke in the name of the Unión General de Trabajadores. Violence broke out. In the wake of this violence two people were killed and many were injured. The demonstration petered out. Again the socialists condemned the government. The violence was premeditated by government forces. Government forces were waiting for an incident to erupt. The Executive Committee condemned the attitude of the police. The police were denounced as promoters of disorder. The socialists excoriated the bloody blows on unarmed people. Finally, the Executive Committee warned the government that the history of the European socialist movement demonstrated that the government could not destroy the socialist movement.

However, these words fell on deaf ears. In the hope of crushing the working class, a second state of siege was declared October 7, 1905. Again locals and centers were closed. Houses of workers were violated. Hundreds of workers were deported in a furious campaign. Notwithstanding the fact that the government prohibited the circulation of La Vanguardia, which became a daily September 1, 1905, a year and a half after Palacios' election, Justo, who was its director, made sure that the paper appeared weekly. It was distributed secretly every Saturday.[52]

Without minimizing the effects of government persecutions, there were some gains made in behalf of the working class. In 1905 a law was passed which prohibited Sunday work in factories, mills, and commercial houses. However, the law applied only to Buenos Aires and did not include

domestic service workers. Justo recalled that President Quintana initiated his government with some favorable works for labor. However, most of the laws were never implemented. This was true of the law of Sunday rest and the law that regulated the labor of women and children. According to Justo, these laws were entrusted to capitalists, civil servants, and police to administer. They were not implemented except when some workers were willing to see that they were enforced. Justo criticized the newly established National Department of Labor. It was, he said, inadequately administered for the ends of the institution.[53]

Notwithstanding the repressive actions of the government the Socialist Party grew. Palacios was elected National Deputy. La Vanguardia became a daily, as Justo had urged since the founding of the newspaper. The growth of the party between 1896 and 1905 was measured by the increased number of socialist centers, the size of the socialist vote, and the membership of the party. In 1896 there had been ten socialist centers in the City of Buenos Aires and nine in the interior. By 1904 there were nineteen socialist centers in the capital and twenty-nine in the interior. Socialists had received 134 votes in the election of March 8, 1896. However, in the elections of March 13, 1904, the socialists received 1,297 votes. In 1902, the Socialist Party had 8,912 members. By 1904 it had 18,871 members.[54]

It was during this period that Justo, ousted from the Facultad de Medicina de Buenos Aires in 1905 for his support of rebellious students, bought a farm, El Olivar. Justo sought a farm near the City of Buenos Aires where his family could grow their own fruit to defray the cost of the house. During this time he travelled daily to the Federal Capital to

help the sick and to fulfill his party obligations. It was here in his room which faced open fields that he wrote his magnum opus, Teoría y Práctica de la Historia.[55]

Quintana was succeeded by Figueroa Alcorta. His administration was repressive and brutal. He deliberately confused the actions of anarchists and socialists in order to be able to persecute the socialists. His four years of power were a dictatorship of a decadent oligarchy. During his administration there was violence in the City of Buenos Aires, Ingeniero White, and Rosario. The strike of Inquilinos was repressed. His administration was characterized by the sinister acts of violent acts against the Labor Movement that culminated in the Centennial of 1910. The difficulty faced by the socialists was indicated statistically. After Palacios' term expired no socialist was elected to the Cámara de Diputados until 1912. By 1910 the number of socialists centers decreased from forty-eight in 1904 to thirty-six. The membership of the party was 14,699, a decline of approximately 4,000 from the 1904 figure.[56]

This period was marked by a conflict within the party between syndicalists and socialists. The syndicalists' thoughts and organization was that of the pre-1914 Confédération Genérale du Travail in France. They were followers of the economic-social school founded by such leaders as Sorel and Arturo Labricola. Their ideology fused the Marxian concept of class struggle and the anarchist conceptions of Proudhon and Bakunin. Advocating unions as the instrument of struggle, the syndicalists were essentially apolitical. Although they favored the substitution of producer and consumer collectives for the capitalists' structure, production would still be for profits. However, the means of production would be the property of the workers rather than the capitalists. The syndicalists

were not calling for the substitution of a new manner of production but only a different manner of distribution. According to the socialists, the syndicalists wanted syndicates to replace the state. They reasoned that the bourgeois would gladly concede to the proletariat, the socialization of the means of production provided the bourgeois were able to maintain the moral and political domination in society. The end of syndicalism, according to the socialists, was not collectivism but bourgeois corporativism.

The syndicalists scorned contact with the political power of the bourgeoisie. Anything that gave prestige to the state ought to be rejected by the worker. They characterized social legislation as counter-revolutionary. It weakened the proletarian spirit. Reasoning that history was moved by the violent action of active minorities, they favored strikes, sabotage, and boycotts. Revolutionary syndicates were to be formed. They would drill the proletariat in strikes until the day when they were able to paralyze production and transfer it to the syndicates.

Syndicalism took root in Argentina in the middle of 1903. It was introduced principally from France by Señora Gabriela L. de Coni and by Dr. Julio A. Arraga, both active members of the Socialist Party. The ideas were spread by Walter Mocchi, an Italian editor of Avanti, who came to Buenos Aires in May 1904. Syndicalism was embraced by other prominent members of the Socialist Party such as the Secretary-General of the party, Aquiles S. Lorenzo. The syndicalists formed groups within each socialist center. Their official organ was La Accion Socialista: Periodico Sindicalista Revolucionario. They attacked the party as they proselytized their "apolitical" position. The party, which fought against the anti-

politicalism of the anarchist, now encountered this same attitude within the Socialist Party. The syndicalists tried to gain control of socialist centers, La Vanguardia, and the Executive Committee.

The fight between syndicalists and socialists in the party lasted for three years. The direction of the party was resolved definitely at the Party Congress at Junín, April 12 to 15, 1906. The Seventh Socialist Congress debated widely the traditional concepts of Marxism and Democratic Socialism. The debates were on the highest level. They did not degenerate into slanderous assaults. The issue was resolved when Nicolás Repetto made a motion for the ouster of the syndicalists from the party. This was approved by a vote of 882 to 222. This was the first split in the ranks of the party based on principles and ideas. Men of great ability retired from the party. Nonetheless, this pruning permitted the party to continue its normal route.[57]

In retrospect, Justo thought that in France syndicalism was a necessary reaction against the political maneuvering of socialists in Trade Unions. Initially, it was positive because it was concerned with practical, timely questions. However, Justo faulted the syndicalists' premise that the direct action of Trade Unions was sufficient. They omitted all other forms of social action. He differed with the syndicalists on the general strike. Justo reasoned that the general strike was used by some of the most cultured European countries such as Germany and Denmark for clearly political ends. To Justo, the proletarian Trade Unions were organs of political coercion.[58]

Notwithstanding the difficulties faced by the socialists during this period they participated in National, Provincial, and Municipal elections. Although the socialists recognized the corruption and fraud that

existed, they maintained that political action was one of the means useful for their liberating work. Moreover, as the bourgeoisie permitted the socialists to participate in the elections, it would be stupid for them not to profit from it. However, it was inevitable that the socialists would lose these elections, especially after the uninominal system, in which Palacios was elected, was terminated in the interest of the political factions that directed Argentine politics. Throughout this period, the socialists labelled the major political groups as representatives of ignorant landowners and greedy and backward industrialists who wanted to crush the labor movement.

Justo headed an unsuccessful socialist slate for election to the Cámara de Diputados of the Province of Buenos Aires in March 1907. The platform called for the reduction of burdensome taxes on the necessities of life, an eight-hour workday, Sunday rest, decent working conditions, and sanitary housing for rural workers. However, the socialists received a total of 179 votes because of the fraud and corruption of the política criolla. The next year, on March 8, 1908, Justo was part of the 11-man socialist ticket that was put up to run for the position of National Deputy from the City of Buenos Aires. Again the election was marked by fraud. However, the socialists did place second in the election. They received 7,462 votes out of the 26,283 votes cast in the city. On March 15, 10,000 persons attended a protest demonstration and heard the candidates criticize the political situation in Argentina.

Following the regular election of 1908, two vacancies occurred in the Cámara de Diputados when Deputy Tornquist died and Deputy Naón became Minister of Justice. The socialists demanded that elections be held in compliance with Article 43 of the Constitution and the electoral law that

obligated the President to call for elections ten days following notification from the Cámara of a vacancy. Three days after a demonstration called by the socialists on August 9, attended by approximately 6,000 people, the government called for elections on October 18.

The Socialist Party candidates were Juan B. Justo and Alfredo L. Palacios. They ran on a platform that distinguished the party. The major emphasis of the party was its opposition to armed peace. This placed it in direct opposition to President Alcorta. The President had initiated a policy of galloping armament. Congress had approved an expenditure of 150 million pesos for armaments. The socialists asked the Trade Unions of Chile, Uruguay, Brazil, Paraguay, and Bolivia to send delegates to its antimilitarist demonstration on October 11, 1908.

Other parts of the party platform urged that indirect taxes be reduced, called for proportional representation and a municipal government elected by universal suffrage, demanded political rights for immigrants with two years of residency who were inscribed in the civic register, advocated that employers be responsible for labor accidents, demanded the repeal of the Law of Residence, urged the separation of Church and State, and demanded that the divorce be granted in Argentina. The government candidates won the election. According to the socialists, the electoral law was violated. Pecho G. Méndez received 7,530 votes; Ignacio Llobet received 9,020 votes; Palacios received 5,505 votes; and Justo received 4,848 votes.

The party's antimilitaristic attitude had been reflected in the Eighth Congress of the Socialist Party that met in the City of Buenos Aires on May 24 to 25, 1908. Justo, who represented the Centro Socialista de Morón (Interior) chaired the Congress. The representatives of thirty-

three groups condemned the growing militarism of Argentina. They resolved to press for the suppression of the permanent army and for the organization of a citizen militia. The Congress denounced the narrow patriotism of the ruling class as a means to strengthen the military which defended their privilege and domination over the proletariat.[59]

During this period of intense union and socialist agitation the Italian socialist, Enrique Ferri, arrived in Argentina. He caused a commotion among Argentine socialists. Ferri, who spoke with Manuel Ugarte in Paris and was sent letters and parliamentary discourses by Palacios, claimed to know about the Argentine Socialist Party prior to his arrival. Within a few hours oafter his arrival Ferri characterized the Argentine Socialist Party as an "exotic flower" which immediately made him persona grata to the powerful and wealthy adversaries of socialism. Ferri had little contact with Argentina socialists.

However, he offered to hold a meeting prior to his return to Italy; the benefits were to go to the Socialist Party. During his speech, on October 26, 1908, Ferri recognized the useful work of the Argentine socialists. However, he reasoned that the Socialist Party was not a natural product of the country but was imported by immigrants. Ferri's view centered on the supposed immaturity of the historic-economic conditions of Argentina to produce the birth of the Socialist Party. He argued that the proletariat was the product of the steam engine and only with the proletariat was the Socialist Party born, which was the final evolution of the primitive labor party. To Ferri, the Argentine Socialist Party was a labor party in terms of its economic program and a radical party, in the European sense of the word, in its political program.

Therefore, the Argentine socialists were fulfilling the functions of a radical party, since Ferri did not consider the Argentine radicals as a positive political party.

The Argentine socialists took strong issue with Ferri's opinions on the origin of Argentine socialism. They saw their roots sunk firmly in the Argentine soil. They cited the Revolution of May 1810, where the ideas of republicans, liberals, and democrats were all daughters of the French REvolution. The works of Mariano Moreno, Bernardo Monteagudo, and Bernardino Rivadavia made them precursors of the socialist work in Argentine. This work took concrete form under the tyranny of Rosas when, in 1837, the poet and philosopher Esteban Echeverría wrote Dogma Socialista de la Revolución de Mayo for La Asociación de Mayo.[60] Therefore, the socialists argued that with the creation of the Argentine Socialist Party there developed a political party that proclaimed the principle of social justice sustained and consecrated by these esteemed Argentines.

Justo practically labelled Ferri a prostitute as Ferri was being wined and dined by the oligarchy. He was the guest of the President and earned money while he criticized the Socialist Party. Justo was disturbed by attempts to adjust the social action of the working class to unproductive dogmatic discussions based on the thoughts of Marx. He characterized this as anti-scientific and anti-socialistic. In the name of doctrinaire orthodoxy, Ferri had even denied the existence of Argentine socialism. Systematically, Justo challenged every one of Ferri's comments. Justo reasoned that the Socialist Party was the only party which existed in Argentina. He cited the last chapter of Capital, "The Modern Theory of Colonization," in order to prove that Marx had foreseen clearly the steps taken by governing classes to rapidly create a proletariat in

agrarian countries such as Argentina. It was ludicrous to him that Dr. Ferri prohibited in the name of orthodox Marxism what Marx authorized. To Justo, the proletariat was not a product of the steam engine but resulted instead from the dissolution of feudal society. He noted the government favored the process of "systematic capitalistic colonization." The government made it difficult for farm workers to become free farm owners, yet the government favored servile, cheap, immigrant labor and the exploitation of workers. In this manner, a relatively numerous proletarian class had formed in Argentina. Its membership was swelled by the 200,000 to 250,000 immigrants who entered Argentina each year. Justo dismissed Ferri's comments as narrow dogmatism and minimized the distinction that Ferri had made between a labor party and a socialist party by terming it trivial. Justo concluded by defining socialism as the action of the workers to increase their measurable benefits.[61]

Apparently the Argentine socialists thought that support on this issue from Pablo Iglesias would be of great help in their dealing with Spanish immigrants. Pablo Iglesias wrote a letter on this subject dated September 2, 1909, which was published in an Argentine socialist magazine, Revista Socialista International. He wrote that he was convinced that:

> In every country where there are proletarians--and in Argentina there are--the Socialist Party has a reason of being; that the men of the ARgentine Socialist Party worked well for the cause of human emancipation, and I think it an obligation of Socialists of other countries that visit that nation, to show their solidarity with them aiding them in the fight that they maintain and to consider as their own enemies all that combat them [the Argentine Socialists].[62]

In 1909, Buenos Aires had a population of 1,231,698 people. It was the most important city in Latin America and the most populous of all Spanish-speaking cities. The workers celebrated May 1, 1909. The socialists and anarchists held separate demonstrations. As the socialists

marched toward the Casa Rosada, Enrique Dickmann, a member of the Executive Committee, brought news of government atrocities against the anarchists, which he witnessed. Provoked by an incident, the police, under the command of Chief of Police Ramón Falcón, killed eight demonstrators and wounded forty others. After this massacre, the Executive Committee, consisting of Mario Bravo, Nicolás Repetto, Basilio Vidal, Eduardo Porrinni, Domingo de Armas, Enrique Dickmann, and the Director of La Vanguardia, Juan B. Justo, adopted Dickmann's proposal of a general strike to demand Falcon's resignation and the punishment of all responsible for the massacre.

The party realized that only an act of working-class solidarity could influence the government to stop committing such atrocities. The party urged the working class to participate in a general strike in a declaration that ended "down with the assassins of the people." The strike lasted the week of May 3 to 8 and was supported by all the organs of the working class. In was the culmination of all the frustration, pain, and violence experienced by the working class at the hands of the government, especially in the last decade.

Although there were demonstrations in the interior which lasted between twenty-four to forty-eight hours, the strike was confined mainly to the City of Buenos Aires. There, 220,000 strikers were able to paralyze the city. They tied up the port, industries, and transportation. The Argentine working class was supported by the workers of Uruguay and Brazil, who protested against the actions of the Argentine government. The government responded by bringing in 5,000 national troops to occupy Buenos Aires. Falcón was not removed from his post. Meetings were

prohibited. Workers were killed. The government launched a campaign which denounced the labor and socialist movements as a sinister conspiracy of foreigners against the welfare of the state.

The socialists strongly denounced these statements which exploited Argentine nationalism. In a declaration written by Justo but signed by all members of the Executive Committee because of its importance, the socialists denounced the policy of the Alcorta regime toward the working class. The Labor Day massacres were the responsibility of the government. Bitterly Justo reported that the government wanted to reduce the workers of Buenos Aires to the same level as the workers who were the most abject and servile in Argentina. The declaration denounced Alcorta's policy of fomenting the immigration of cheap, ignorant labor with money extorted from the working class, as one of the greatest obstacles to national development. Other unpatriotic policies were noted. Foreign employers were asked to order their peons to vote for factions of the política criolla. The country was sold to foreign businessmen. Ministers and Presidents were former directors of these businesses. In juxtaposition, the document emphasized the truly patriotic work of the Socialist Party. It united men of equal social condition regardless of their country of origin. It undertook the work of Argentinization of the working class. It freed both natives and foreigners from racial prejudice. It made them work together for the development of a better ARgentine nation. Justo noted the logic of using ideas and practices from Europe to free the people from the control of the política criolla. He emphasized, however, that the socialists must continue the work of the Argentine Independence Movement.

Justo's role was not limited to drafting declarations. He exhibited great courage as he challenged the government directly. Although the police prohibited meetings, the Executive Committee announced that eight public meetings would be held on Tuesday at 10 A.M. at various centers. The majority of these never were held. Meeting halls were closed and guarded by police. Justo, in an act of rare civic valor, violated the government's decree and forcibly entered the Centro Socialista de Barracas. From a balcony Justo urged the people in the street to join the strikers and attend a rally at the Plaza Constitución. His actions alarmed the police. Justo was arrested. He was kept incommunicado for a number of hours, after which he was released.

As a result of this type of tenacity on the part of the working class, the authorities gave in to some of the demands of the strikers. The Municipal Código de Penalidades was abolished and strikers who had been imprisoned were freed as the success of the general strike exceeded the expectations of the socialists. However, the horrors of May 3 to 8 sowed the seeds for more violence.[63]

Ramón Falcón was murdered on November 14, 1909, by Simon Radowitzky, a young Russian anarchist, who had witnessed the brutality of May 3 to 8. Immediately the authorities declared a state of siege which lasted two months. The terrible repression was not directed just at anarchists. The trade union and socialist movements were blamed for an act of individual terrorism. Constitutional guarantees were suspended. The Law of Residence was invoked. Workers were arrested and deported. Union halls were closed. The anarchist press was suppressed. La Vanguardia also was closed for sixty days.

The Executive Committee's Manifesto pointed out that the party never supported individual acts of violence. It sowed ideas of legality in a country of disorder, revolts, and military mutinies. The party objected to the punishment of the entire working class. The Executive Committee said that neither the assassination of three Presidents in the United States of America nor the assassinations of Sadi Carnot of France or King Humberto of Italy led to such extreme measures as a state of siege or to the atrocities committed by the government. The party emphasized that the violence from above triggered violence from below. The Executive Committee scorned the government that believed it possible that it could destroy in two months of persecution the labor of the Socialist Party. With almost religious conviction, the Manifesto proclaimed that the socialists thrived on persecution.

During the state of siege the Socialist Party met in an Extraordinary Congress in Montevideo. The party resolved to participate in the March 13 elections if the state of siege was raised. When the state of siege ended, January 13, 1910, the party designated nine candidates, including Justo, for National Deputies and established its platform which was essentially the same as previous party platforms. The government candidates received an average vote of 23,000, while the socialists averaged 7,000 votes. Justo received 7,221 votes. Undaunted, the party ran Justo, Palacios, and del Valle Iberlucea as candidates for Provincial Congressmen in an election held March 25, 1910, in the Province of Buenos Aires. The socialists received a total of forty-three votes.

On the eve of the Centennial, the political atmosphere was charged. The violent deaths of Colonel Falcón and his secretary Lartigau, and the governmental atrocities, inflamed the spirits of the government and

proletariat. Three months after the state of siege ended, the Labor Centrals declared they would call a general strike while the country prepared to celebrate the Centennial of the May Revolution unless the government met their demands. They wanted the repeal of the Law of Residence, liberty for jailed strikers, and amnesty for violators of the law of military enrollment. La Vanguardia opposed the anarchists. It was the wrong moment for a general strike. Such an act would be contrary to the basic interests of the working class and the country. The socialists wanted to calm the atmosphere. However, the government anticipated difficulties and declared a state of siege on May 14, 1910, for an undetermined period. It lasted three months. Anti-labor demonstrations followed. The government condoned attacks by reactionaries against the labor and socialist movements. Approximately 500 militants were jailed or deported as President Alcorta unloosed mass terror against the working class movement.

The socialists had opposed the general strike. The Chief of Police had assured them that the government could distinguish between socialists and anarchists. He had given the party permission to hold its Ninth Congress in Buenos Aires on May 22 to 24.

Nonetheless, socialist headquarters was attacked savagely on the evening of May 14. After destroying La Protesta, the anarchist newspaper, a savage mob of patriots and nationalists, led by Baron Demarchi, Dr. Aubone, Captain Lava, and Deputies Carlos Carlés, Juan Balestra, and Pedro Luro, protected by the police and chanting "Long live the country, long live the police," destroyed the offices of La Vanguardia, its machines, press, and library. Books by such authors as Sarmiento, Mitre,

Alberdi, Zola, Tolstoy, Marx, Engels, and Darwin were burned. Miraculously the staff of La Vanguardia escaped by a door that opened on a side street.

However, Justo, the Director of the newspaper, chose to remain in the office. The police detained him and later brought him to the police station. At the police station Justo chastised Colonel Dellepiane, the police chief, for deceiving the socialists when Dellepiane assured the socialists a few hours before the attack that the government would not harm socialists. When Colonel Dellepiane threatened to imprison him, Justo defiantly and sarcastically told the Colonel to do with him what he pleased. Justo was released.

The party issued a statement to inform the public of the barbaric deeds of the government. It placed the responsibility for these atrocities on Figueroa Alcorta. He wanted to destroy the proletarian movement. He wanted to turn foreign workers into submissive beasts of burden. The Manifesto reaffirmed the decision of the party to fight continually for the elevation of the working class.

As a result of these events the government seized upon an explosion in the Teatre Colón to gain passage of the Law of Social Defense on June 27, 1910. It complemented the Law of Residence and was an instrument of repression against the enlightened proletariat who fought to better their living and working conditions. It restricted those who wished to enter Argentina. Anarchists were prohibited from entering the country. A person could receive a maximum jail sentence of three years for encouraging another individual to strike. It provided for a one- to three-year sentence for a person who by spoken or written word defended subversive ideas. A death sentence was to be administered without distinction of

sex. The result of the state of siege and the implementation of the Law of Social Defense was virtually to destroy the dominant role that the anarchists played in the Trade Union movement.[64]

In the midst of all this misery Justo noted some positive advances made by the Argentine working class by the completion of the first century of independence. The general workday in the City of Buenos Aires had been reduced from ten hours to eight hours. Nominal salaries in the last years tended to increase more than prices. Certain responsibilities for accidents had been imposed on management by the strongest Trade Unions. The cultural growth of the working class was evident in the respect shown for women, the campaign against alcohol, and the appearance of a cheap press.[65]

With the Centennial the formative period of the Socialist Party was completed. Notwithstanding both internal and external obstacles, the party made tremendous gains from then until Justo's death in 1928. The first sign that the party had come of age was when Justo was delegated to represent the party in the International Socialist Congress at Copenhagen.

Justo went to Copenhagen to represent Argentina at the Eighth International Socialist Congress which met from August 28 to September 3, 1910. The Argentine Socialist Party had been represented at other International Socialist Congresses. However, this was the first time that a delegate direct from the party attended a congress. The 887 delegates to this Congress were more than attended the Congress at Stuttgart in 1907. Germany had the largest delegation. It numbered 189. August Bébel, the leader of the German Social Democrats, was unable to attend

because of illness. However, Justo met with Jaurès, Lenin, Guesde, Elm, Wilburt, and Iglesias, among others.

In his report to the Executive Committee on November 10, 1910, Justo described the setting of the Congress. The delegates met in the Palacio-Concert, whose interior was decorated in red. The wall behind the platform was covered with a map of the world across which were the words "The International Proletariat of the World Unite." Flags which represented the attending countries were hung in the hall. To Justo they were similar to medieval flags of provinces and cities which still existed in official ceremonies. Therefore, they could be welcomed by the world flag symbolic of the International Socialist Movement. Stauning welcomed the delegates in the name of the Danes while Vandervelde sketched briefly the situation of the Universal Socialist Movement. Vandervelde erred when he included the Argentine Socialist Party among those parties whose votes had decreased. Justo thought that this judgment was based on the fact that the socialist representation in the Cámara was not the same as in 1907. He pointed out that this was owed, not to a decrease in socialist votes, but to a change in the electoral law. Thereafter, the Congress divided into eight commissions. Justo was part of Commission Five. It dealt with the political situation in different countries. Justo noted that he was only able to discuss the actions of the Congress in which he participated.[66]

There were two issues discussed at Copenhagen that Justo related in detail to the Executive Committee. He spoke on the condemnation of the Argentine oligarchy and the Co-operative movement. Justo placed the problem of Argentine before this international forum. Perhaps he thought that international pressure could bring about some reform in Argentina.

At the Congress Justo placed in juxtaposition to foreign capitalists who failed to take an active role in Argentine politics, the oppressed and persecuted working class who had taken an active role in Argentine political life since the formation of the Socialist Party. Justo noted the party's role in assimilating immigrants. However, he told the world community that the Argentine oligarchy failed to recognize this. Instead, it linked socialists, maffias, and anarchists together. Then Justo explained all the events that happened in Argentina from May 1, 1909 to 1910. He presented photographs of the locals after the attack. He mentioned that the Law of Social Defense restricted the rights of freedom of the press and assembly. It was another weapon in the oligarchy's arsenal to combat strikes. Justo claimed that the Argentine Socialist Party was non-violent. It was a party of order in a country of revolts.

He proclaimed that the Argentine Socialist Party was the first expression of political activity of the working people in Latin America and urged the Socialist International to encourage the party in its difficult struggle. The French delegate thought that the Congress of Copenhagen should demonstrate its support of the Argentine working class and contempt for the ruling oligarchy by boycotting Argentine. Justo rejected this proposal. He thought that a boycott would harm both the Argentine and European working class. The latter would be deprived of the raw materials that were indispensable for their life and work. Instead, Justo supported warmly a verbal condemnation of the Argentina government and oligarchy by the Congress. The Congress declared that they perverted universal suffrage, violated laws, disregarded the political action of the working class, caused violence, showed a perverted

complacency with capital and kept the people in a state of oppression. The Congress saluted the action of the Socialist Party in such difficult circumstances.[67]

Justo commented on the propositions presented on Co-operatives. He regretted that on this issue the socialists had not progressed noticeably over the years. He was critical of the Socialist Party of Belgium which wanted the Co-operatives tied to socialist parties. Justo was annoyed by the position of the German Social Democrats. They refused a categorical answer on this question. The English were silent.

The French Socialist Party was praised by Justo. The French recognized the Co-operative movement as one of the basic elements to change societies. They gave it an important role in the education and organization of the proletariat. They urged militant socialists to aid the Co-operative movement in a non-sectarian fashion. Therefore, Justo was pleased that Lenin's proposal, to recognize the socializing and democratizing role of the Co-operatives only as something that would develop after the expropriation of the capitalist, was rejected overwhelmingly by the reformists at Copenhagen. A compromise resolution, that did not satisfy Justo, resolved this issue.[68]

In an article printed in La Vanguardia on November 4, 1910, Justo described the Congress. He stressed that representatives of the world's working class censored the Argentine oligarchy. The action was printed in the world press. Much to his chagrin it was not printed in the newspapers of Buenos Aires. Justo saw this as a conspiracy. The press was tied to the política criolla. Justo denied charges of anti-patriotism. It was the oligarchy that was unpatriotic. It had used the Brazilian army to put down the campesina insurrection of Artigas. They allied with

the French and Brazilians against Rosas. They kept alive the firest of civil war in Uruguay. Justo wrote that as long as Argentine politics was violent and corrupt, socialists feared the Argentine government much more than foreign governments.[69]

In September 1911, Jaurès, possibly as a result of an invitation extended to him by Justo at Copenhagen, visited Argentina. Justo took him to see some of the sights of the country. They visited the Esposicion Ganadera in Palermo. Jaurès was taken to an estancia. He objected to the mistreatment of the animals. When in Buenos Aires, Jaurès gave a series of six lectures. Unlike Ferri, Jaurès said that socialism had a reason for being in Argentina. It must have been an amusing scene at the Justo house when Jaurès came over for supper. One may almost imagine Justo, the fanatical anti-alcoholic, dashing out of his house in order to buy a bottle of wine to satisfy the palate of the French gourmet. Jaurès returned to Europe with a copy of Justo's Teoría y Práctica de la Historia.[70]

Throughout the formative years of the Socialist Party, Justo played a key role in the Party. Moreover he was instrumental in formulating party policy. Shortly he would have an opportunity to present his ideas on the major issues of the time in the Cámara de Diputados.

CHAPTER I

FOOTNOTES

[1]Mario Bravo, "Organización, programa y desarrollo del partido socialista en argentina," Revista Argentina de Ciencias Políticas, X (1915), 136-137; Enrique Dickman, Recuerdos de un militante socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 87-90; Jacinto Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), II, 208-209, 321-322.

[2]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 5-8.

[3]Juan B. Justo, La realización del socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 41-43 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas VI).

[4]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 117, 125, 128; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 256-277.

[5]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 323-324, 353-358; Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la política: De Roca a Yrigoyen (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1956), p. 31. The following year Augustín Reynes presented his resignation when the party's vote decreased.

[6]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 359-362; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, p. 22; Juan Antonio Solari, "La labor periodistica de Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 501-505.

[7]El Diario del Pueblo, 1 Oct. 1899, p. 1.

[8]Romeo Ferrara, "La obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo en pro de los productores del campo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 485-490; Noticias Graficas, 20 Aug. 1956; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 382; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, p. 197.

[9]F. Casaneuva, "La obra de Justo en Junín," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 527-528; Romeo Ferrara, op. cit., pp. 485-490; Romei Ferrara, "La obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo en Junín," Acción Socialista, XIX (14 April 1928), 647-651; Jacinto Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), I, 212; La Vanguardia, 13 April 1901, p. 1; 20 April 1901, p. 1. Some of the men who worked with Justo were Javier S. Castro, Vicente Linguido, Juan C. Alerino, José Petracini, and Victor Maurin.

[10]Juan B. Justo, "Epistolario inédito," Revista Socialista, II (Sept. 1939), 163-164.

[11]Manuel Palacín, "Para el anecdotario del Maestro," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 464-466. The author related that after listening to Justo, he became a member of the Socialist Party.

[12]"Testamento de Juan B. Justo," Anuario Socialista (1938), 82; Emilio J. Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestion nacional," Todo es Historia, LXII (June 1972), pp. 16, 18. Justo had six children by his first wife who died in 1912. They were Andrés, Daniel, Leticia, Aurora, Miguel, and Sara. In 1922 he married Alicia Moreau who gave him three children. They were Juan Roberto, Luis Nicolás, and Alicia Marta; Alicia Moreau de Justo, widow of Juan B. Justo, personal interview with her at her home, 18 Aug. 1972. Dra. Alicia Moreau de Justo was an extremely patient, sensitive person. There was very little doubt of her great love for her country. She hoped that the various factions of the Socialist Party would unite. She showed her great interest in the problems of socialism in the United States. Although she was of advanced age, her eyes were those of a 25-year-old. When we parted company she was on her way to address an anti-Vietnam demonstration.

[13]Ferrara, Acción Socialista, XIX (14 Apr. 1928), 647-651.

[14]Juan B. Justo, "Base biológica de la historia," La Universidad Popular, I (1905), 27-28; Juan B. Justo, Cooperación Libre (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1929), p. 19 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas II); Juan B. Justo, Teoría y práctica de la historia (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Libera, 1969), pp. 53-81, 515-516 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas IV); Juan B. Justo, Socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1920), p. 7; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 59-68.

[15]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 12-18; Corbiere, op. cit., pp. 10-12; Nicolás Repetto, "Sintesis del hombre y de su obra," Anuario Socialista (1938), 19.

[16]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 18-30, 81-95; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 37-38.

[17]La Vanguardia, 7 April 1894, p. 1.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 24-25, 36, 141-147, 156, 294, 333-335; Juan B. Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos (Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1933), pp. 90, 92, 121-125, 129-130; Juan B. Justo, Internacionalismo y patria (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1933), pp. 171-172 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas V); Justo, Socialismo, p. 138; Alicia Moreau de Justo, El socialismo según la definición de Juan B. Justo (Buenos Aires: Editorial Polis, 1946), pp. 18-20, 66, 69-75, 83-89, 107, 111-112, 116-118, 124, 128

[20]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 160-228, 238, 482: Justo, Obras Completas VI, p. 121; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 389-398; Juan B. Justo, "La explotación de los yerbales," Revista Socialista, II (Sept. 1940), pp. 83-89: Alfredo Palacios. Estadistas y poetas (Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1952), p. 26. Justo defended the Indians and Mestizo population in the Alto Paraná throughout his political life. He did not conceive of the development of socialism without its benefits reaching the Indian worker.

[21]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 141, 249-250, 425, 457-458, 462-463, 469-470, 473, 478; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 353-355; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 133-135; Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 211; Justo, Socialismo, pp. 7, 26-30, 114.

[22]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 343; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 94; Enrique Dickmann, Democracia y socialismo (Buenos Aires: Serafin Ponzi, Nibbo y Cia., 1917), pp. 135-149; La Vanguardia, 7 April 1894, p. 4.

[23]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 30-33.

[24]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 367-373; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 276-280, 299-303, 334-373; Miguel Navas, "El Dr. Juan B. Justo creador de las agrupaciones socialistas gremiales," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 519-590.

[25]The best works on this subject are: Jacinto Oddone, Gremialismo proletario Argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949); Sebastian Marotta, El movimiento sindical argentino: su génesis y desarrollo. 2 vol. (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Lacio, 1960-61.) Diego Abad de Santillan, FORA. Ideologia y trajectoria del movimiento obrero revolucionario en la argentina (Buenos Aires: Editorial Proyección, 1933).

[26]Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 376-380.

[27]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 436; Justo, Obras Completas VI, p. 277; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, 169-170.

[28]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 481; Justo, Socialismo, p. 117; Luis Ayarragaray, Socialismo argentino y legislación obrera (Buenos Aires: J. Lajouang and Cia., 1912), pp. 35-41; Enrique Dickmann, "Salario minimo para los obreros y empleados del estado," Acción Socialista, XIII (27 Dec. 1924), 387-394; Alfredo L. Palacios, "El partido socialista y la legislación del trabajo," El pequeño libro socialista, pp. 69-75; Partido Socialista, Legislación del trabajo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1928), pp. 3-5; La Prensa, 28 Jan. 1959; Angel M. Giménez, "El sembrador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 455-456. The Law of Sunday rest that was passed in 1905 was proposed by Palacios. An accident which killed Maximo Dickmann led to the Socialist Party to demand workmen's compensation. The first socialist bill for an eight-hour workday was presented to the National Congress in 1912. A project

for such legislation in the City of Buenos Aires was presented by the Radical alderman Dr. Eduardo Pittaluga. However, it was written by Dr. Justo.

[29]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 396-398.

[30]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 389, 391-393; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 96-98, 102-103.

[31]Alberto Belloni, Del anarquismo al peronismo (Buenos Aires: A. Pena Gillo, 1960), p. 15; Sebastian Marotta, El movimiento sindical argentino: su génesis y desarrollo (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Lacio, 1960), I, 87-92, 98-100; Jacinto Oddone, Gremialismo, proletario argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 306-308, 70-79.

[32]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 453-457; Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 453-457; Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 240-242.

[33]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 67, 99-100, 137; Oddone, Historica del socialismo argentino, I, 164-168; José Vazeilles, Los socialistas (Buenos Aires: Editorial Jorge Alvarez S.A., 1967), p. 37. Before 1900 socialists and anarchists celebrated May Day together. The anarchists named their centers after other anarchists who were infamous. There was a group named Santo Caseiro after the Italian anarchist who killed Sadi Carnot. Vazeilles wrote that it was the anarchist who represented an authentically proletarian tendency.

[34]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 437-438, 449-451; Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 7; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 104; 235-236; Justo, Socialismo, pp. 111-112.

[35]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, pp. 217-219.

[36]Enrique Dickmann, El partido socialista argentino en los congresos internacionales (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1946), pp. 7-9.

[37]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, pp. 11, 199-211.

[38]Ibid., pp. 225-236.

[39]Belloni, op. cit., p. 17; Adolfo Dorfman, Historia de la industrial argentina (Buenos Aires: Escuela de estudios argentinos, 1942), p. 193; Marotta, op. cit., I, 145-149; Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino, 108-109, 118; Diego Abad de Santillan, FORA. Ideología y trajectoria del movimiento obrero revolucionario en la argentina (Buenos Aires: Editorial Nervio, 1933), p. 107. This work presents an account of the anarchist influence in the labor movement.

[40]Article 23 reads: "In case of interior turmoil or exterior attack that puts in danger the exercise of this Constitution and of the Authorities created by it, will declare in state of siege the Province or Territory where the disturbance exists, remaining suspended there

the Constitutional guarantees. However, during this suspension the President of the Republic cannot by himself condemn nor apply punishment. His power will be limited respecting persons, to arrest them or transfer them from one point to another in the Nation if they do not prefer to leave Argentine territory."

[41]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 93, 133-134; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 6, 10-22. The Law of Residence (Law 4144) is reprinted in Historia del socialismo argentino.

[42]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 134-136; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 22-23; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 60-61.

[43]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 201-202, 225-228.

[44]Dickmann, Recuardos de un militante socialista, pp. 120-121.

[45]Ibid., pp. 119-120; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 287-294.

[46]La Vanguardia, 19 March 1904, p. 1.

[47]Belloni, op. cit., pp. 17-18; Marotta, op. cit., I, 193-199.

[48]Marotta, op. cit., I, 196.

[49]Justo, Socialismo, p. 116.

[50]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 202, 228-231.

[51]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 431-433; Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino, pp. 137-141; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 26-30.

[52]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialiste, pp. 140-147; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 30-39; Comision de Prensa del Partido Socialista La Vanguardia (Buenos Aires: 1948), pp. 27-32. When the paper became a daily Justo was its director. He held this post for the next five years. He was also director from June 1914 to January 1916; May 1916 to June 1916; and April 1924 to January 1925.

[53]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 116-117.

[54]Bravo, op. cit., pp. 131-137.

[55]Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la agricultura (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1959), pp. 13-14.

[56]Bravo, op. cit., pp. 131-137; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 93, 147-148; Marotta, op. cit., I, 88.

[57]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 201-204; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 231-232, 370-380; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 102-104.

[58]Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 320-321.

[59]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 151-155; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 232-235, 295-310, 328-330; La Vanguardia, 10 Sept. 1908, p. 1; 11 Sept. 1908, p. 1.

[60]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 95-97. Justo was extremely critical of the "Socialism" of Echeverría. Echeverría neglected to discuss the division of the latifundios. Angel M. Giménez, Los precursos del socialismo en la Republica Argentina (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1917), pp. 20-22. This work lists Bartolomé Victor y Suarez and Dr. Serafin Alvarez, both Spaniards, as precursors of Argentina socialism. Unfortunately, this aspect of Argentine socialism has been neglected by the leading socialist historians in Argentina. Even Justo neglected to mention these men, nor did he discuss the Spanish influence on Argentine socialism.

[61]Justo, Socialismo, pp. 104, 123-141; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 23-24.

[62]Pablo Iglesias, "Carta," Revista Socialista Internacional, III (15 Oct. 1909), 257-258.

[63]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 164-165. 171-176; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 47-72; Luis Pan, Vision socialista de medio sigla argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), p. 12; El Socialista, 16 Sept. 1910, p. 3. El Socialista was sent a list of names of people who were arrested or deported, by Mario Bravo. The paper published this list. It gave the names, sentence, occupation, and nationality of each person.

[64]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 174-189; Marotta, op. cit., II, 73-74; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 77-87, 310-312, 330.331.

[65]Justo, Socialismo, p. 118.

[66]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 3-5, 8-9; Centro Editor de America Latina, Congresos de las Internacionales Obreras (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de America Latina S.A., 1969), p. 17; Dickmann, El partido socialista argentino en los congresos, pp. 12-17.

[67]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 6-8.

[68]Ibid., pp. 8-14.

[69]Ibid., pp. 242-244.

[70]Corbiere, op. cit., pp. 22-23; Angel M. Giménez, "El sembrador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 455-456; Repetto, Mi pasor por la agricultura, pp. 84-85; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 111-117. Before the Belgium and German socialists dealt with the problem of alcohol, Justo had waged an anti-alcohol campaign. Alcohol hindered the diffusion of ideas.

II.--SIX MAJOR ISSUES THAT JUSTO ANALYZED DURING HIS POLITICAL CAREER

By 1910 there was a general longing to bring about peaceful political reform in Argentina. This change was brought about by the election of Roque Sáenz Peña. Although elected by fraud, he nevertheless initiated a new political era in the country. Argentina was given honest, secret, and free elections. Roque Sáenz Peña and his Minister of the Interior, Indalecio Gómez, had lived in Europe. They observed and studied the development of democratic institutions and understood the inferiority of the political institutions of Argentina. Once in office they worked with honest energy to reform the political regime of Argentina.

The battle for electoral reform was led by Gómez. It was approved by Congress in 1911 because the President demanded it even though the legislators did not believe in the virtue of the law nor the capacity of the masses to elect their representatives. Therefore, without wishing it or knowing it, the oligarchy upon passage of this act voluntarily ceded power to the government. The law called for obligatory and secret universal suffrage. Federal judges controlled all electoral operations. It established "the incomplete list" or minority representation. Two-thirds of the seats in an election would go to the majority party and one-third to the minority party. This law symbolized a greater political refinement and finesse on the part of the Argentine government.[1]

Justo, who approved of the new law, explained in his first parliamentary speech on May 31, 1912, that the new law was the result of an intellectual progress rather than any kind of moral progress. The law was not a product of a new virtue. It resulted from a notion of what the country required. Sáenz Peña's wisdom, according to Justo, was that he knew to give the country his new electoral law and to insure its implementation.[2] When Sáenz Peña died August 9, 1914, the Cámara met in an extraordinary session to pay homage. Justo delivered an eloquent and sensitive eulogy in the name of the socialist parliamentary group. He noted his personal pain at the death of Roque Sáenz Peña. He characterized him as a builder and creator. The socialists admired the great work that Sáenz Peña brought about in Argentine politics.[3]

To Justo, universal suffrage was a new historic phenomenon. Never had the masses participated in the formation and exercise of government. The bourgeoisie got political power not by the vote but by virtue of wealth and education. Insofar as historical progress obeyed laws and decrees all progress was possible by means of universal suffrage. Therefore, Justo reasoned that all citizens, including women, must be allowed to vote. With universal suffrage, political activity became a means of abolishing the privilege of the oligarchy. Justo dwelled on the patriotic implications of the Law of 1912. Until its passage, elections were distrusted. They were marred by fraud. Voter turnout was relatively small. The ballot box was distrusted. Political rights in the city were abandoned. However, with the passage of the Law of 1912, 76 percent of registered voters voted in the City of Buenos Aires.[4]

The Sáenz Peña Law was first applied April 1912. Half the membership of the Cámara de Diputados de la Nación was to be elected. The City

of Buenos Aires was to elect twelve deputies. In accordance with the new law the Socialist Party nominated eight candidates. Justo headed the list. However, Justo did not campaign. Physically exhausted and mentally depressed due to his wife's death, Justo travelled in March to his farm, La Vera, in Tío Pujío, Province of Córdoba, with his son Andrés. Since his ouster from the university in '05 he had hardly practiced his medical profession. Instead, he had become more deeply and intensely involved in socialist activities. As Director of La Vanguardia from 1905 to 1910 Justo witnessed the destruction of La Vanguardia on numerous occasions. Therefore, in order to rejuvenate his spirits he went to his farm to work the land.

The election law was applied honestly. All parties were free to conduct their campaigns. The oligarchy was sure it would triumph by virtue of the same old fraudulent practices and placed little significance in the electoral law. As a matter of fact, the oligarchic parties divided into different factions in the hope of gaining all twelve seats in the Cámara. The only blemish in the election was that made by the oligarchic-controlled Unión Nacional, the party that elected Sáenz Peña President. It paid as much as fifty pesos a vote. The Unión Cívica Radical was an unknown quantity since it had never participated in an election. The socialists followed their traditional campaign methods. They organized conferences. Thousands of leaflets were distributed. Hundreds of posters were pasted on the walls of the city.

The votes were counted on April 8, 1912, by the President of the Cámara, Dr. Eliseo Cantón, who lost his bid for re-election as a candidate of the Unión Nacional. The results of the election were revolutionary. The Radicals elected eight deputies. The Socialists elected

Justo and Palacios as National Deputies. The minority list was completed with the election of Dr. Estanislavo Zeballos of the Unión Nacional Party and Dr. Luis Maria Drago of the Unión Cívica Party. More than 21,000 citizens voted for Justo, who thereafter served in parliament for sixteen continuous years. The magnitude of change was best gauged by Justo's own comment in the aftermath of the election of 1896 when he stated that, given the fraudulent electoral practices of Argentina, a socialist would not be elected deputy until the year 2000. Upon his return to Buenos Aires on May 1, 1912, Justo was greeted by a huge rally of socialists. In true political fashion, Justo, spirits revived, led the demonstration wearing a campesino sombrero.[5]

Justo's entrance into the National Congress constituted a true revolution. Immediately he attacked the old oligarchy and affirmed that the labor movement was the basis of a new democracy. He revolutionized the conduct of the Cámara de Diputados. In contrast to the flowery, superficial oratory of the other deputies his speeches were concise, precise, witty, biting, incisive, penetrating, enlightening, and analytical. Justo mastered the multitude of data that he wove into his debates. He had completed his major works before taking office. His encyclopedic knowledge and thorough preparation were evident in all discussions. Justo illustrated ideas with foreign examples. He cited the budget of the United States, agriculture in Ireland, banking in England, and farming in New Zealand and Australia. German writers, English Trade Unions, political economists such as Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill were used to emphasize points as Justo educated his colleagues in congress and actively participated in the intense debates.

With the election of Justo there was now an authentic spokesman of the Argentine working class in Congress. The Cámara understood at once that Justo was not a deputy but The Deputy. The legislative work of Justo was a permanent dedication to the defense of the working class and not of self-aggrandizement.

When in a debate an adversary cautioned Justo that his reputation was at stake, Justo angrily responded that he was not concerned about his reputation. He was concerned about his work which was a necessary labor. He did not compromise with lies. He was fulfilling a duty and mandate. When baited by Señor Agote during a debate on June 19, 1912, Justo firmly pointed out that he had not expected to be treated cordially when he entered the Cámara. He was immune to insult and was not to be baited into any duels. He was not concerned about the enemies he made but was interested in the positive work he was doing. He degraded the term "caballero."

Sarcastically he noted that with his election ministers were no longer called to the Cámara to inform the representatives as to how the government was to enrich them. They were called now to inform the deputies how the government intended to stop impoverishing the working people. After two decades of struggle, socialist ideas finally were dealth with on a national level. With an unblemished private and public life, Justo was respected by his adversaries.[6]

Justo reasoned that labor parties were less concerned with the extrinsic condition of candidates than other parties. They were most interested in the capabilities of the candidate. In what amounted to an indictment of the maturity of the Argentine working class at that time, Justo noted that the better educated the working class, the greater would

be the proportion of deputies who had been wage earners. To illustrate this point he cited the difference between Britain and Italy. In Italy the intelligentsia dominated the labor movement. Parliamentarians elected by the working class were a new category of professionals to serve the working class. As Justo was very practical and candid, he acknowledged in a parliamentary speech that the efficacy of socialist parliamentary action was not measured by the number of affirmative votes which socialist proposals got in the Cámara. Socialists wanted to alter completely Argentine politics in its proceedings and ends.[7]

Socialist parliamentarians were accountable to the Congress of the Socialist Party and the membership of the party. They participated in meetings of the Executive Committee. Fifty percent of their salary was given to the party to defray the cost of La Vanguardia and other services for the working class. The increased expenditures for new services was illustrated by data for the period 1911 to 1914. In 1911, a year before Justo and Palacios entered Congress, the party's income was 3,277.75 pesos while it spent 3,248.11 pesos. By 1914 the party's income was 90,256.71 pesos while its expenditures totalled 86,257.34 pesos.[8]

Throughout his political life Justo dealt with the major issues that affected the working class of Argentina. He was interested in bettering the standard of living and improving the quality of life of the wage-earner. Although issues were discussed individually they were viewed by Justo within a total context.

Socialists had called for the naturalization of immigrants even before the founding of the party in 1896. This was seen in such newspapers as Vorwarts 1886, El Obrero 1890, and La Vanguardia 1894. The Socialist Party intended to assimilate and naturalize the immigrants.

This was seen in the statutes drafted by Justo and approved by the Constituent Congress. Article Seven required that all political questions be resolved by members of the party who were Argentine citizens. Article Twenty-Seven required that one be a citizen to be a member of the Executive Committee. At various times the Executive Committee reported the number of members who became naturalized citizens of Argentina. La Vanguardia constantly published the requirements for naturalization. The party's position was that the Argentine bourgeoisie was backward. All initiatives for political progress of the country remained with the workers. The party reasoned that the land cleared and developed by the sweat of the workers was by right their country. Therefore, it was the party's obligation to defend the country from the vampires that sucked the blood from the nation. Thus, from its foundation the party undertook this patriotic task of incorporating the immigrant into Argentine society. It wanted him to become concerned for the political and public life of Argentina.[9]

Justo, in his comments to the Italian population of Argentina in the last decade in the nineteenth century, expressed himself clearly on this subject. In June 1896, Argentina and Chile were on the verge of war. Justo wrote an article for La Nación which he signed Cittidano. He urged the Italian population in Argentina to enter the political life of the country. It was unfortunate that the prospect of war was necessary for the Italians to show their love for the country. Justo argued that the prospect of an armed fight was always present. The armed fight would continue as long as politics was corrupt and economic parties were not formed and immigrants failed to become citizens. It was through politics that the internal developments and foreign relations of Argentina were

decided. If immigrants did not become active citizens they failed to fulfill their obligations and the country suffered. He reasoned that political relations between Italy and Argentina would be more cordial and commercial relations more prosperous when there were in Argentina hundreds of thousands of Italo-Argentines. When La Patria degli Italiani cautioned Italians against immigrating to Argentina because of the monetary manipulations of the government, Justo dismissed this as a secondary measure.

He urged the immigrants to become citizens. He wanted them to become active participants in the political life of the country. They should exercise greater control over the Argentine government. To Justo, the important conversion was not that of paper into gold but of immigrant into citizen. Justo predicted that, should immigrants become citizens and unite with natives of equal interests, they would create an irrepressible force which would control the government. He demanded that immigrants become citizens in order to hinder the slaughter of conationals by a barbaric political system.[11]

Justo's fetish for exactness caused him to differ with L'Italia al Patria which favored naturalization also. This paper wrote that foreigners were excluded from the political life of the country. Justo stressed that it was not difficult to become a citizen of Argentina. He even noted that naturalized citizens were exempt from military service for ten years. Therefore, Justo's complaint was not against the restrictive requirements of the state. He was disturbed by the fact that foreigners, either because of ignorance or false patriotism, failed to make use of the political rights that really cost them so little to acquire. Justo reasoned that the failure to become an active citizen was to fall

into the Latin vice of hoping that laws made what only men were able to make. When a person stopped being a subject of Humberto or Alfonso XIII one resigned a purely legal and political tie in order to acquire a more fertile tie which permitted one to show his sympathy to his native country in a much more meaningful fashion. One did not alienate the ethnic, sentimental, nor moral tie with Italy or Spain.[12]

For these reasons Justo was critical of Jews. In an article published November 6, 1923, Justo wrote that the Jewish pledge to conserve themselves as a race offended his national sentiments. He favored assimilation not balkanization of the Argentine population. It was unreasonable and nonprofitable for the Jews to attempt to conserve their ethnic characteristics. He criticized the perpetuation of castes. Furthermore, Justo reasoned that Judaism was as dogmatic and exclusive as other religions. The sectarian preoccupation of Judaism was a manifestation of a spirit that had not added to the unity and strength of the country. Judaism, as other religions, clashed with the high ideals of socialism.[13]

The problem of naturalization was so serious that the socialists tried constantly to get eminently popular foreign dignitaries to plead their cause. Pablo Iglesias, the founder of the Spanish Socialist Party, who, through the years maintained an active correspondence with Justo, wrote a letter dated June 23, 1897, which was published in La Vanguardia. He urged Spaniards to become Argentine citizens. Iglesias emphasized that it was an error for socialists not to participate in the political fight.[14] On February 3, 1898, the Groupo Parlamentaria Socialista de Italia urged Italians living in Argentina to become Argentine citizens.[15]

Justo was very critical of the government's actions to attract European immigration. The government spent large sums to attract

immigrants. Lies were told to induce them to come to Argentina. Angrily, Justo noted that the oligarchy and industrialists wanted an abject group of immigrants similar to the peons of the northern sugar mills who did not complain about the extortions to which they were subject. Justo regretted that each day Argentina became less attractive to European workers. Justo lamented that for those immigrants who lived in Argentina the idea of real well-being became more remote due to the monetary manipulations of the government. As early as April 7, 1894, Justo reasoned that the immigrants who arrived united with those people of European origin who already lived in Argentina and formed the most active part of the population. Inevitably, they would absorb the incapable old criolla element. This new proletariat understood that its material and moral well-being were incompatible with existing economic systems. They demanded the socialization of the means of production and exchange.[16]

Rivadavia, Alberdi, Sarimiento, and Mitre equated the desert with barbarianism and population with civilization. So did Justo. Justo viewed biology as the basis of history. He argued that it was necessary to populate Argentina. Because demography was the basis of all progress and the natural growth of the population was insufficient to populate Argentine, immigration was vital for the Republic. However, Justo did not want an immigration fomented artificially. He did not wish cheap labor for landowners and greedy industrialists. Justo argued that the favorable conditions of the country should attract immigrants. Immigrants would be attracted by high salaries, decent working conditions, modern social legislation, easy access to the land, and a popular democratic government. Justo wanted not only the arms but the hearts and heads of the immigrants.[17]

Justo traced the development of immigration in Argentina in the period after 1863. With the acceleration of the commercial movement in the mid-nineteenth century the immigrant was desired. He was seen as simple merchandise in line with bourgeois economic science. However, he was respected in contrast with the inertia of the proletariat criolla. To Justo, the work of Alberdi to exempt immigrants from military service, was an attempt to shelter the most useful workers in Argentina. Nonetheless, he minimized the privileges of foreigners. They suffered the effect of monetary manipulations. The depression of the real wage in the second half of the nineteenth century greatly neutralized in Argentina the universal tendency to raise the price of labor. The false hope of abundant cheap land attracted many immigrants who dreamed of becoming landowners. There was a temporary stabilization of the monetary regime in 1867. Immigration increased. Some colonies were established. However, this was short-lived. Colonization became an individual speculation. It was profitable for latifundistas. The state sold or donated public lands in the form of enormous latifundios. This strengthened the domination of the landowners and surrendered the country to "systematic capitalistic colonization." Justo reported that immigration which exceeded 76,000 persons in 1873 did not reach that level again until after the federalization of the City of Buenos Aires in 1880 and the re-establishment, even momentarily, of a normal monetary regime. When the traditional questions of internal politics that divided the national oligarchy were resolved, immigration soared. Whereas some immigrants became businessmen, many more remained wage-earners and dislodged the less apt criolla proletariat. In addition to their labor, these immigrants brought their ideas of social education.[18]

Since its creation, the Socialist Party had opposed artificial encouragement of immigration. Human migrations responded to the economic evolution of societies. Therefore, Justo strongly condemned, in the Cámara de Diputados, the government's action encouraging immigration with public funds drawn from the working people. However, Justo emphasized that the socialist policy was not to hinder spontaneous healthy and free immigration. To prove this point Justo cited the resolutions of the International Socialists Congress of Stuttgart of 1907.

The Argentine Socialist Party was represented at this Congress by Manuel Ugarte. Justo argued that the socialists wanted to combat artificial immigration supported by agents of capitalist governments. These governments wanted a cheap labor force to compete with the native work force. This socialist policy was non-racist. Workers should be informed of the living and working conditions of the country to which they wished to immigrate.

The Congress of Stuttgart declared it an obligation of the organized working class to defend itself against the depression of its own level of living as a result of the mass importation of disorganized workers. It condemned contract labor. Workers were obliged to hinder the importation and exportation of strikebreakers.

Such restrictions were applied in the United States. Nevertheless, millions of immigrants went to the United States where restrictions were more numerous than those mentioned, according to Justo. Each immigrant who entered the United States was forced to pay a tax on four pesos gold. He had to undergo a severe medical examination. Justo noted that in 1907, 1, 285,319 immigrants entered the United States while in 1910,

289,000 immigrants arrived in Argentina. However, in the United States, emigration was only 20 percent of immigration. In Argentina, where it was difficult to find work and shelter during the winter, it was 41 percent. The government treated the immigrants as merchandise and things rather than men. Justo cited two contemporary cases to illustrate this point. He denounced the government's action of diverting the immigratory current from Buenos Aires to Bahía Blanca without any consideration to the will of the immigrants. Justo objected to the measures taken in 1909 to limit migration from Argentina by artificially raising the price of third-class passage. As a result of official intervention, the price of passage rose from thirty to seventy pesos.[19]

Justo paid special attention to the Italian immigrants in his work on immigration which appeared in La Vanguardia on September 29, 1911. He pointed out that between 1865 and 1908 41.84 percent of the immigrants originated in Italy. This immigration had been a factor of progress. This was verified by the most superficial study of Argentine agriculture, industry, and commerce. Yet the Italian government hindered emigration to Argentina. This restriction by the Italian government, an anti-proletarian policy which ought to be denounced by Italian workers, seriously hurt thousands of Italian proletarians. It was anti-Italian as far as it damaged Argentine agriculture, which was principally in the hands of Italian empresarios.

However, Justo was not puzzled that this policy was accepted by the socialist deputies in the Italian parliament. Undoubtedly the explanation was that the socialist deputies knew of the terrible situation of the Argentine working class since the passage of the Law of Social Defense. Obviously, these deputies did not think the transatlantic

journey was worthwhile since workers were deprived of the right of freedom of assembly. A gesture or a word during a strike could be punished as a crime in Argentina. According to Justo, the socialists of Montecitorio, the plaza where the Italian parliament was located, knew that in the United States, Italians were not subject to this type of treatment.

Justo noted the prejudice against Italian immigrants in the United States. They were given the most degrading jobs. These immigrants were on the margin of society. Nevertheless, Justo understood the actions of the Italian legislators. The United States excluded anarchists. However, the labor and socialist movements were protected by law. Strikers were not hindered by governmental authority. The United States did not induce anyone to immigrate. Nevertheless, once admitted, the foreign worker enjoyed the protection of the law. In order to Americanize the immigrant wage-earner, it was necessary to make him acquire new appetites and to develop a sense of dignity. New York State legislation protected the less capable immigrant. It required employment agencies to tell the immigrant whether he was to serve as a scab.

Contrarily, Argentina's policy was to attract foreign workers to the country by any means. Justo noted that as a result of the restrictions enacted by the Italian government the demand for cheap labor increased. The Argentine government resolved to reduce port duties to two-thirds for ships which transported four hundred or more immigrants. It reduced duties to one-third for those ships which brought eight hundred immigrants to Argentina. Ships that brought twelve hundred immigrants to the country were exempt from all taxes. To Justo, what the government wanted was an unconscious and submissive labor class.[20]

Justo provided a thorough analysis of the financial situation of Argentina. First he provided a complete theoretical and practical study of the monetary problem of Argentina. Justo noted the development and evolution of paper money as well as the debasement of money by governments. This governmental fraud, beneficial to debtors, was ruinous to the poor who lived from wages and fixed salaries. Money with less value was exchangeable for a smaller quantity of products. Justo reasoned that the prices of all goods increased including the basic necessities while salaries increased very slowly. Although not properly a class question, money was of vital interest to the workers. Their political force should be directed to the solution of this grave economic problem. To Justo, superfluous and debased paper currency was the worst vice of the land-owning oligarchy of South America.[21]

Justo gave a chronological history of money in Argentina. He noted that the first issues of inconvertible money dated from 1826 when Argentina fought with Brazil. The quantity of paper money multiplied under Rosas. It reached its peak under the Presidencies of Juárez Celman and Pellegrini. These were the years of monetary disaster for Argentina which caused a profound economic crisis and mass anguish and misery. The emission of paper currency was so great that, notwithstanding the development of the country, the average value of a paper peso was less than forty centavos gold by 1890. Justo maintained that these emissions robbed the people of some of their money. He labelled these emissions forced loans and extortion. During the period 1893 to 1899 emissions ceased and the price of gold fell to two hundred pesos in 1899 in spite of the government.

Thereafter, according to Justo, exporters, protected industries, debtors, speculators, and politicians conspired to detain the valorization of paper currency. Their success was the law of 1899 which had been drafted by Tornquist, Pellegrini's technical advisor. The essential object of the Law of Conversion was to hinder the reduction of the price of gold. It was to insure, according to Justo, that the paper peso, with which salaries were paid, was never worth more than forty-four centavos gold. This enabled the members of the Rural Society, who were paid in gold for their bulls, geldings, wools, and skins, to make an enormous profit without any effort.

In the parliamentary sessions of August 5, 1914, Justo said that the Argentine government was ill-prepared to manage the country's finances. With businesses managed by non-naturalized foreigners, money had been the object of manipulation. According to Justo, the Socialist Party was needed in Argentina to deal with these problems from a socialist point of view. This it did from the time that La Vanguardia first appeared on April 7, 1894. At that time, Germán Avé Lallemant wrote an article on the significance of the price of gold on the working class.[22]

Justo emphasized the destructive effects of depreciated currency on the working class. The price of human labor did not rise as rapidly as other prices. Argentine money was a curse for the people and for that reason Argentine was one of the most backward countries. The monetary calamity was the fault of the government which wantonly violated basic monetary laws. This debasement, advocated by the oligarchy, was especially cruel because Argentine was intimately tied to world commerce. Justo reasoned that the prices of Argentine products and especially foreign products consumed in Argentine were fixed in the world market

where gold was the measure of value. The principal foods of the Argentine people, bread and meat, were articles of foreign commerce por excelencia, and their price in paper currency had risen with the increased price of gold.[23]

Within this framework, Justo lashed out against Professor Lorini of the University of Pavia who, after visiting Argentina, published in 1902 a work on the Argentine monetary system which favored the Law of Conversion. He was dismissed as a courtier by Justo. Lorini's wisdom had been obscured, according to Justo, by the recent death of his mother.

Justo was fearful that the consequence of Lorini's studies was more ominous than the Law of 1899. It provided an intellectual sanction to the South American governments for their blind and ruinous work in monetary matters. According to Justo, the most dangerous error made by Lorini was his comment on the harmless consequences of the emissions of paper pesos. Justo feared that the supporters of South American monetary disorder would apply this part of Lorini's doctrine as did the governments of Chile and Paraguay. Argentine paper money was a Minotaur fed with the gold and blood of the people. Justo said that Lorini was myopic, if Lorini denied what was universally known, namely, that devalued currency caused the misery of the working class.[24]

With the outbreak of World War I, Justo's attention was focused again on the Caja de Conversión which was closed by the government. The country was saturated with non-convertible paper money. Justo noted that neither Germany nor France, which were at war, closed their banks. He placed the responsibilities for the difficulties of the Argentine banks not on the war but on inept management.

Justo denounced the acts passed by the Argentine government as examples of false capitalism. The new debasement of money depressed real wages and benefited exporters and the Banco de la Nación. The closing of the banks interrupted the most basic relations of the entire life of the country in which money played a role. It violated Law 3871 which ordered that pesos be redeemed at the rate of forty-four centavos gold.

Justo proposed legislation to abolish Law 9483 which closed the Caja de Conversión and Law 9506 that prohibited the exportation of gold. The new debasement of money raised the prices of all articles of general consumption including sugar, herbs, coffee, and cloth above the increase caused by the war. Justo saw his function as national representative to guarantee the stability of the peso.[25]

Throughout August and September 1914, in a series of enlightened speeches, Justo denounced the closing of the Caja de Conversión. He noted the intellectual metamorphosis that led socialists to support the Law of Conversion by 1908. The socialists desired that the Law of 1899 be fully implemented. They wanted the peso stabilized at forty-four centavos gold. Justo reasoned that the socialist campaign for sound currency was in the best interest of the country. It proved, according to Justo, that the Socialist Party was a party of a class whose interests were more in harmony with the interest of all the people of Argentina.

He was pained by the closing the the Caja de Conversión because it demonstrated the uselessness of universal suffrage. Justo argued that the gold enclosed in the Caja de Conversión had never been considered by socialists as a sound guarantee of the representative value of the peso. The best guarantee was found in the effective circulation of gold pesos

and gold certificates exchangeable at any moment for gold. However, interrupt the daily conversion and the guarantee was stopped.[26]

Justo was critical of the government policy which prohibited the export of gold. He deduced that there was no reason to suspect that gold would leave the country. As a matter of fact, he noted the influx of gold to Argentina. He pointed out that Europe wanted gold so that it could buy Argentine products. As long as Argentina was neutral it was guaranteed a regular and growing influx of gold. According to Justo, gold would continue to come to Argentina as long as the country had wheat, meat, leather, and wool to export. Therefore, he viewed such a prohibition as a restriction on the development of Argentina. He likened the situation in Argentina to that of Spain in the sixteenth century and noted that the Spanish policy of prohibiting the exportation of precious metals was a disaster for the nation.

By 1920, Justo observed that the debasement of currency was greater than that allowed by the Law of 1899. The peso was worth much less than forty-four centavos gold. He complained that these measures which were never justified continued two years after the war ended.[27]

Justo showed how the devaluation of money affected the working class.[28] He noted that a substantial portion of the industrial and agricultural bourgeoisie viewed the debasement of money as a legitimate form of protectionism. He observed that the more ignorant and submissive the working people of a country, the more debased the money was in which they were paid. A prime example of this was Paraguay. The debasement of the wages of the Argentine working class in the period 1887 to 1897 was thoroughly illustrated by Justo with data from the municipal census of the capital of 1887 and the work of Adrían Patroni, Los Trabajadores en

Argentina 1898. In 1887, when one peso of national money was worth seventy-four centavos gold, the average daily wage of workers was 1.93 pesos or 1.43 centavos gold. However, in 1897, when one peso national money was worth thirty-four centavos gold the nominal wage increased to 3.05 pesos national money which was worth 1.04 centavos gold. In terms of real income there had been a debasement of the daily wage.

This devaluation restricted consumption. It limited imports. Coupled with custom duties and internal taxes, it raised the cost of living for the people. It aggravated the disequilibrium between the salaries of the workers and the nominal cost of living. This situation was aggravated further when the poorest and most backward provincial governments issued their own currency. Justo maintained that this money was used principally to pay salaries. In Salta and Jujuy where teachers were paid with provincial currency as in other provinces where local currency was used workers received very low real salaries which affected the economy of the nation. Consequently, this monetary policy reduced the working people to a state of misery. It led to a stagnation in the immigration movement. He cited the exodus of workers from Argentina. Justo noted that it was almost impossible for a worker to save money in Argentina. Workers were viewed by the governing class as a source of tax and exploitation.[29]

To Justo, the explanation for the debasement of money centered on Argentina's tie to the world market. Throughout the world the prices of articles and goods were reduced because of more efficient methods of production. However, production had not been subordinated rationally to the demands or needs of the consumer. Capitalists were concerned solely with the profits which they could draw from the labor of their workers.

Because Argentine products received such low prices in the world market, the capitalists relied upon an indirect method for securing profits. The estancieros and farmers understood the need to produce their products cheaper. Nonetheless they resisted improving their methods of production. Therefore, the working class paid for the mismanaged production by debased wages. By depressing wages and reducing production costs, exporters had pocketed as profits a part of this reduction. Justo noted that this ruinous action would stop only when the workers became knowledgeable.[30]

In the name of the Executive Committee he told the delegates at the Constituent Congress that in monetary matters the interest of the proletariat coincided with the interest of the most progressive and intelligent capitalists. He concluded that in monetary matters the state did not create; however, it had the power to rob and destroy.[31]

The devaluation of money was one of the manifestations of criolla protectionism. However, cheap money contrary to cheap bread was expensive for the working people. To Justo, the poor monetary system was not only a calamity for the working people. It also hindered the country's development. Artificially debased money was responsible for the high cost of living. Prices of imported articles were raised considerably as a result of this artificial reduction of the peso. Items produced in Argentina for exportation, such as meat and bread, sold for a higher price in paper pesos owing to this reduction. Therefore, real wages were depressed. It caused misery. This action was favored by the traditional forces such as estancieros, exporters, debtors, and bankers.

However, Justo argued that the resignation of workers to an inferior wage retarded technical progress. Where there was an abundancy of cheap

labor machines were not needed. Justo noted that the steam lift used to distribute materials in England was not used in Germany where salaries were lower. It was more convenient for the businessman to make the workers carry the bricks and line. Justo reported that the Australian worker who shears sheep received bouble the salary of the Argentine worker. Furthermore, the Australian worker slept on a bed, while the Argentine peon slept on the floor.[32]

Justo's through investigation of monetary matters led him to scrutinize custom duties. He reasoned that the high custom duties, on the basic necessities of life, raised the cost of living for workers. This increased production costs for the large producers. Justo argued that when prices on basic necessities increased, salaries necessarily increased to meet the cost of higherprices. Justo cited a report by Dr. Balbin, ex-Minister of Finance of the Province of Buenos Aires, who calculated that each person in the province paid annually sixty pesos of indirect national taxes, the lion's share of which was custom duties. Custom duties lowered the living standard of the worker at the same time that it raised the cost of his work. The farmers and <u>estancieros</u> were faced with increased production costs, according to Justo, since the duties on rice, salt, sugar, and cotton clothes increased the expense of sustaining the peons. By increasing production costs, the custom duties hindered the marketing of products or diminished profits.

Justo noted that English manufacturers understood this point when they supported the free trade campaign of Cobden, which was to diminish production costs. Therefore, in order to reduce production costs, foment immigration, and be assured of a competent working class, the agrarian groups, according to Justo, ought to make sure that basic articles

entered the country duty free. Justo viewed the custom duties on basic necessities and tools of the working class as the equivalent to a waste of real wage. It was a burden placed on the working class by the bourgeois state.[33]

Justo favored free trade between nations. He wanted nations to produce that which they were best capable of producing. He strongly opposed a protectionist policy for business. Existing duties were to be no more than necessary to sustain existing industries. However, custom duties would decrease gradually. Free competition would reign.

In a lengthy speech, given in the Cámara de Diputados, July 22, 1912, which evoked criticisms and applause, Justo lashed out against the custom duties, which brought revenues to the treasury under the guise of protectionism while raising the cost of living of the working class.[34]

In a report written at the request of the International Socialist Bureau on the high cost of living Justo stated that the general increase of prices implied the lowering of the value of gold. He contrasted the free circulation of gold with the custom duties that blocked the circulation of merchandise and blamed this situation for the increase of prices. Justo concluded that even articles produced more efficiently, now imported, were costly because of the high custom duties.[35]

Justo's ideas on protectionism have been severely criticized from a nationalist point of view. It has been argued that free trade hindered the development of Argentine industry and the development of an enlarged working class.[36]

There were some taxes which Justo favored. He urged copious inheritance taxes. He supported taxes on whiskey and automobiles. Justo wanted the cost of tavern licenses to be increased. Justo thought that

the private ownership of land was a noxious and absurd privilege when it hindered the cultivation and population of an area. Therefore, he favored a progressive, direct tax on land, which had been suggested by Quesnay in the eighteenth century, to alter the situation.

He noted the effects of such a tax on New Zealand. It reduced huge holdings, gave workers access to the land, and encouraged the cultivation of the soil. It contributed to making New Zealand one of the most flowering countries of the world. Justo noted that landed property had a tendency for its price to increase without the owner doing anything to improve the land. He reasoned that land was the most secure fiscal source which could be subjected to a tax without hindering the technical-economic development of the country. He wanted this tax system to be adopted in Argentina where land prices increased as a result of the work of society.

It was necessary that landowners understand that their property was conditional, relative, and prescribable. The state conserved in principl, according to Justo, the ownership of the land that it surrendered to individual exploitation. It reserved in all cases an increased portion of the increased value of the soil.[37]

Justo was extremely critical of the Argentine banking system. He argued that the capital of the Banco de la Nación resulted from the emissions of devalued currency and a loan whose service was paid by the entire nation. He criticized the bank for not contributing some of its profits to the public expense. He denounced the bank's lack of accountability to the state.

In the parliamentary session of May 31, 1915, Justo complained bitterly that he had been unable to obtain information from the bank on its

operation. He forcefully denounced this as a violation of the public interest and his right as a representative of the people. In his report "Como se manejan los dineros del Banco de la Nación" presented in the National Senate, August 26 to 28, 1924, Justo noted the trend to public accountability in the United States and demanded an investigation of the bank's operations. To Justo, the bank was born from the blood of the nation and therefore the nation had a right to some benefits.[38]

Justo was a tenacious fighter in behalf of public education. There was not a more important function of the state for a labor democracy than common education. This was part of Argentine historical tradition. It had been recognized by Belgrano, Rivadavia, and Sarmiento. Justo understood that the development of socialism paralleled the development of civilization. He recognized that it was impossible to speak of socialism to ignorant masses. He struggled to end illiteracy. It was a social plague. The salvation of the working class was education. Illiterates, Justo said, were condemned to slavery and exploitation in a modern society. This was equally valid for nations.

Justo illustrated the scope of the problem. The census figures of 1914 showed that 35.1 percent of the Argentine population over the age of seven was illiterate. He emphasized the criminal indifference of the authorities. This figure was greater than the illiteracy for blacks in the United States in 1910. Justo reasoned that with widespread education, the ignorance and backwardness of Argentine, the base of all injustice, slavery, exploitation, and misery, would end. Effective democracy needed an educated citizentry.[35]

According to Justo, it was necessary to prepare people for a technologically changing world. Education was the means which enabled an

individual to fit into modern society. It enabled him to adapt to the technical-economic evolution. Whereas Mill urged the state to indemnize workers dislodged by new inventions, Justo conceived of an education which empowered the worker with an ability to adapt to technical progress as well as to anticipate these changes and benefit from them. He recognized that neither technological progress nor democracy was conceivable in a country of illiterates. The development of a modern country without the exercise of universal suffrage was inconceivable. To Justo, modern governments viewed common education as an essential state function.[40]

Justo knew that the social transformation was an educational and economic transformation. It was especially an educational transformation. The worker, whose wages increased and working hours decreased, but spent his salary in a tavern, was a negative factor in the process of social transformation. Therefore, Justo fought for the education of the young masses. Unfortunately, Justo's projects for mass education were not passed by the time he died, January 9, 1928.

Throughout his political life Justo fought to make sure that illiteracy was non-existent in Argentina. He wanted Article 12 of the Law of 1884, which ordered the Argentine government to educate all children to read and write, to be implemented. His bills to establish schools were tied in with discussions of the national budget, banking, public works, and nationalism. Justo knew he was following the traditions of Sarmiento. He argued that national funds should be used to encourage the development of primary education throughout Argentina.

In Congress, on May 13, 1913, Justo declared that primary education was the most important branch of education. Unfortunately it was in a

deplorably backward state. Statistics of the National Council of Education were used by Justo to demonstrate this point. The school census of 1909 stated that out of every 1,000 children between six and fourteen years of age in Argentina, only 590 went to school. According to Justo, the urgency of the situation was illustrated by workers who, permitted to vote, served only as unconscious and degraded instruments of caudillos. Public education was necessary to conserve the national language as the creole population disappeared.

On September 3, 1913, Justo presented a bill to establish free, laic, public, primary schools wherever there were at least twenty children of school age. Charts were used to illustrate the shocking state of primary education in Argentina in 1912. Fifty percent of the school-age children lacked schooling. The rate of illiteracy among enlisted soldiers increased from 23.67 percent in 1890 to 32.60 percent in 1892. Justo appealed to the national pride of his colleagues. He argued that his plan could be implemented by 1916, the Centennial of independence. It would fulfill the works initiated by Rivadavia and Sarmiento. The means of the nation should be used for this end. On June 28, 1915, Justo presented a bill to construct 1,000 elementary schools in Argentina with funds of twenty-five million pesos deducted from the capital of the Banco de la Nación.[41]

Justo reconciled his national concerns with internationalism. Socialism was compatible with nationalism. The racial prejudices in the world led him to believe that the future of Argentina and Internationalism rested on each group concentrating on its own development. This was the type of patriotism that the Argentine socialists thought

most productive. As internationalists, it was logical to be concerned about the moral and material progress where one was born, lived, and worked.

In his interpellation of the Minister of War on March 5, 1915, Justo accused the governing class of abandoning completely the education of the mass of citizens. Justo had regarded this function as a sacred obligation of the state. He noted the special attention given to primary education in cultured and democratic nations. He stated emphatically that since Argentina was so backward culturally, primary education ought to be of greater concern to the country.

His patriotism was evident when he wrote that schools be free in order that sons of the illiterate proletariat receive an education, otherwise what kinds of mothers, fathers, and citizens would these people become? He reiterated this in the Congress on July 17, 1916, when he reintroduced the bill presented in 1913.[42]

Justo earned the title of precursor of university reform by virtue of his role in reforming medical procedures and by his assumption of the provisional presidency of the Círculo Médico in 1889. However, his right to this title was established fully by his actions in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

A student outburst against the old academies in 1903 to 1904 centered on Justo. He had been awarded a gold medal by the medical faculty. He was the recipient of a surgery award instituted by Manuel Augusto Montes de Oca. Justo received the highest grade in a competitive examination for the position of First Assistant Professor of Surgery. He was considered the originator of Argentine surgery to the asceptic

method and technique. Nonetheless, his name was not placed first on a list of candidates for the position of Professor of Surgery. This act of favoritism triggered a collective protest not only by the students but by numerous professors. It caused the academy to withdraw its listing of candidates from the University. The faculty understood that the moment had arrived to suppress the academy and replace it with a council composed of practicing professors elected by an assembly of professors and assistant professors. However, the reform was delayed for two years.

The well-thought-out plan of university reform of Dr. Juan R. Fernandez, an obstetrician and Minister of Public Instruction, was not implemented because Dr. Fernandez became ill. Meanwhile, another protest erupted in 1906 when the name of Dr. Julio Méndez was excluded from the terna, list of three names, to select a Professor of Clinical Medicine. This time the protest ended with the collapse of the discredited academies. The staff of the Facultad de Medicina protested to the Consejo Superior de la Universidad. The reform movement was brought to the attention of Minister Joaquín González. However, the academy fired four professors who signed the note to the Consejo. These were Justo, Texo, Repetto, and de Madrid. With the hindsight of more than fifty years La Prensa on January 1, 1958, wrote that this movement initiated the university reform program in the country.[43]

Justo earned this title by the lively speeches he gave in Congress from the time he was a freshman congressman until 1918 when the university reform movement exploded at the University of Córdoba. Many of Justo's comments on university education anticipated the students' demands of 1918. Justo had been appalled by the Cámara's rubber stamp approval

of the government's budget without discussions or analysis. He forced discussions of the budget especially when it related to university education.

On May 19, 1913, he criticized Argentine universities as poor copies of archaic European institutions. They created sinecures for men who judged their importance by the height of the backs of their chairs. He wanted a more practical university education. Justo desired that the various faculties be annexed to the various departments of government by function. He wanted the medical school annexed to the Department of Public Assistance, the Faculty of Law dependent upon the Ministry of Justice, the Engineering Faculty tied to the Ministry of Public Works and the Faculty of Agronomy dependent upon the Ministry of Agriculture.[44]

Throughout the years Justo criticized the Argentine universities. He disapproved of the excessive costs of the universities. Justo denounced the literalism that existed in universities. He was critical of a system where a student who studied pathology never saw a sick person. The various academic senates were anachronistic institutions. They were vestiges of the Middle Ages. He continually repudiated the obscurantism imposed by religion in the universities. Universities were repressive, corrupt, and wasteful. To Justo the universities were archaic, superfluous, expensive, and corrupt institutions por excelencia because they were the creations of the política criolla. Therefore, he reasoned that the Socialist Party represented the university ideas better than did the university in Argentina.[45]

As early as September 27, 1912, Justo cautioned the Cámara about university education at Córdoba. The dangers of clerical influence in the national colegio and university were stressed. Students were forced

to attend mass on specified dates. In mid-December 1915, Justo again cited the situation at the University of Córdoba. He based his comments on information supplied by students. The government never checked on federal monies spent by the University of Córdoba. According to La Voz del Interior on November 24, 1914, salaries were increased 20 to 130 percent. New positions were created. According to Justo, salaries accounted for 81.8 percent of the cost of the University of Córdoba as useless professorships multiplied and favoritism was rampant.

Furthermore, Justo reported that the administrative autonomy given to the University of Córdoba had a disastrous effect on the Facultad de Medicina and the hospital in Córdoba. Because the hospital was to be administered by a commission named by the Superior Council and composed of a member from each faculty, it was possible that a lawyer would be named president of the hospital.[48]

Justo's criticism crystallized when the students at the University of Córdoba revolted in 1918. Argentine students were influenced by the ideas which were embodied in the electoral Law of 1912. They were influenced by the doctrines that developed as a result of the war. In a manifesto of June 1918, they demanded a role in the governing of the university. The student movement at Córdoba, which eventually extended to all the universities of the country and resulted in the university reform, was championed immediately by Dr. Justo.

The subject dominated the sessions of the Cámara de Diputados of July 17, 24, 29, 1918. Justo had asked that the Minister of Instruction, Señor Salinas, be questioned immediately by the Cámara. Justo stated that he did not promote this interpellation as an act of opposition to the Yrigoyen regime. He wanted to stimulate the government into action.

Justo was concerned with the fate of the University of Córdoba. Furthermore, his intervention was requested by the students. University education was now part of the party's minimum program. Señor Salinas failed to accept the Cámara's invitation as President Yrigoyen questioned the ulterior motives of those who originated the resolution and evoked Executive privilege.[47]

Notwithstanding, the absence of Salinas, Justo gave one of his better speeches. This was the first defense of university reform, a reform of the method and programs of study. Justo viewed the government intervention in the provinces as a precedent for government intervention in this conflict. He viewed government intervention in the provinces as a preparation for the unification of the country.[48]

The sectarianism of the university was denounced. The University of Córdoba was infiltrated by an orthodox and intransigent catholicism. The course on ecclesiastical public law undermined the foundations of civic society. Students were forced to hear dissertations by professors paid 4,800 pesos a year on limitations on the state in its relationship with the church. The students heard criticisms of civil marriage and state control over primary education. The intellectual decadency and doctrinaire fiction of the university were illustrated by reference to texts used in the courses at the University written by the Chilean Bishop Fernandez Cocha and the Jesuit Mateo Liberatore.

Angrily, Justo related that 99 percent of "knowledge" at Córdoba was pure verbalism, a point he substantiated by citing Gaceta Universitaria, organ of the students of Córdoba. Sarcastically he reported that calculus was taught in ten days at the University. After ten days it was possible to receive the highest classification in the subject when elsewhere it

took years of assiduous work to master the subject. Justo was not surprised that this University which stressed verbalism had an inadequate library and inadequate laboratories. The library lacked the works of Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, Marx, Morgan, Stammler, Thierry and Carlos and Antonio Menger of the University of Vienna.

The financial administration of the University came under Justo's careful scrutiny. Although the University was subsidized to the tune of 1,400,000 pesos yearly, it failed to give an accounting of its resources in compliance with Law 1597, Article 1, clause 7. Justo emphasized that the money wasted at the University in one year was enough to construct an institute of chemistry. Justo reported that in German universities the proportion of the budget for salaries diminished while in Córdoba 88 percent of the budget went to salaries. The University of Córdoba was at the same point where the University of Berlin was a century ago. Justo cited the payroll of the University to note the nepotism which explained the superfluous positions in the University.

Justo concluded his remarks by pointing out that the students wanted a better education. They wanted new laboratories that they could use. They objected to obligatory attendance of absurd classes. Justo recommended that the University be decloistered. Useless professors were to be ousted. The physical plant and material were to be adequate for instruction. Justo urged the government to suspend its subsidy until the University was reorganized.[49] On the eve of his death, in an article addressed to young socialists, Justo with a great deal of satisfaction wrote that with the reform of 1918, professors, methods, and texts which hindered scientific, modern education fell loudly. This infused a new

spirit in the education of the country. It endowed the universities with a rather democratic organization.[50]

Justo was a bitter foe of useless courses, foreign lecturers who taught Argentine history, superfluous positions, and non-teaching administrators. Justo cited the work of Señor Pizzurno, who played an important role in the development of Argentine education, to point out that unfit individuals controlled Argentine education. Justo repeatedly stressed that it was important for administrators to teach classes since they were predisposed to lose their intellectual habits by their function. In the parliamentary session of September 8, 1919, he pushed for this reform, which eventually was enacted, by relating the homey story of an administrator of approximately 70 years of age that he had seen in Bern, while he attended the International Socialist Congress, who taught classes as did any other teacher.[51]

During a discussion on the budget of public instruction in the Cámara on December 21, 1914, Justo argued for the creation of normal schools. The country needed at least 60,000 teachers to educate the school age population which Justo estimated to number between one and a half million to two million children. He cited official statistics and noted unfortunately that in 1912 there were only sixty-eight normal schools with a total of 7,226 students. Furthermore, it had cost on the average 1,805 pesos national money per pupil in Argentina to educate a teacher. In 1911, in the United States the average cost per pupil was 248 pesos of national money.

Justo wanted the government to reduce expenses and improve the quality of normal education. He noted that the ratio of professors to students in Argentina was 1:4 while in the United States it was 1:20.7.

Justo demanded the elimination of superfluous positions. The educational results in Argentina were not superior nor even comparable to those obtained in more cultured countries where the costs of secondary education were much less.

Justo lashed out against the deplorable conditions under which the professors in normal schools worked. They lacked materials for experimentation. To Justo, the instruction of future teachers without elements of demonstration was a mental corruption of these future teachers. They would only be able to give an unproductive, verbal education to Argentine children.[52]

In the Cámara de Diputados on February 18, 1921, Justo denounced the shameful record of the Yrigoyen government in the field of education. He used material from the National Council of Education to illustrate his point. Justo emphasized that after five years of Radical government the state of primary government was deplorable. In 1916, 59.83 percent of the school-age population went to school. By 1919 this figure was 61.15 percent, an increase of 1.32 percent in the course of three years. Sarcastically, Justo noted that Argentina would need more than eighty-eight years of this kind of progressive government to abolish infantile illiteracy in Argentina.

Furthermore, Justo claimed that there was not a great increase in the number of schools during the last years. Although the number of national schools increased the total number of schools did not increase. In the provinces there was a stagnation if not an actual diminution of schools. The number of people educated lagged behind the increased school population.[53]

Justo's educational policy was not limited solely to the education of Argentine youth. The pioneers of the socialist movement understood the need for an intensive and extensive cultural education for the workers. They recognized the need for the diffusion of positive knowledge, scientific truths, esthetic notions, and ethical precepts. Without this knowledge the working class lacked the dynamic force which led to power.

Three institutions were founded by Justo to meet the needs of the workers. In mid-1896, the Centro Socialista de Estudios was founded in the City of Buenos Aires with the objective of forming a popular library and organizing lectures. Inspired by the Fabian Sciety in England, this institution was organized by Justo, Roberto J. Payró, Leopoldo Lugones, Carolos Malagarriga, and José Ingenieros. The first lecture was given by Justo on the "Método Cientifico." Short-lived, it gave its books and furniture to the citizens who founded the Biblioteca Obrera.[54]

In order to educate members of the Socialist Party, Justo founded the Sociedad Luz in 1901. It was a popular university to educate socialists about general ideas of science and contemporary problems. The Sociedad Luz organized lecturers throughout the city by competent persons. During the early years Dr. Augusto Bunge lectured about human health and the dangers of alcohol; Dr. Angel M. Giménez spoke about healthy sex and venereal diseases; Enrique Dickmann, a medical student, gave an elementary course on anatomy and physiology; Nicolás Repetto lectured on organic evolution; Carlos Roque discussed experimental chemistry; and Dr. Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, a lawyer, gave a course on universal history.[53]

A third institution created was the Associacion Obrera de Socorros Mutuos in 1898. The dual aim of this institution was to educate the working class to care for their own physical health and to instruct them in

the benefits of mutual medical assistance. This cosmopolitan institution, that admitted members of both sexes without distinction of nationality, race, or religion, was unique since mutualism in Argentina was at the time principally organized along the lines of nationality.[56]

Justo viewed the Co-operative movement as one of the means to improve the situation of the working class. The roots of the Argentina Co-operative movement were laid prior to his arrival on the political scene. The first Argentine consumer Co-operative, Sociedad Cooperativa de Almacenes, was started in 1884 by Carlos H. Otwell who was either British or of British descent. The bourgeois Co-operative disappeared in the economic crisis of 1890. The first workers' consumer Co-operative, founded by French socialists in 1885, disappeared in 1888 as a result of poor financial management. The reasons for the failure of the Co-operative bakery, established by the German Club Vorwarts in 1890, were more complex. The Co-operative, which lasted approximately eight years, failed because it offered credit, was not easily reached by workers, and was verbally attacked by anarchists. In June 1896 a publications Co-operative was founded. Its principal object was to print La Vanguardia. The rules of La Presse Socialista of Brussels served as the basis for the rules drawn up for this Co-operative by Dr. Justo, Augusto Kühn, and Juan Schaeffer. Justo was treasurer of the Administrative Council of this Co-operative which lasted five years.[57]

In 1897, the year that Justo gave his first lecture on Cooperación Obrera, Bartolomé Victory y Saurez died. Although neglected by socialist historians, Victory y Suarez, who immigrated to Argentine from Spain in 1857, was an enthusiastic partisan of the Co-operative movement. He defended the ideas of the pioneers of Rochdale with facts and data.

Although he did not have the doctrinaire solidarity and clarity of knowledge that distinguished Justo in his famous conference on Co-operation, it added another dimension to Victory y Suarez's profile as a precursor of Argentine socialism.[58]

The lecture Justo delivered on December 30, 1897, at the request of some workers, was given after he returned from Europe and seemed to have been influenced by La Maison du Peuple. This complete and conclusive lecture appeared in four issues of La Vanguardia. It destroyed errors, demolished prejudices, and rectified mistakes of Co-operativists. He sketched the direction for the principles of Co-operativism to triumph. Justo cited the antecedents for the Co-operative movement. He distinguished betewen forced and free Co-operation and producer and consumer Co-operatives. The Co-operative movement was one way to increase the measurable welfare of the people. Forced Co-operation was imposed under capitalist direction. Free Co-operation was the voluntary Co-operation of the working class. Within the free Co-operative the working class developed its aptitudes in order to organize and direct production. Here the proletariat, normally subject to the wage relationship, acquired rights and contracted obligations between equals. It required a greater capacity on the part of its members than the negative actions of strikes.

To Justo, the free Co-operative strengthened the working class. Inside of the free Co-operative the worker was not just a wage earner. He was a consumer, employer, producer, and owner of the means of production. It gave the greatest historic importance to the smallest amounts of money of the working population. Justo emphasized the distinction between forced and free Co-operation. The former was motivated by profits. The second was concerned with communal welfare and comfort.[59]

In 1923, in a bill presented to Congress, Justo noted other differences between stock companies and Co-operatives. The first were considered businesses for personal enrichment, insured the founders of high compensation, limited members by virtue of the considerable value of each stock, were of limited duration. Co-operatives were characterized by the fact that the founders did not seek any personal advantages, stocks were of moderate value, capital was limited, and it had an unlimited duration. Therefore, by their motives, ends, founders, and procedures, Co-operatives were entirely different from those entities of industry and commerce.[60]

Justo distinguished between the producer and consumer Co-operatives. He opposed producer Co-operatives. Inevitably they degenerated into simple capitalistic businesses. Eventually they were transformed into monopolies similar to other monopolies which produced merchandise to earn a profit rather than to serve social ends. Justo recalled the difficulties of producer Co-operatives. He noted the difficulty for workers to become owners of the means of production without individually becoming capitalists. Producer Co-operatives failed in France, England, Italy, and Belgium. There were no more than a thousand producer Co-operatives in the entire civilized world. Only a minority of the workers of the Co-operatives were members of the producer Co-operative.[61]

To Justo, the consumer Co-operative was the most eloquent manifestation of the economic power of the working class. It was a factor of growing importance in the centralization of the modern economy. It freed the proletariat from parasitic intermediaries. It raised the level of living of the working class and offered an infinite field for the

development of the technical-economic aptitudes of the people. Justo, who regretted that Marx did not give importance to the Co-operative movement, noted the success of consumer Co-operatives in England, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Holland, and Switzerland. Two million workers were associated with consumer Co-operatives. Justo pointed out the fallacy of the "iron law of wages" and noted that the highest wages were found in England where the consumer Co-operative had its greatest development and the retail cost of consumer articles was lower. He reasoned that the consumer Co-operative improved the standard of living of its members, accelerated industrial evolution, and educated its members. They were an eloquent expression of a new grade of consciousness of the proletariat.[62]

Justo favored the complete autonomy of the Co-operative movement. His report on the Conference of Berne urged the socialist parties to relinquish all ideas of extending their hegemony over the Co-operatives. For this reason Justo was critical of the decisions on this question for the International Congress of Copenhagen of 1910 which he had attended as a representative of the Argentine Socialist Party. He reasoned that the ties between the Socialist Party and the Co-operative were to be solely emotional and intellectual. The Co-operative movement had an end unto itself.

On June 7, 1920, Justo recalled the situation in Copenhagen. He criticized the sectarian character of the Co-operative movement in Belgium, and praised the German attitude of full autonomy for Co-operatives. He noted that Lenin, whose proposal on this subject Justo opposed in the plenary session, proposed not to recognize the democratic and socialistic action of the Co-operative until there was a complete expropriation of

the capitalists. Commenting at a time when his party was plagued by the attacks of communists, Justo cited the words of Russian Co-operativists found in the organ of the League of Swiss Consumer Cooperatives, to demonstrate that Lenin's ideas expressed in 1910 were not implemented under the Bolshevik regime that some considered the future society.

Justo concluded that it was evident that socialism was a more complex process than the simple political action of the workers. The conquest of public power was one means to establish the socialization of the means of labor. Although the conquest of public power was the objective of the Socialist Party, Justo reasoned that the working class had to strive for immediate goals outside politics. The free Co-operative, the economic action of the worker, was another powerful means of establishing the collective ownership of the means of labor.[63]

In a bill presented to the Cámara de Diputados, in 1923, Justo noted that the economic action of the working class was one of the new characteristics of the most developed nations. No longer limited merely to working in production, workers wished to decide what to produce. They aspired to direct the social economy. They wanted to organize men to the ends of production and exchange of products. Technological Co-operation already existed in vast proportions inside capitalistic businesses and in the operations of governments. This obliged, coerced Co-operation was facilitated by the circumstance that the workers did not own the means of production either as individuals or collectively. Coercion was necessary for the technical work of all, for conserving and developing the means of production, and for making good use of raw materials. With the socialization of the means of production, workers would not have the free

individual possession of their means of production. They would still employ them as directed.[64]

By 1922 it was obvious to Justo that the coercion for the technical work was not exclusively part of the capitalistic regime. It existed under the Russian communist regime. On the other hand, the economic work, the direction of the technical work, had to be diffused among the masses, rather than businessmen, merchants, and bankers, to insure that production satisfied necessities and did not depend on greed However, the association of the economic forces of the masses had to be spontaneous and free. Production was to be organized on a new basis. To Justo, the Co-operative movement was a powerful means to abolish exploitation.[65] At a dedication ceremony for houses built by a labor Co-operative, Justo reiterated that the new feature of the labor Co-operative was the economic labor of the members who determined to build the houses and used technology for this purpose. He urged that on the building they inscribe "the work of the economic strength of the workers freely associated with the Co-operative El Hogar Obrero."[66]

In 1898 Justo founded a consumer Co-operative. Its statutes edited by Justo were concise. Essentially, shares cost ten pesos; each member had one vote; items were sold for cash; 60 percent of the profits were distributed to the members in proportion to their consumption. Thirty percent went to a reserve fund. Ten percent was for salaries. However, the Co-operative did not have salaried employees. It was opened only evenings. Utilized by people who lived a good distance from it, the coup de grâce was given when a police edict prohibited people from carrying packages in the street after ten o'clock in the evening.

Notwithstanding the almost religious devotion of its members, the Co-operative disappeared within three years. However, other Co-operatives of short duration sprang up in different cities. There were bread, meat, clothing, and consumer Co-operatives. Compana, San Nicolás, La Plata, Rosario, Bahía Blanca, Tolosa, and San Nicholás de las Arroyas all had had Co-operatives.[67]

Therefore, when Justo and thirteen other people founded El Hogar Obrero in 1905, Justo had had a rich background in the Co-operative movement. El Hogar Obrero, a limited Co-operative of Credit and Construction, was modeled after a construction Co-operative of Dayton, Ohio. Justo was the president of the first nine directories of this Co-operative. He drafted the statutes for the organization. Article 2 of the Statutes explained that the object of the Co-operative was to provide credit to the members for the acquisition of homes and for other proven needs. This Co-operative began its operation in 1907 after Dr. Alfredo L. Palacios persuaded Congress to exempt Co-operatives from paying a license fee of at least 1,000 pesos to the government. Justo emphasized that the important thing about El Hogar Obrero was the creation of new homes through the production of the people.[68]

Justo's record, while president of El Hogar Obrero, illustrated the methods he applied in order to develop, consolidate, and guide the coperative. El Hogar Obrero was the positive proof of Justo's theoretical principles. The first eight years of El Hogar Obrero were marked by progress. One hundred sixty small houses and two working-class quarters were built. Justo reasoned that it was important to build inexpensive houses which the working class could afford to purchase. He wanted to build houses that compared in cost to those built in Europe. At the

inauguration of the working-class quarters in Ramos Mejía, Justo expressed his pleasure by reporting that this development was the first important demonstration of the capacity of the Argentine working class. It was proof of their ability to join and administer their savings without the aid of a parasitic managerial class. To Justo, these better constructed houses were proof that only the working class was capable of resolving its housing problems. However, Justo noted that more houses would have been built had not taxes devoured one-tenth of the money. Therefore, Justo continually demanded that the government do away with taxes which hindered this positive and necessary activity.

At the dedication ceremony of a group of houses in Turdera in September 1914, Justo urged the working class to put its savings in El Hogar Obrero instead of banks which encouraged speculation. It was a wise and secure investment. Inexpensive houses were built. The worker had control of the use of his money through his participation in assemblies. He elected the directors of the Co-operative.

In a bill presented to the Cámara de Diputados in 1915, Justo emphasized that the directory of El Hogar Obrero was made up of workers such as the chauffeur, Juan Calabrese; the baker, Baliño Gonzalez; the the belt maker, Antonio Planas; and the painter, Juan Petragli.[69] Notwithstanding, the campaign of defamation against El Hogar Obrero, spearheaded by the Radical deputy Dr. Tomás A. Le Breton in the midst of the election of 1916 and the paralyzing of the construction and credit section of the Co-operative owing to the war, the activity and membership of El Hogar Obrero increased.[70]

After Justo returned from the Co-operative Congress at Hamburg in 1910, El Hogar Obrero developed a consumer section in 1913. The

consumption of members increased continually until 1920. Then it dipped in the wake of the world depression. It increased again in 1924. By 1926 El Hogar Obrero had grown tremendously. It had 7,131 members and a capital of 683,349.71 pesos.[71]

Throughout his legislative career Justo struggled to get the Cámara to pass legislation on behalf of Co-operatives. Until 1926, when this legislation was passed, Co-operatives were viewed as commercial societies and regulated by the Codígo de Comercio. The Codígo's greatest defect was that it failed to distinguish between Co-operatives and societies which were not authentically Co-operatives. The first bills, proposed by Senator Uriburu in 1905, Dr. Lobus in 1911, and Dr. Mujica in 1912 (the latter two men were Ministers of Agriculture in the Sáenz Peña government), centered on agricultural Co-operatives. They did not propose a base for a general law for Co-operatives.

It was not until Justo presented his bill in 1915, which he modified in 1921 and 1923, that Congress was presented with a proposal that dealt with a general law of Co-operatives applicable to all Co-operatives. The bill characterized those entities as ones whose objective was the collective welfare of the members by means of their own economic action.[72] Justo did his best to spell out the origin and use of capital in a Co-operative. The bill was to create the legal atmosphere in which the economic activity of the working class could develop. Article 3 of the bill read, "Until today, the workers have carried out production; it is necessary that they begin to organize it, and this is the goal of the good and genuine Co-operative societies."[73]

Unfortunately, the times were not right for the passage of this bill. The deputies were ignorant of Co-operatives. Nevertheless, this

did not stop other attempts to get such legislation passed. Following Justo's attempt in 1915, there were other men who proposed legislation on Co-operatives. These proposals tried to get such legislation by going through the back door. They sought legislation on agricultural Co-operatives.

With the experience he developed over the years, Justo amplified his earlier project. On 1921 he presented another bill to the Cámara. This bill stressed the differences between capitalists and Co-operative societies. It recommended that the word "limited" accompany the name of the Co-operative. Credit in consumer Co-operatives was prohibited. It limited the use of Co-operative service to members.

Justo's bill provided for accountability in Co-operatives. Railroads were to give land to agricultural Co-operatives so that granaries and storage bins might be constructed near stations.

Justo was opposed to credit Co-operatives. Nonetheless, he incorporated credit Co-operatives in his bill in order to get the project approved. He knew that he operated in a legislative body which did not vote questions of a general character. However, when it was time to vote on the issue, Justo, now a Senator, worked successfully to separate concessions of credit from the general law of Co-operatives. The socialists were aided by legislation suggested by Dr. Quirós in 1921 and Dr. Sagarna, President Alvear's Minister of Justice, in 1924.[74]

By the time the law of Co-operatives was passed on December 20, 1926, there had been a great deal of material at the disposal of Congress. The major part of Law 11.380 was based on Justo's bills. After twenty-five years of hard work, Law 11.380 was incorporated into the Codígo de Comercio. It was the most complete and advanced legislation on this

subject at the time. At the inauguration of apartment houses on Calle Cangallo 2070 on April 6, 1927, Justo recalled the contribution that Dr. Sargarna made to the passage of the law of Co-operative societies. Joyfully, Justo commented that the law anticipated the social state socialists desired in which everything that was not government property would be Co-operative property.[75]

Justo made a complete study of the agrarian problem in Argentina. With the knowledge acquired in Junín, Justo spoke on El programa socialista del campo on April 21, 1901, in the salon Vorwarts of Buenos Aires.[76] He exposed the agrarian problem and sketched a program of action to remedy the situation. The basic problem was the distribution of land. Justo argued that it was necessary to destroy the latifundios. The land had to be given to those who actually worked it. He saw this as a means of assimilating a good portion of the immigrants. It was necessary, if the number of farms and production were to increase. This division was a prerequisite if the rural population was to grow. It was necessary for the progress of the country. It was a sine qua non if politics were to leave the degenerate state of caudillismo. Justo urged Argentina to follow the example of New Zealand, which placed a progressive tax on the latifundios. He noted the lack of social responsibility of the large landowners. At the very least, the progressive tax insured the national treasury of a large part of the increased value of the property. This idea was implemented for two years, 1925 to 1927, by the Cámara de Diputados of the Province of Buenos Aires.[77]

Justo favored the formation of a family farmer. This was necessary for the growth of democracy and progress of the country. Notwithstanding the fact that they employed wage earners, Justo classified the

moderate farmer and tenant farmer as workers. He reasoned that their incorporation into the party strengthened the socialist nucleus of the country. He urged the party to make common cause with the small farmer whenever possible. Thereby the party indirectly defended the rural proletariat.

The tenants were the victims of the greedy landowners. Eight-tenths of the soil was worked by tenants. He noted the negative features of their leases. Sometimes they paid a fee of 40 percent of their produce or an equivalent in money to the landowners. Justo wanted them to be given long-term leases as well as a guarantee of some type of indemnity for the improvements they made on the property. He denounced the seizure of tools for debt payment. Justo was critical of the tax system which burdened the small owners and tenants.

Justo wanted the creation of small family-size farms owned and worked by people for whom the land was a means of production rather than a source of profit. The majority of small farmers were foreigners. To Justo they lacked either political rights or were ignorant of how to use their rights and were therefore unable to alter their situation. With this situation, what could the peons expect?[78]

Justo noted that the Census Report of 1895 reported that the rural population made up 57.2 percent of the country. He rejected the idea that the prosperity of agriculture and cattle raising depended on lower wages. Higher wages were paid in Montana, Michigan, and Nebrasks. He demanded the repeal of burdensome taxes. Realistically he recognized the improbability of obtaining legislation on behalf of the rural worker in a country where children were exploited in factories.

The living conditions of the workers were deplorable. They were inferior to animals in many cases. They slept on the ground on beds of branches and crossed twigs. When it rained they slept outdoors. They gave up their shelter in order that the sheep be kept dry. It was impossible to shear wet wool. Although the peon was paid in piece work, it was to the owner's interest not to lose a day. It cost him to maintain the personnel on days of forced rest. The men who operated the threshing machines did not have any covering to protect them from the sun or a decent place to eat, or a bathroom. It was no wonder that men turned to alcohol in this environment.

Justo contrasted this with the situation in New Zealand. There the law demanded annual inspections of places where workers worked, slept, and ate. Those who violated the law were fined. Justo urged the workers to organize and to take direct action to improve their living and working conditions.[79]

At the Fourth Congress of the Socialist Party, which met in La Plata July 7 to 8, 1901, the party adopted Justo's program. The minimum program was modified. It called for the abolition of taxes which hindered agricultural and cattle production; a direct progressive tax on profits from the land; the exemption of the small rural property owner from direct taxation; the indemnization of tenants for the improvements that they made; the regulation of agricultural work; and hygienic lodging for farm workers.

Thereafter the fight in behalf of the small farmer, tenant, and worker intensified. La Vanguardia published a series of articles publicizing the agrarian problem. Organizations were founded in different parts of the provinces of Buenos Aires and Santa Fe. In 1902 the first

Agricultural Congress met in Pergamino and was attended by various groups of the Socialist Party. Basically, this Congress followed Justo's ideas. These ideas were discussed and expanded in periodicals and Congress by Justo as he presented the agrarian problem clearly and offered remedies for this problem.[80]

To Justo this was a Latin American problem. It needed to be resolved in order for these countries to develop and maintain their autonomy. Justo placed the landowners' desire for profits in opposition to the welfare of the country. It was wrong for the latifundistas, whose immense lands were depopulated and hardly cultivated, to control the life of the continent. Notwithstanding the fact that these latifundistas preferred that this area be nothing more than a great breeder of cattle and sheep, it was necessary, according to Justo, that it become a densely populated agricultural area.[81]

The agrarian problems were discussed in terms of population by Justo. Three and a half centuries after the Spanish conquest, Argentina had less than three people per square kilometer. Unfortunately, the population had increased only from four million people in 1895 to eight million in 1914. This resulted from the monopolization and speculation in land, the vassalage of the rural population, and the poorly cultivated or abandoned fields. Justo illustrated this point by noting that emigration from Argentine was over 46.30 percent of immigration in contrast to the United States where it was only 20 percent of immigration. Argentina was a great encampment where life was insecure and where it was extremely difficult to find permanent work.

Justo used official statistics of the Minister of Agriculture to illustrate the degree to which land was monopolized in Argentina. He

pointed out that in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Santa Fe, and Entre Ríos rural properties of less than one thousand hectares accounted for only 15.69 percent of the total land surface sold in 1914. It was virtually impossible for rural workers to acquire land. Therefore, the proportion of tenant farmers was extremely high. Agricultural statistics for 1914 to 1915 showed that more than 67 percent of Argentine cereal farms were in the hands of tenants.

Justo noted the paradoxical position of the Socialist Party which wanted more farms farmed by workers who loved the soil and wanted to secure their labor, life, and liberty. Justo urged the government to note the practice of the United States and offer cultivable free land to workers. He cited the United States to point out that unlike industry there was an inverse evolution in farming. Decentralized agriculture was motivated by the necessity of intensifying production. Justo argued that there was a tremendous need to increase the rural population in order to extend and intensify the cultivation of the soil.[82]

Justo realized that the country could not be healthy while the rural worker was in misery. Justo painted a depressing picture of rural life. He noted that the estancias were no place for a worker with a family. According to Justo, sexually the peons were condemned to practically a military life. In the Cámara de Diputados, in 1923, Justo emphasized the abnormal demographic composition of rural Argentina. He pointed out that 19.85 percent of the rural population were women, 27.54 percent were children, and 52.59 percent were men.

Family farms were beneficial for Argentina especially in terms of politics. In contrast with the estancias, where few children were born, almost all of whom were illiterate, the creation of a large class of autonomous independent farmers benefited the Argentine political scene.

Justo stressed the need to populate Argentina in order to civilize the country. He understood that it was necessary to subdivide the land in order to populate it. He cited the results of the French Revolution to illustrate this point. As a result of the French Revolution the land was surrendered to the cultivators. This was the starting point of a rapid agricultural progress and an increased demographic movement.

Justo pointed out that tenants often lacked contracts or had contracts for only a year. Their families were packed into shacks which lacked windows and floors. The cabins were full of vermin and rats. Bubonic plague was endemic. Alcoholism was rampant. To Justo, it was no wonder that rural areas were deserted or that the number of females was so small. The land was exploited. Agricultural technology suffered. These provisional farms were systematically impoverished and plundered by rootless farmers who continually grew wheat and maize. Grain rotted in the open air for lack of installations. The situation was aggravated by oscillation of prices in the world market and speculation.

Justo noted that a tax such as that on galvanized iron, which was used to make roofs and sheds, increased the cost of building farm houses and raised the price of production. It made life odious for the farmer. Noting the privileged position of the sugar, wine, and refrigerated meat industries, Justo emphasized the class character of taxes. Burlap and bags used for the packaging of cereals were taxed heavily while casks for wines were exempt from taxation.[83]

In 1912 a farm strike, Grito de Alcorta, erupted. It voiced the complaints of the tenants of the Provinces of Buenos Aires, Santa Fé, Córdoba, and the territory of La Pampa. The strike intensified. There were reprisals. Landlords cancelled contracts, seized the machines, tools,

and horses of the farm workers and threw the tenants into the street. Tenants were arrested. Many were expelled under the ley de residencia. Justo went to Santa Teresa to study the situation. Thereafter the newly elected deputy protested against the brutality with which the workers were treated.[84] In one of his first parliamentary acts he interpellated the Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Adolfo Mujica. Justo wanted the government to explain its action in this conflict.

For the first time the National Congress dealt with a subject that by its very nature made evident the complicity of the government with the landowners. Justo dismissed Dr. Mujica's statement that the conflict was the work of professional agitators. Justo argued that this was a genuinely campesino movement. He was sure. He met the organizer of the movement, Dr. Francisco Netri. Justo explained in detailed fashion the conditions that caused the strike. Contracts were cited to illustrate the exorbitant demands of the landowner. These contracts were for two years. Justo emphasized that the 38 percent gross of the harvest owed to the landlord was in reality 60 percent by virtue of other obligations placed on tenants. This was aggravated by other high-handed actions of the landowners. They decided on the machines to use for threshing. They failed to compensate tenants for improvements to the land. Tenants were obligated to insure their harvests against hailstorms in companies selected by the landlords.

Justo welcomed this strike. It would lead to the transformation of national politics as did the urban labor agitation. With sarcasm and wit that brought laughs from the gallery Justo ridiculed the government's contention that Argentina was in the best of all possible worlds. He

exposed Dr. Jujica's ignorance of the issues that burdened agriculture in Argentina.[85]

Justo noted the violent aspects of the strike. The principal feature of the strike was to suspend the work of sowing and threshing. It was necessary to prevent these destructive conflicts which disturbed the principal branch of national production. To Justo, these strikes were harmful not just to the landowners but to the entire nation. Nonetheless, Justo argued that the actions of the campesinos were healthier than those of the landowners who resisted shamefully a basic human movement.[86]

Justo reasoned that agrarian laws were of general interest. He urged government price-fixing on rent. He cited the precedents for price-fixing and reasoned that if the government did not intervene immediately on the subject it would be forced to intervene after a long, destructive struggle took place between landlords and tenants. Again Justo urged the passage of a progressive tax on the increased value of the land. This would make it easier for workers to get land and it would cut down on speculation.[87]

His ideas were reflected in his fight for agrarian legislation from 1912 to 1927. Basically Justo wanted legislation which gave stability and guarantees to tenants, combatted the monopoly of landowners and speculators, and made good use of public lands. Justo reasoned that the agrarian question was the most fundamental question in Argentine politics. It had to be resolved for national and international reasons.

On August 4, 1913, he presented a bill for the indemnization of tenants who improved the land. He cited statistics of the Minister of Agriculture to point out that 66.9 percent of the farms in the Provinces

Buenos Aires, Santa Fé, Córdoba, Entre Ríos, and the territory La Pampa were cultivated by tenants. Therefore it was necessary to legislate a more stable and secure existence for them.

On September 5, 1914, Justo stressed that it was essential that the government teach the agrarian population to read. He reasoned that the farmer had to have knowledge for his own technical-economic direction. He cited the report of the Austrian Socialist Otto Bauer which demonstrated that agricultural production per hectare was greater in Western Europe than in Eastern Europe where the people were illiterate. In Belgium a hectare of wheat gave 26.6 quintals average while in Russia it gave 6.9 quintals and in Argentina 8 quintals.[88]

After twenty years of struggle, Law 11.170 was passed on September 28, 1921, much to Justo's satisfaction. This was the first serious attempt to modify the civil code as it related to leases of rural land. The law applied to areas of land no larger than three hundred hectares. It called for a four-year lease, cash indemnity for improvements on the land, and abolition of the practice of crops being sold to the landlords. However, there were a number of defects in the law. Law 11.170 applied basically to agricultural areas and excluded cattle establishments. It did not apply to areas larger than three hundred hectares or cover, according to Article 17, irrigated lands. On May 15, 1925, Justo presented a bill to the Senate to correct these defects. He was unsuccessful.[89]

Justo realized that laws which regulated relations between landlords and tenants did not resolve the basic question. He wanted the destruction of the latifundias. On July 16, 1917, he presented a bill on this subject which was reintroduced July 6, 1922. This bill called for

property evaluations every ten years, declarations of the value of land by owners, and a progressive tax.[90]

Justo's last major work on this subject took place on April 20 to 21, 1923. In a parliamentary debate he showed superb form in handling the narrow criteria and destructive ideas of the cattle barons who had presented a bill to deal with a "cattle crisis." When he was sure of a quorum, Justo dealt with the issue. He explained that the issue under discussion was not a cattle crisis but an agrarian question. It was the national question por excelencia. He denounced the lack of patriotism of the latifundistas and ganaderos who were more concerned with the number of cattle and sheep in Argentina than with the number of fellow citizens. He wanted the number of small farms to increase at the expense of the estancias. Justo, who had made a thorough study, concluded that it cost less on a farm in the United States to produce a ten-month-old calf than in areas destined exclusively for the breeding of cattle. Therefore, he argued that it was necessary to raise cattle as a side activity to agriculture.

Justo labelled the proposed legislation restrictive, negative, and destructive. He opposed any prohibition on the exporting of cattle because of apparent low price. To Justo it was a world problem. He noted that Australia and New Zealand increased their exports of cattle. Justo urged the cattle barons to sell their products on the market for the same price that meat of similar quality received.[91]

Many of the ills of Latin American society and especially Argentina Justo placed at the door of the Roman Catholic Church. Religion was the opiate of the masses. It was a spiritual yoke that made them obedient to the dominant social system. To Justo, religion separated rather than

united man. It lacked any progressive tendencies. It invented myths. Justo reasoned that as man better understood his relationship with the physical-biological environment, the hold of religion weakened.

Justo used the statistics of the Anuario Estadistico for the Federal Capital to point out that the precentage of religious marriages fell from 66.31 percent for the period 1892 to 1900 to 49.43 percent for the period 1909 to 1914. However, religious marriages in the wealthy parish of Socorro accounted for 66.35 percent of marriages between 1882 to 1907. Justo reasoned that as the masses became more irreligious the alliance between religion and privilege became more obvious. The clergy was supported by all who possessed wealth; the large landowners, industrialists, and financial interests were the pillars of the Roman Catholic Church. Justo demanded the separation of Church and State. The precedent for such an action was set in 1884 when President Roca's proposal for civil registers was enacted into law on October 25, 1884.[92]

Exploiting patriotic sentiments, Justo denounced the invasion of Argentina by a legion of foreign ecclesiastical orders. Whereas in 1853 there were three orders, in 1926 there were more than fifty foreign congregations in Argentina. In Córdoba 52 out of 149 clergy were foreigners; in Santiago del Estero 8 out of 14 clerics were foreigners; in San Juan all the Jesuits were Spaniards; and in Mendoza 19 out of 25 clergymen were foreigners. Justo concluded that Argentina was an ecclesiastical province to the clergy. Justo did not want the state to protect the church. He wanted the state to keep it within bounds. The composition of the clergy was due to the fact that Argentine youth were not entering the profession. To Justo this was a normal, healthy

evolution. He noted that this trend existed overseas and cited Germany to show that the church was alarmed by the decrease of theological students.[93]

Justo emphasized the correlation between Catholicism and immorality. Justo made use of the work of the criminologist Lombroso, L'uomo deliquente. Justo noted that crime was higher among Catholics than non-Catholics. In Prussia, out of every one hundred Catholics 0.87 percent were criminals, while among atheists 0.37 percent were criminals. He cited the work of Enrique Ferri to show the religiosity of criminals. Many criminals kept religious images. Justo stressed that religious sentiments did not hinder criminal acts. These sentiments were used to sanctify the criminal actions.

The ties of Catholicism to crime were seen in collective criminality. Italy, the cradle of the Papacy, was the country of the Mafia and the Camorra. It was where fascism developed and came to power by means of systematic violence. Italy produced the largest number of anarchist assassins of heads of state. Italian anarchists assassinated Sadi Carnot, Cánovas del Castillo, the Empress of Austria, and King Humberto. It was this same tendency to violence that was responsible for Catholic countries conserving the custom of dueling that hypocritically was punished by a penal code.[94]

The same lack of moral control explained the fact that Catholic countries had the highest numbers of illegitimate births. He noted the misfortune of those who lived in countries where divorce was forbidden. It resulted in consensual marriage.

The same tie existed between Catholicism and prostitution. To Justo, regulated prostitution was a Catholic institution. In non-Catholic

areas prostitution was prohibited by law and not exercised as a social function. Cynically, Justo stated that prostitution was not important to Catholic morality because it was necessary for some people to go to hell.

Gambling and alcoholism were tied to Catholicism. Monte Carlo was a Catholic Principate. Baden-Baden was a Catholic section of Germany. Justo noted that Argentina, which supported the Catholic Church, had as one of its important national institutions a national lottery. Justo was critical of the aristocratic clubs in Argentina, attended by overt Catholics, where men lost their honor. Justo claimed that savings banks had degenerated into gambling houses in the Province of Buenos Aires under the Catholic Governor Señor Cantilo. They had periodic drawings for prizes.

The Catholic Church prevailed in countries where the horrors of alcoholism reigned. It was the non-Catholic countries which initiated the fight against the degeneracy caused by alcohol. Justo regretfully noted that it was in Argentina where the attempt was made to present the consumption of alcohol as a patriotic action in order to insure the prosperity of certain regions of Argentina.[95]

Throughout his parliamentary career Justo opposed the church playing any role in public education. In the session of September 10, 1912, Justo objected to the fact that students of the national colegios were coerced into attending church services. Justo referred in particular to Dr. Rafael Garcia Montaña, Rector of the National Colegio de Córdoba. Justo reasoned that the Catholic Church mutilated the spirit and engendered hypocrisy. It created citizens who were concerned with symbols and not substance. To Justo this patriotism was analogous to the charity of

a nun who in a hospital denied water to a dying man because he did not confess. The schools of Colombia were controlled by the clergy. Justo noted that its currency was devaluated and the country dismembered. In Ecuador mobs inspired by religious fanatics assassinated ex-President Eloy Alfaro. Therefore, Justo proposed a bill that prohibited universities from allocating monies for religious ceremonies.[96]

In his classic speech on the subject of the church given in the Cámara de Senadores on September 23, 1926, Justo denounced the church doctrine that truth arrived by way of revelation as counter to modern educational philosophies. Truth was taught together with the method to arrive at it. Justo denounced miracles as inhibitory and paralyzing. They suppressed the initiative of the individual.

Justo noted that in areas where the Catholic Church was strong, the mortality rate was higher. He supported this thesis with statistical data taken from official sources of Germany and New Zealand. In Italy there was a mortality rate of 15.8 per thousand. Poland had a rate of 17.8 per thousand. Russia, which used more wax candles than the Catholic Church in 1912, had a mortality rate of 25.2 per thousand. Spain's rate was 21.9 per thousand; Portugal 25.6 per thousand; and Chile 31.4 per thousand. In non-Catholic Germany the rate was 13.9 per thousand. Switzerland had a rate of 11.8 per thousand. In Uruguay, where church and state were separated, there was a mortality rate of 12.0 per thousand.[97]

In his discourse on church-state relations, in 1926, Justo expressed his disdain that the state was involved in the selection of an Archbishop for Buenos Aires. Justo demanded the suppression of the patronage, and the separation of church and state. Justo made his points by use of

sarcasm, wit, and humor. He denied that the patronage concerned the state. Facetiously he noted that without Bishops the harvest would still be abundant and national morality would not decay. Because the church argued that the right of patronage was not an attribute of sovereignty nor a concession by the church to the state, Justo, with tongue-in-cheek, questioned whether Jesus Christ conceded it. With a great deal of levity Justo questioned whether the Argentine navy would bombard the Vatican if the church denied the patronage.

Justo noted that in the concordat between the Italian government and the Vatican, the state conceded absolute ownership to the Pope of an automobile road that led to the seacoast. Justo queried whether the road was for the Vatican to receive foreign diplomats or to enable the Pope to escape when circumstances demanded. The gallery laughed. Justo thought it absurd that the Senate was occupied in designating a functionary that proclaimed his absolute allegiance to an old Italian. Again the gallery laughed.[98]

Justo knew that Article 2 of the Constitution established that the state sustain the Catholic Church. However, he noted that the present situation differed from 1853 when the Constitution was developed. Under the shadow of the campesina insurrection, partly undertaken with the slogan of "Religion or death," the creators of the Constitution included Article 2. Justo reasoned that the creators of the Constitution hoped eventually to subdue the church. Justo pointed out that he was elected by 80,500 votes to the Senate. He interpreted this as a mandate to fight for the separation of church and state, to expel church congregations illegally established in Argentina, and to confiscate church property.[99]

In the course of dealing with the major problems affecting Argentina, Justo showed himself to be concerned with the welfare of the Argentine nation. The reforms he proposed were geared to raise the moral and material level of the Argentine working class, thus making them better citizens of Argentina. However, the nature of Justo's "patriotism" became more evident when he addressed himself to some of the most important international issues of his day.

CHAPTER II

FOOTNOTES

[1]Enrique Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 243-245; John J. Johnson, Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 99.

[2]Juan B. Justo, La obra parlamentaria del diputado socialista por la capital Juan B. Justo Mayo 1912-Abril 1913 (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1913), p. 10 (hereafter referred to as La obra parlamentaria 1912-1913).

[3]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 253-255; Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la política: De Doca a Yrigoyen (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1956), pp. 119, 155-156.

[4]Juan B. Justo, Teoría y práctica de la historia (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Libera, 1969), pp. 459-460 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas IV); Juan B. Justo, La realización del socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), p. 332 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas VI).

[5]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 245-252; José Rodriquez Tarditi, "Juan B. Justo," Semblanza de tres lideres (Buenos Aires: Bases editorial Buenos Aires, 1960), p. 52; José Rodriquez Tarditi, Juan B. Justo Parlamentario (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), p. 23.

[6]Juan B. Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos (Buenos Aires: El Ateno, 1933), pp. 249-250; Augustin de Arrieta, "Juan B. Justo--Al entrar en la historia," Acción Socialista, XVI (29 Feb. 1928), 565-566; Emilio J. Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestión nacional," Todo es Historia, LXII (June 1972), 18; "Homenaje a la memoria de Juan B. Justo en el Concigo Deliberante de Buenos Aires," Acción Socialista, XX (28 April 1928), 691-692; Luis Pan, Vision socialista de medio siglo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 9, 65-67, 73-92; Guillermo Rolandi, "Figuras internacionales," Accíon Socialista, XV (14 Feb. 1928), 529-530; Tarditi, Semblanzade de tres Liberes, p. 52; Enrique Dickmann, Democracia y socialismo (Buenos Aires: Serafin Pongenebbio y Cia., 1917), p. 164. Justo served in the Cámara de Diputados from 1912 to 1923 and in the Cámara de Senadores from 1924 to 1927.

[7]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 471-473; Juan B. Justo, La Obra parlamentaria (Mayo 1913-Abril 1914) (Buenos Aires: Editorial Prometeo, 1914), p. 218 (hereafter referred to as La Obra parlamentaria 1913-1914).

[8]Mario Bravo, "Organizacion, programa y desarrollo del partido socialista en argentina," Revista Argentina de Ciencias Politics, X (1915), 124, 133-134.

[9]Adolfo Dickmann, Nacionalismo y socialismo (Buenos Aires: n.p., 1933), pp. 17-19; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 88; Jacinto Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), I, 185-188, 197.

[10]Juan B. Justo, Internacionalismo y patria (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1933), pp. 189-192, 201 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas V).

[11]Ibid., pp. 205-211.

[12]Ibid., pp. 212-216.

[13]Juan B. Justo, "Porque no me gusta escribir para una hoja que se dice Israelita," El Marxismo y la cuestión judia (Buenos Aires: Editorial Plus Ultras, 1965), pp. 171-175. Juan B. Justo, Educacion publica (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1930), p. 32 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas III). Justo thought that circumcision was a barbaric custom. Jacinto Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 286-295. In 1919 there was a wave of anti-Semitism in Buenos Aires. This was triggered by the "Semana tragica" of January 7 to 14, 1919.

[14]Oddone, Historia del socialismo, I, 187.

[15]Ibid., pp. 187-188.

[16]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 202-203; Justo, Obras Completas VI, p. 24.

[17]Enrique Dickmann, "El pensamiento vivo de Juan B. Justo," Anuario Socialista (1948), 3.

[18]Juan B. Justo, Socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1920), pp. 98-105.

[19]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 112-113; Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 109; Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1913-1914, pp. 85-88.

[20]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 116-121.

[21]Juan B. Justo, La moneda (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1928), pp. 18-28 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas I).

[22]Ibid., pp. 28-33; 43-50, 132-133.

[23]Ibid., pp. 33-38.

[24]Ibid., pp. 54-88.

[25]Ibid., pp. 139, 275-277; Enrique Dickmann, "La ideas monetarias de Juan B. Justo," Pensamiento y Accion (Buenos Aires: Sociedad amigos del libro ripplatense, 1937), pp. 77-82.

[26]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 3-9, 128, 125-129, 211, 215-217, 222-223, 247.

[27]Ibid., pp. 255-260.

[28]Juan B. Justo, Precios y salarios (Buenos Aires: Lolito y Barberis, 1913), pp. 4-12. This study dealt with the wages of workers and the cost of the basic necessities of life. Justo compared salaries, rents, and food prices of Argentine workers with those of workers from Europe and the United States.

[29]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 38-42.

[30]La Vanguardia, 7 April 1894, pp. 1-2; Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 171. Justo cited the article "Porque sube el oro," written by Avé-Lallemant to demonstrate the party's concern for national problems.

[31]Justo, Obras Completas, p. 179; Dickmann, Pensamiento y acción, p. 63; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, p. 50.

[32]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 118-121; Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 254; Justo, Socialismo, p. 32.

[33]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 485; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 137-141.

[34]Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1912-1913, pp. 40-61.

[35]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 89-91.

[36]Rodolfo Puiggrós, Las izquierdas y el problema nacional (Buenos Aires: Editorial Jorge Alvarez S.A., 1967), pp. 35-50.

[37]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 482-483, 491-493; Julia Garcia Games, "El Dr. Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XX (23 April 1927), 626-628.

[38]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 137-138, 267-268; Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1913-1914, p. 195; Juan B. Justo, "Como se manejan los dineros del Banco de la Nación," Acción Socialista, XII (13 Dec. 1924), 355-359. Justo was elected to the Senate in 1924.

[39]Justo, Obras Completas III, p. 114; José S. Campobassi, "La preocupación de Justo por la instrucción primaria," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 522-524; Lorenzo Sitano, "Justo, ecuador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 509-511.

[40]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 79-80, 489; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 128-129.

[41]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 60-79, 153-159; Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1912-1913, pp. 158, 162; Campobassi, "La preocupacion de Justo por la instrucción primaria," pp. 522-524.

[42]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 107-109, 148, 182-187, 293. 307-310; Tarditi, Juan B. Justo Parlamentario, pp. 29-32.

[43]Nicolás Repetto, Hombres y problemas argentinos (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1945), pp. 71-79; La Prensa, 1 Jan. 1958.

[44]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 45-53.

[45]Ibid., pp. 81-90, 189, 207-214.

[46]Ibid., pp. 167-177; José S. Campobassi, "La obra educacional de Justo en el campo de la enseñanza secundaria y universitaria," Acción Socialista, XVI (29 Feb. 1928), 573-576.

[47]Justo, Discursos y escritos politicos, pp. 273-277, 279-280.

[48]Rosendo A. Gomez, "Intervention in Argentina 1860-1930," The Evolution of Latin American Government, ed. Asher Christensen (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1951), pp. 382-400. Yrigoyen intervened twenty-four times in the provinces during his administration. This was more than any other President.

[49]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 221-260.

[50]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 403.

[51]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 54-60, 86, 145, 263.

[52]Ibid., pp. 91-95, 100, 106.

[53]Ibid., pp. 283-289.

[54]Enrique Dickman, Biblioteca Obrera Juan B. Justo: Cincuentenario de su fundacion (Buenos Aires: 1947), pp. 7-15. The name of the library was changed officially to "Biblioteca Obrera Juan B. Justo" on August 16, 1928. Initially the Biblioteca Obrera was located on calle Mejico 2070. From 1927 to 1953 it was located in the Casa del Pueblo on Rivadavia 2150. On April 15, 1953, the Casa del Pueblo was destroyed by a fire caused by "vandals." The "Biblioteca Obrera Juan B. Justo" was located as of 1972 on Avenida La Plata 85. Unfortunately, it was opened for only three or

four hours in the evening. There was no duplicating equipment. However, the librarian, Juan B. Lamesa, approximately 80 years old, knew all the material located in the library and was most helpful.

[55]Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 27, 68-69.

[56]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 100.

[57]Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, I, 197; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 385, 388-389; Nicolás Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación (Buenos Aires: Federación Argentina de Cooperativas de Consumo, 1944), pp. 85-87.

[58]"Victory y Suarez," Revista Socialista, I (July-Sept. 1971), 72-73.

[59]Justo, Discursos y escritos politicos, pp. 47-48, 84-85; Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 9-10, 14-15, 61; La Vanguardia, 8, Jan. 1898, pp. 1-2; 15 Jan. 1898, pp. 1-2; 22 Jan. 1898, p. 2; 29 Jan. 1898, pp. 2-3; 7 July 1923, p. 5; La Vanguardia placed Justo's picture next to the pictures of the pioneer of cooperation; Juan Nigro, "Juan B. Justo, propulsor de la acción economica del pueblo," Revista Socialista, I (Aug. 1947), 92-95.

[60]Juan B. Justo, Cooperación Libre (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1929), pp. 123-135 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas II).

[61]Ibid., pp. 5-11.

[62]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 13-25; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, p. 66.

[63]Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 41; Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 338-340; Justo, Discursos y escritos politicos, pp. 68, 126-127.

[64]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 123-135.

[65]Ibid., pp. 189-195; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, p. 87.

[66]Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperacion, pp. 116-117.

[67]Angel M. Gimenez, "Juan B. Justo y la cooperación," Anuario Socialista (1938), 58; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 387-400; Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 87-88.

[68]Giménez, "Juan B. Justo y la cooperación," p. 58; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 400-403; José Rodriquez Tarditi, Juan B. Justo y Nicolás Repetto en la acción cooperativa Sus discipulos (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Intercoop, 1970), pp. 39-44; Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 88-89; Nicolás Repetto, "Los progresos de la cooperación," Acción Socialista, V (28 Aug. 1926), 130-132.

[69]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 37-43, 120, 147-154; Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 97-98. The cottages built in Ramos Mejía cost a worker 55.60 pesos monthly. Justo thought this to be too expensive since most of the working class could not afford more than 35 pesos monthly.

[70]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 48-61; Nicolás Repetto, "Una compaña de difamación," Acción Socialista, XXVII (25 June 1927), 760-762.

[71]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 26-34, 61-66, 166, 172; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 65, 86; Rómulo Bogliolo, "El Hogar Obrero y sus progresos," Acción Socialista, XVI (14 Feb. 1925), 489-490.

[72]Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 270-278.

[73]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 117-118.

[74]Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 143-144, 278-289, 294-295.

[75]Justo, Obras Completas II, pp. 44-47, 136-142; Repetto, Lecciones sobre cooperación, pp. 269,272.

[76]Juan B. Justo, El programa socialista del campo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1915).

[77]Ibid., pp. 21-27; J. Vidal Baigorii, "Justo y la cuestión agraria," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 476-482; Juan B. Justo, "La ciudad y el campo," Revista Socialista, XX (Jan. 1932), 2.

[78]Justo, El programa socialista del campo, p. 15; Justo, "La ciudad y el campo," pp. 1-10; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 383-384; Romeo Ferrara, "La obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo en pro de los productores del campo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 485-490.

[79]Justo, El programa socialista del campo, pp. 3-4, 6-10.

[80]Ferrara, op. cit., p. 489; Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino, pp. 236-239; Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino, II, 383-384; Repetto, Mi paso por la política, p. 36.

[81]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 141-142.

[82]Ibid., pp. 142-146; Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 104-105.

[83]Justo, Obras Completas IV, p. 220; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 150-155; Waldino B. Maradona, "Trabajo y miseria de los campesions," Acción Socialista, XV (24 Jan. 1925), 462; Ferrara, "La obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo en pro de los productors del campo," pp. 558-464.

[84]Oddone, Gremialismo proletario argentino, pp. 239-246; Nicolás Repetto, "Sintesis del hombre y de su obra," Anuario Socialista (1938), 15.

[85]Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1912-1913, pp. 63-73.

[86]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, p. 149.

[87]Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1912-1913, pp. 63-73.

[88]Justo, Obras Completas I, pp. 202-208; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 149, 155; Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1913-1914, pp. 131-135.

[89]Juan B. Justo, "La reforma de la ley agraria," Acción Socialista, XXIII (29 May 1925), 714-715; Ferrara, op. cit., pp. 562-563; Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la agricultura (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1959), pp. 229-230.

[90]Ferrara, op. cit., pp. 558-564.

[91]Baigorri, op. cit., pp. 476-482; Repetto, Mi pasor por la política, p. 281; Lorenzo Sitano, "Justo, educador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 509-511; La Vanguardia, 23 June 1965, p. 20.

[92]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 496-504; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 255-257, 270-272.

[93]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 190-227, 247-249.

[94]Ibid., pp. 230-243.

[95]Ibid., pp. 239-243.

[96]Justo, Obras Completas III, pp. 7-9, 11-34.

[97]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 228-231.

[98]Ibid., pp. 190, 211-212, 225.

[99]Justo, Obras Completas III, p. 39; Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 505-508; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 257-260; Justo, La obra parlamentaria 1913-1914, pp. 253-259.

III.--DIVISIONS WITHIN THE SOCIALIST PARTY 1915-1928: NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

With the death of Roque Sáenz Peña, Victorino de la Plaza became President. Although a member of the oligarchy, he maintained the integrity of the Law of 1912. Between 1912 and 1915 the Argentine Socialist Party made tremendous gains. In 1913 Dr. Nicolás Repetto and Mario Bravo were elected to the Cámara de Diputados. Dr. Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, son of a Spanish Republican who fled to Argentina when Enrique was eight years old, was elected for a nine-year term to the Cámara de Senadores.

In the election of 1914 the Socialist Party triumphed with its majority list in the Federal Capital. Elected to the Cámara de Diputados to join Justo and Palacios were Nicolás Repetto, Mario Bravo, Antonio de Tomasço, Francisco Cúneo, Angel M. Giménez, Antonio Zaccagnini, and Enrique Dickmann. The Radicals elected three deputies and the conservatives were definitely rejected by the citizens of the Federal Capital. The socialists received more than 55,000 votes in the national elections of 1914. They had ten representatives in the National Congress.

By 1914 there were socialists in the Provincial Congresses of Buenos Aires and Mendoza. They were represented in the municipal bodies of Mendoza and Resistencia (El Chaco). By 1914 there were thirty socialist centers in the City of Buenos Aires and 103 centers in the interior of the country. The membership skyrocketed to 43,640. Emilio Frugoni, the Uruguayan disciple of Justo, noted that the electoral success of the

Socialist Party was in proportion to the political capacity of the working people. The Radical Party triumphed in the interior of the country. The Executive Committee proudly proclaimed that the victory in the Federal Capital signified that a true democracy existed in the most cultured zone of the country. According to the Executive Committee, the socialists constituted the dynamic force in the National Congress. Justo was their spiritual mentor.[1]

Although the progress of the party appeared unlimited, there were divisive forces within the party. Ostensibly this division centered on the question of dueling and revolved around the person of Alfredo L. Palacios, the first Socialist Deputy elected in the Americas. By the time Palacios became a member of the Socialist Party on September 1, 1902, the party had, on numerous occasions, gone on record against dueling. It condemned it as an absurd, barbaric custom at variance with the positive morality of the Socialist Party. The Constituent Congress unanimously approved Article 61 of the first Statutes of the party which called for the expulsion from the party of any member who duelled. This Statute was not modified until 1913. The Executive Committee was unsure whether it was empowered to apply the penalty to a National Deputy; it vacillated. The Ninth Congress of the Socialist Party repealed the penalty portion of Article 61. Thereafter, Palacios was involved in a number of duels. The issue came to a head at the Twelfth Congreso Socialista in Rosario on May 23 to 24, 1914. The debates were spirited. Palacios spoke in his own behalf. The delegates voted down an amendment to oust a participant in a duel by a vote of 2,050 to 1,770 with 77 abstentions. They repealed Article 61 by a vote of 1,891 to 1,396 with 40 abstentions. However, once again Palacios was involved in a duel. The socialists

found this repugnant. This time the issue was resolved by a general vote of the membership, an action used by the "old guard" to enforce its ideas and discipline. Although Justo's role in this maneuver was not mentioned in any works, it is reasonable to assume that this would not have taken place without at least his knowledge if not his support. By an overwhelming majority the general membership voted to include Article 61 and to expel anyone who duelled. Again Palacios violated this Article. At the Second Congreso Socialista Extraordinario, in La Boca, July 9 to 11, 1915, Dr. Carlos Manacorda's proposal to confirm the results of the general vote and to deny the right of appeal to Palacios was approved by a vote of 4,203 to 983 with 273 abstentions. On June 12, 1915, Palacios resigned from the Cámara de Diputados. He was not to reaffiliate with the Socialist Party until 1931, three years after Justo died.

Notwithstanding the duelling issue one had to suspect that theoretical differences between Palacios and Justo led to Palacio's separation from the party. Apparently Palacios was viewed as an intellectual renegade in the party. When coerced into joining the party by the National Council, Palacios affiliated with the socialists of La Plata, thereby maintaining his independence from the socialists of the City of Buenos Aires. Almost at once Palacios was at odds with the founders of the Socialist Party. He was criticized especially for establishing Círculos de Obreros Liberales. He was suspected of using these for his own personal ambitions. Nicolás Repetto criticized him in an article published in La Vanguardia, on October 26, 1901. At this time Justo lived in Junin. He did not know Palacios personally. However, he lent his support to the anti-Palacios forces with an article "Socialismos y Liberalismo" published in La Vanguardia on November 1, 1901. Justo

noted the similarities and differences between the two ideologies and concluded that liberalism, the precursor of socialism, was directed not to the proletariat but to the bourgeoisie. La Vanguardia published debates on the subject. However, the founders of the party thought the issue was resolved when the party by a general vote of 292 to 69 with 29 abstentions on May 6, 1902, prohibited socialists from establishing Círculos Obreros Liberales. Palacios continued to defy the party. This caused Justo to write a letter which La Vanguardia published on June 2, 1902. Justo criticized Palacios and stressed the substantial differences between their points of view. To Justo, the liberal centers spent too much time debating. They failed to provide workers with customs of organization. Thirteen years before Palacios' ouster from the party Justo suggested that it might be beneficial for everyone if Palacios was to leave the party. His separation was thus foreseen, if it was not expedited by Justo.[2]

Palacios' ouster from the Socialist Party also has been viewed as a clash between "Americans" or nationalists and "Europeanizers" or internationalists in the Socialist Party. The "Americans" treasured the unique features of Argentine society while the "Europeanizers" wanted to strengthen the European bases of Argentine culture. When Palacios resigned from the Cámara de Diputados, he emphasized that his sense of honor was part of his blood and race which thereby set the tone for his supporters to argue that Palacios was purged from the party because of his nationalistic outlook.[3] This view has been expressed recently in works by Rodolfo Puiggros[4] and Robert Alexander.[5] According to Professor Alexander, Palacios was expelled from the Socialist Party because "Palacios had adopted an increasingly nationalistic position,

which conflicted with the internationalism preached by the Socialist Party."[6]

The socialists suffered a setback in the election of 1916. In part this was due to the schism. The Presidential campaign had polarized opinion between Radicals and Conservatives. Once again the Socialist Party became the minority party of the Federal Capital as the radicals triumphed. Hipólito Yrigoyen, candidate of the Unión Cívica Radical, was elected President in a free and honest election by a majority vote in the electoral college. This election marked the beginning of fourteen years of middle-class leadership. Notwithstanding discrepancies between the program of the Radicals, which promoted representative government and freedom of expression, and the demagoguery of Yrigoyen, who intervened continually in the provinces and used patronage to buy political support, solid contributions were made to the development of representative government. Yrigoyen's administration was marked by violent parliamentary and party struggles.

Yrigoyen was followd by the Radical administration of Marcelo T. de Alvear in 1922. A split developed within the Radical Party ostensibly over Yrigoyen's efforts to dominate the party. However, there were fundamental differences between the Yrigoyen wing of the party called Personalista and Alvear's anti-Personalista group. The former represented the more nationalist and reform-minded elements whereas the latter was supported by the more conservative groups. Thereafter the Alvear group won the Presidential election in 1922. Yrigoyen was an expression of an inorganic democracy--chaotic and anarchistic but democratic nevertheless. A symbolic expression of the transition from oligarchy to democracy, Yrigoyen unfortunately did not know how to give to the popular

aspirations that he interpreted so well a true democratic and social content once he became President.

To Justo, the Yrigoyen regime was an oligarchy disguised as a popular government. This point was made by Justo in Congress on August 19, 1918. Although the Socialist Party opposed the misgovernment and demagoguery of this regime it did not systematically oppose Yrigoyen. Instead it attempted to direct the government's actions along regular and normal ways. Notwithstanding acts of repression against labor, the fundamental liberties of the socialists were not suppressed.[7]

During the period of the elections of 1916 the political climate was extremely heated. Justo had noted this as early as August 7, 1914, when he paid homage to Jaurès who had been murdered by a nationalist student on the eve of World War I. Justo had been pained by the news. He was concerned by reports of the persecution of socialists in Germany. It terrified him to see the bloody face of Repetto who had been attacked for ideas he expressed in the Cámara. At all times Justo reasoned that socialism could not be destroyed. Men could be killed. The idea lived.[8] Throughout his political career Justo had been insulted and slandered. Dr. Nicolás Repetto, Justo's close friend and colleague, noted that this also had been the lot of Pablo Iglesias, founder of the Spanish Socialist Party. However, this only made Justo more tenacious. It spurred his spirit. The explosiveness of the times was best illustrated by the unsuccessful assassination attempt made on Justo's life on June 7, 1916, shortly after the election. Many years later, on November 20, 1929, when Dr. Repetto addressed the Cámara he placed the blame for the attempted assassination on the Radicals who feared Justo. This was a bad omen for the future of Argentine politics. Justo was wounded in the leg by his unknown assassin.[9]

On June 9, 1916, the Spanish daily El Socialista, gave front page coverage to the attempt on Justo's life. It stressed his accomplishments and efforts in behalf of the proletariat. Therefore, it was extremely critical of other newspapers that had erred in the spelling of Justo's name.

> Unquestionably, the newspaers that have reported the event, not knowing the name of our Argentine comrade Dr. Juan Bautista Justo, one of the most eminent figures of the Socialist International and one of the wisest and best known public men of the Argentine Republic, have mistaken his name upon reporting it, since the name Yuste that they have written does not correspond to any Argentine comrade that we know.
>
> Dr. Justo is very loved in Spain.
>
> The translation of Capital, from which almost all the Spanish Socialists have learned the theories of Karl Marx has spread his name, as has his unforgettable, valiant campaigns in the Argentine Camara awakened our admiration.[10]

While convalescing he spent his time studying the budget that the President had sent to Congress for 1917. However, his commitment to the cause led to ludicrous scenes that lost their humor in the glow of his sincerity. Either because of dedication, loneliness, or boredom, or a combination of all of these reasons, Justo had a bed set up in the Cámara. This permitted him to continue his work as a member of the Commission on the Budget. There was the ludicrous scene of Justo being carried in a litter into the Cámara after seven months' absence to vote on issues related to alcohol, petroleum, and the budget. The discipline and absurdity of Justo was seen when Justo, who still suffered from his wound, refused to ride on an elevator because the Executive Committee wanted to cut down on its electric bill.[11]

World War I had a profound effect on the Argentine Socialist Party. Justo presented a theoretical construct for evaluating war in a section of Teoría y práctica de la historia. War had a biological base.

This was verified by the animalistic emotions it awakened. Technical advances altered its results and aims. No longer were the victors the strongest biologically. They were the better armed and organized. War was no longer the extermination or dislodgment of human groups. It led to the assimilation of some human groups by others in a relationship of permanent dependency. However, when war did not destroy people but united them into greater social entities, such as existed under the Romans and Incas, it was then an important factor for historical progress and peace.

Justo reasoned that, as commercial relations developed, war was more ruinous for nations that fought and, therefore, they were less frequent and shorter. Commercial ties mitigated against war, especially between societies of advanced development. International wars became more like civil wars. Civil wars were fought for new social forms necessary for the development of the collectivity. However, armed movements were not as necessary for the political evolution as the military became subordinated to industry. Justo stated that the new objective of war was the acquisition of cheap labor that was exploited systematically. Commerce imposed calculatively by violence prepared the base for new wars. Justo noted that to the leaders of world affairs the unmeasurable term "honor" was the decisive factor of war or peace. To Justo, modern war was the survival of the unfit. However, with the diffusion of culture the world came closer to unity and peace which was translated into a greater uniformity in progress. There were only two instances when war was justifiable to Justo. One was a defensive war against a barbaric foreign enemy. The second were wars that opened new zones of the earth to the intelligent action of man. However, Justo reasoned that among cultured people arbitration ought to resolve all questions.[12]

Within this context Justo viewed the catastrophic events of World War I. Immediately Argentina felt the effects of the war. Its maritime commerce was almost completely halted by submarine warfare. Justo reflected on the causes of the war. He pointed out that the war resulted from the breakdown of commercial relations between European nations. To Justo, the origin of the war was the adoption of protectionism by Germany in 1879. This idea was proposed by Dr. Repetto, the Argentine representative to the International Socialist Conference of Neutral Nations in La Haya in 1916. Justo viewed commerce as an agent por excelencia of international peace and termed comments on international ethics an absurdity. Therefore, he was extremely critical of the actions of Germany. He noted the militaristic spirit of the country. Germany opposed disarmament and treaties of arbitration. Justo dismissed the idea that Germany's territorial expansion was for German colonists. He placed the responsibility for the war on German capitalism which favored a reckless policy in order to insure German industries of raw materials. This policy was favored by the German government to divert public attention from internal questions. It was favored by German cultural pride which corrupted by militarism became a menace for other nations.[13]

However, the blame must be shared by those whose moral cowardice contributed to the war. French and Belgium international "pacifists" showed their moral cowardice by their support of the state. Germans submitted without protest to the oppression in Germany. They did not rebel when universal suffrage was abolished in Saxony and Hamburg. They did not revel against the attacks on the Co-operatives nor the systematic isolation of the country by the privileged class that ruled Germany. Justo censured those who filled the world with racial prejudice but now

asked blacks and orientals to defend their wealth and territory. Because Europe lacked men of courage thousands of young men died in the war.[14] Labor and socialist groups were responsible for the war. The socialists in the Reichstag voted military expenditures while German Trade Unions supported the government. In France, Guesde and Sembat joined the Ministry. The Labor Party of England favored military recruitment. Justo provided a rationale for these actions. He noted that the socialists, even where they were most numerous, were a minority and were unable to stop the preparation for the war. Furthermore, socialists never really saw the ties of international labor as powerful nor viewed the class struggle as very profound. They gave in to their own narrow interests and prejudices against freedom of international commerce. The worst form of solidarity between management and labor was cultivated. French socialists did not oppose the custom wall that separated France from other nations. The German Socialist Party also contained strong currents of protectionism. This was reflected in the declarations of the International Socialist Congresses which failed continually to mention the need of freedom of commerce.[15]

Justo regretted that the European socialists had not understood its importance. Justo expressed his disappointment with Jaurès who, during his visit to Argentina, told Justo that protectionism coincided with the aims of the Socialist Party. La Vanguardia published an article written by Justo on July 17, 1915, which criticized European socialists for their failure to understand the fundamental cause of the war. The National Congress of French Socialists proclaimed the virtue of democratic governments as the means to avoid wars. Justo denied that democracies were inherently peaceful. Greece and Rome were maintained by

slaves. The French Republic conquered Indochina, Madagascar, and half of Africa. The United States violently established control over Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Panama. Justo demonstrated that Republics were not enough to strengthen the ties of peace. A better guarantee of international peace was free trade. He denounced the policy that led to the absurd separation of Nancy from Strasbourg, Havre from Southampton, Lyon from Turin, Venecia from Trieste, and Milan from Munich.

According to Justo, war killed the best youth of a nation. He was dismayed that society became inured to the horrors, that people went about their business unaffected by the slaughter and destruction. Justo was terrified by the waste of human physical and mental energies on anti-human ends, the use of human labor to destroy the creation of human labor, and the horrors caused by the lies and intrigues of government.[16]

The war had an immediate effect on Argentina and on the Argentine Socialist Party. Justo outlined the problem that it presented to Argentina. In an article published in La Vanguardia December 6, 1914, Justo pointed out the disastrous effects the war had on Argentina's commercial relations. Her maritime transportation was mainly in European ships that were menaced by German warships cruising the Atlantic. He called the German navy pirates. It robbed or destroyed cargoes that entered or left Argentina and therefore effectively blockaded the country. Notwithstanding this situation and the sympathy that Justo felt for the Allied cause, he reasoned that Argentina should not become compromised in the war. It could not treat the German navy as pirates. He thought Argentina should adhere religiously to the rules of neutrality in terms of German ships. However, he urged Argentine authorities to place German merchant ships in port under strict surveillance for the welfare of Argentina.[17]

However, his attitude changed by 1917 and with it the position of the Argentine Socialist Party. As a result of the sinking of a modest Argentine boat, "Monte Protegido," the socialist leadership took a more aggressive attitude toward the Germans. This was reflected in an editorial written by Enrique del Valle Iberlucea in La Vanguardia. The article argued that national interests ought to be above all passions. On April 17, 1917, a declaration issued by the Parliamentary Socialist Group, signed by Justo, urged the government to take all measures that were necessary to secure Argentine commerce. On April 17, 1917, La Vanguardia reprinted on the first page the resolutions of the Parliamentary Socialist Group and the Executive Committee which supported the declaration. This apparent reversal of policy triggered off a strong reaction in the socialist ranks.[18]

As a result an Extraordinary Congress met April 28 to 29, 1917, in the room of the Sociedad José Verdi of La Boca.[19] The Executive Committee, composed of eleven members of whom five were parliamentarians, issued a majority and minority proposition. The majority proposition, supported by Justo, stated that the submarine warfare of the Germans as well as the sinking of ships of neutral countries amounted in fact to a declaration of war; that the destruction of Argentine merchant ships would paralyze her economic life and thereby harm her working class. Therefore, it accepted in principle any measure that guaranteed Argentina's foreign commerce. The minority report of the Executive Committee signed by Ferlini, Penelón and Muzio argued that the European war was the consequence of the bourgeois capitalist regime which was obligated to sell the products confiscated from the proletariat of each country. In the interest of the working class it favored a pacifist

position. It proposed that the party and the Director of La Vanguardia take all necessary measures to prevent Argentine intervention in the war.

The party was boiling, the debates were passionate. The indignation was so great that Justo, who had been brought to the Congress in a litter because of his wound, was defeated twice in his bid for President of the Congress by Carlos Pascali, nominated by the delegates who favored the minority proposal. The left-wing group argued that the majority dispatch violated all the resolutions of the International Socialist Congresses. It claimed that foreign commerce increased. Furthermore, since 98 percent of foreign trade was in foreign carriers the protection should rest with the country of origin. They argued that the majority proposed to humanize but not suppress war. Socialists should combat war and prepare for peace. The Internationalist position was defended by Rudolfo Ghioldi who questioned whether the interest of the nation then was synonymous with the interest of the working class.[20]

Justo spoke in behalf of the Parliamentary Socialist Group. Argentina was an internationalist country, por excelencia, as a result of commerce. The Argentine International Party was the true Argentine National Party. He declared that the socialist legislators had sworn to fulfill their mandate. Justo stated that, by virtue of the actions of the Argentine government which prohibited Argentine flags to be raised in areas menaced by submarines, the question of national symbols was removed as an issue. The discussion went to the depth of the question, namely, the defense of free commerce. Justo noted the inability of the Radical government to defend Argentina. He thought that the systematic destruction of mail, merchant, and passenger ships was a new inhumane and destructive phenomenon. Although all neutrals should take measures

to demonstrate their hostility toward Germany's actions, Justo noted that as of yet the Argentine socialists had not taken such measures. Justo explained that only when it seemed possible that Congress would deal with the subject did the Parliamentary Socialist Groups make the declaration. He emphasized that the declaration did not violate any of the doctrines of the Socialist Party. They did not prohibit the use of gun powder. Justo noted that he wished he had a gun to protect himself in the attempts on his own life. He cited the Co-operatives in Woolwich, a suburb of London, and the German City of Essen where the Krupp works were located, to illustrate that during peace times the working class were active participants in the manufacture of war instruments. He wanted Argentine torpedo boats to destroy German submarines. After all, these submarines killed the workers who served Argentina. Regardless if these workers were victims of accidents of work or war it was humane to go to their aid and defense. To Justo, it was necessary to take preventive measures to protect this part of the international proletariat. Furthermore, Justo reasoned that a break in relations between Argentina and Germany was of no real significance. However, he reasoned that the issue was academic because the government was not going to act on this issue. Justo concluded that by protecting the Argentine working class the party served the working class of the world.[21]

The minority dispatch was approved by 4,204 votes against 3,564 votes for the majority proposal. With defeat evident the majority replaced their original proposal. Justo unsuccessfully urged the party to approve a resolution which stated that the Socialist Party did not wish a rupture of diplomatic relations with any nation, nor war, nor any socialist parliamentary initiative on war. Nothing more. The Partido

Socialista Internacional expected the Executive Committee to resign. They did not. Although there had been no resolution on the declaration, the Congress thought that the deputies should not take an action on the war. It stated that the party ought to do all that was possible to make sure that Argentina did not intervene in any form in the war.[22]

Thereafter, the situation again became heated. Notes sent by the German Minister Count Luxburg in Buenos Aires to Berlin were discovered. The Argentine Minister of Foreign Relations was called an ass and an Anglophile. The letters, discovered by the United States, recommended that Germany sink Argentine ships without being discovered. Luxburg was given his passport. The Cámara de Diputados discussed the suspension of diplomatic relations between Argentina and Germany. This declaration was approved immediately by the Cámara.[23] When Justo spoke on September 22, 1917, he supported this move in a speech that was essentially the same as that given before the Extraordinary Congress. He reiterated the internationalist, pacifist position of the Argentine Socialist Party and the international character of Argentina. Justo listed the causes of the war as dynastic interest, caste interest, and the greed of determined businessmen and politicos. However, the main cause of the war was protectionism. He expressed his shame for this horrendous conflict. Justo stressed the basic menace submarine warfare was to the life and work of the people of Argentina and to the people on the ships that carry products to and from Argentina. He recalled the actions taken by the Parliamentary Socialist Group on April 17, 1917, and noted that the majority of his party differed with the ideas implied in that declaration. Although the party did not take any resolution on the attitude of the Parliamentary Socialist Group, Justo reported candidly that the party resolved that all

efforts should be made to insure that Argentina not intervene in the war. Forthrightly, Justo repeated his convictions, aware that he would be held accountable before the Socialist Congress. Justo favored the rupture of diplomatic relations. He reasoned that these relations were broken in fact. Neither men nor goods were exchanged between Argentina and Germany. However, Justo was politically astute enough to play down his vote. He stated that he voted this resolution indifferently. He was satisfying the citizens that wanted this declaration. Obviously Justo violated the spirit of the Extraordinary Congress.[24]

The members of the opposition were furious. The parliamentarians had betrayed the spirit of the Congress. Eventually, this led the group that favored absolute neutrality in the war to separate from the party. When the party membership complained about these actions Justo, in a calculated politically astute move, tied this issue of the vote on the diplomatic rupture with a vote of confidence by the general membership in the parliamentarians. The Parliamentary Socialist Group resigned. In a letter sent to the Executive Committee Justo acknowledged that a number of socialist centers thought the parliamentarians violated the doctrine and discipline of the party. According to Justo the resignations were submitted in order that the general membership of the party could decide whether the parliamentarians were to continue as their representatives. He explained the position of the deputies. Notwithstanding the decisions of the last Socialist Congress, they continued in office in the hope that a conflict would not develop. However, the issue was brought to a head with the publication of the documents that demonstrated the duplicity of the German government. These documents corroborated the ideas mentioned in the party Congress. Justo wrote that if the minority declaration was

considered a mandate, the parliamentarians did not now accept it. He challenged that position. Justo cited the internal situation of the United States and Great Britain to demonstrate that war was not the simple and fatal consequence of private property and mercantile production. He did not believe that foreign commerce was essentially the market of production confiscated from the proletariat of each country. Foreign commerce was a necessity for Argentina. Justo did not deny the capitalist aspects of the war. However, he did not want the party to ignore the conflict of political principles and morals in this war. It was a war between English and North American democratic capitalism and German totalitarian capitalism; it was a war between democratic nations and Prussian militarism.[25]

The resignation was rejected by the general membership. The left-wing group separated from the party.[26] This marked the beginning of the fourth schism which occurred in 1918 when the communists left the party. On December 13, 1917, Justo commented on the vote of confidence given to the Socialist deputies. He noted his pleasure. The party's action was a sign of vitality and strength. Justo held out an olive branch to the dissidents. Different perspectives on issues in the party were healthy. Justo respected the honesty and sincerity of those who opposed his views. He assumed that once the dissident comrades recognized their error they would return to the party and collaborate in the future social work of the party. Justo stressed that the deputies did not want to drag the country into unreasonable warlike adventures. However, it was necessary to realize that to be a pacifist did not necessitate ignoring war. War was a painful reality. It was necessary to direct it in order to dominate it.[27]

From the first day of the war Justo was concerned about the eventual peace. He reasoned that the manner in which the war ended determined the firmness and duration of the peace. Peace would be strengthened among cultured nations. On March 30, 1915, La Vanguardia printed an article by Justo, "Sobre la guerra europa." Justo urged that after the war a European Federation be created. Nationality was to be determined by plebiscites. Peaceful migration was to be permitted. He called for an extension of universal suffrage, parliamentary government, obligatory international arbitration, the end of secret diplomacy, and the universal adoption of the metric system. Justo reasoned that the major contribution of the Argentine Socialist Party for the consolidation of peace was the principle of free commerce.[28] On December 19, 1918, Justo argued that free trade was an absolute necessity for the new republics created by the dissolution of the Austrian, Russian, and Ottoman Empires. Unless new norms were developed between nations that insured economic liberty the multiplication of new political entities increased the motives for war. Therefore, Justo demanded the immediate and gradual reduction of tariffs. They were to disappear within twenty years. This was sufficient time for industries to adapt to free trade or to liquidate the inventory of nonviable industries. To facilitate trade between nations Justo urged the universal adoption of the metric system, the creation of sound currency, and international labor legislation. Within this framework Justo opposed any intentional impoverishment of Germany. Germany should pay for damages caused by Imperial Militarism. But Germany should be admitted to a League of Nations. However, Justo was a product of his times.[29] His utopian notions were illustrated by his comments in the Congress Socialista Extraordinario of 1917. Justo stated

that from the ashes of this universal holocaust a freer and more democratic world would result. This was the war to end all wars.[30]

The socialists desired to insure the world against the horrors of World War I. The first post-war Congresses of the Socialists International met in Bern and Amsterdam in 1919. Justo and de Tomaso represented the Argentine Socialist Party at these Congresses. Justo appeared at the Conference of Bern with a portfolio full of proposals prepared since the outbreak of the war. He represented South American Socialism. On June 27, 1919, Justo submitted his report on these conferences to the Executive Committee. Justo's report, in contrast to the essentially chronicled one of de Tomaso, was full of observations and instructions. It contained a wealth of knowledge, international political concepts, and prophetic visions about future world events much akin to the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. Excluding the last two days of the Congress of Bern, Justo participated in all the sessions of the Congress. Notwithstanding the fact that the European socialists, who were involved in sterile dogmatic disputes, were unable to perceive his genius, his report was of permanent value for International Socialism.[31]

Justo recalled that by virtue of its internal aspects, composition, and circumstances, the Conference of Bern differed profoundly from the Socialist Congress of Copenhagen. There were not the hundreds of delegates. The superficial fate and rejoicing were absent from Bern. The painful realities caused by the war were evident. The delegates met in the midst of revolutions that disturbed the ranks of International Socialism and altered politically central and Western Europe. Here they wrestled with the problems of the world.[32]

Justo was selected to serve as one of the two Vice Presidents of the Congress. He had achieved eminence as a result of Teoría y práctica de la historia and his parliamentary activities. In 1913 he had been designated by the International Socialist Bureau, together with such eminent socialist statesmen as the Fabian Sidney Webb and the Austrian Otto Bauer, to present a report on the cost of living to the Congress that was to have met in Vienna in 1914. The Argentina Socialist Party was honored when Justo was designated First Vice President of the Congress of Bern. Justo was a member of the commission that studied the League of Nations and the Commission that studied the burning problem of democracy and dictatorship. His action excited the admiration of the members of the Congress from the moment he read his basis for the League of Nations which had a great deal of common sense. He served as a gadfly in Bern.[33]

This Congress, criticized by the extreme left for taking the bourgeois chestnuts out of the fire, dealt with the responsibility for the war, territorial questions, dictatorship and democracy, and the problems of prisoners of war. Justo lamented the narrow political motives shown from the start of the Congress. Although Arthur Henderson, spokesman of the Labor Party, had organized the first meetings of the International after the war, Justo was extremely critical of him. Henderson plagued these Congresses with theoretical superficiality and English opportunism. To Justo the British Labor Party had never been distinguished by its doctrines. Henderson wanted the Conference to give its views on the International Labour Charter and the League of Nations in order to influence the men at Paris. To Justo, this reciprocal influence of and over the politics and imperialists at Paris, who dictated the treaty, gave greater efficacy to the work at Bern. However, it did not raise the

spirit of the Congress. Justo thought it more urgent to affirm the principles and aims of International Socialism in the light of the World War and the Russian Revolution than it was to be occupied with the resolutions of the Congress of Paris. Justo denounced the debate on the responsibility for the war as sterile. It only divided socialists. Therefore he was critical of the French deputy Albert Thomas, former Minister of Munitions, who inflamed the issue.[34]

The Conference plunged into the subject of the League of Nations. The commission to study the subject was made up of Florentinus Wibaut (Holland), Karl Kautsky and Hermann Müller (Germany), James Thomas and Philip Snowden (England), Marcel Cachin and Edgar Milhaud (France), Wilhelm Ellenbogen (Austria), Juan Justo (Argentina), and representatives from other small countries. Justo presented the basis for the League of Nations approved by the Executive Committee of the Argentine Socialist Party. It was to be based on free trade, international labor legislation, international money, the metric system, obligatory arbitration, permanent international tribunal, disarmament, public diplomacy, parliamentary control of international relations, and effective sanctions against countries that violated decisions of the permanent international tribunal. Although a subcommission report spoke of free change and opened ports, the concept was weakened by the statement that any custom tariff would be equal for all nations.

When the French delegate, Professor Edgar Milhaud, became part of the commission, the debate on free commerce became heated. Milhaud opposed the declaration edited by Justo. Justo called Milhaud myopic and inconstant. Milhaud demanded the complete autonomy of nations when, to Justo, everything demonstrated the interdependency of nations.

Furthermore, Milhaud claimed that in times of war, no nation had the right to be neutral. Justo denied the contention that small nations needed protection. He argued that it was precisely these nations that needed free trade since they did not produce the basic necessities and their small population did not provide a market for the products of large industry. According to Justo, Milhaud erred when he demanded protectionism for countries destroyed in the war. These countries were situated ideally to elect the type of production best suited to them. Protectionism was not needed.

Milhaud's ideas were rejected. The text edited by the subcommission was modified to read "if there is any tariff it ought to be approved by the League of Nations." Justo noted the vague acceptance of his original proposal of free commerce. Justo viewed migration as a manifestation of the community of nations. When his ideas were criticized by Deputy Renaudel, a disciple of Professor Milhaud, Justo dismissed this as a sign of ignorance. Sarcastically he stated that the proposal of Milhaud to outlaw war would not cause more wars than those necessary to make the prohibition effective.[35]

Justo spoke on the subject of free commerce when the plenary session dealt with the report of the commission. That document showed that the war destroyed the idea of the spontaneous and necessary approachment of nations through economic factors. Justo insisted on free trade in the Constitution of the League of Nations, even if this was the view of the more progressive and enlightened bourgeoisie. Justo reasoned that a League of Nations had been developing in an autonomous fashion for a long time. To demonstrate this he cited such factors as human migration, an

intensified commerce, the advances in transportation and communication, the Universal Postal Union, the Latin Monetary Union, Treaties, International Arbitration, and the international labor movement. Justo noted that governments supported the development of transportation and communication. He thought it destructive that they opposed the development of international commerce. Protectionism was one of the worst forms of nationalism. Justo supported the position of Lensch, the German Socialist, who said that World War I began with the passage of the German custom law of 1879.

Justo noted the inevitably coercive, authoritative, and political orientation of the League of Nations formed by the delegates at Versailles. It was to be an Anglo Franco American peace. Justo reasoned that socialists should concentrate on the development of spontaneous, creative, and free realations between nations. It was upon economic relations that he hoped to build the permanent peace. He reiterated his demand for the abolition of custom duties within a period of twenty years as well as universal adoption of the metric system. He called for the establishment of sound international currency. This view, Justo mentioned to the delegates, was shared by the socialists of San Paulo whom he also represented in this Congress.[36]

However, the arguments against freedom of commerce continued in the Congress of Amsterdam. Although less banal they were no more acceptable to Justo. Most of these objections were expressed by Ryan, the Prime Minister of Queensland and a delegate of the Australian Labor Party. Henderson had agreed to support Justo's demand for a statement that called for the gradual abolition of legal obstacles to international commerce. Ryan questioned whether the phrase "legal obstacle to commerce" referred

to Australia whose tariffs were to protect the white workers against the competition of colored people. Australia had to defend itself against the products of cheap colored labor. Justo lashed into Ryan. Australian custom duties excluded equally the products of foreign workers of any race. To Justo, this attitude would lead to new wars if it were applied in the aggressive sense proposed by Ryan. It clashed with the needs of mankind. Universal cooperation was necessary. Japan had pressed for statements on racial equality. The International Labour Charter obligated governments of all races to enact humane and equitable laws in defense of labor.

Justo reasoned that the different levels of living and culture of nations were to be translated into an international division of labor. The nations of cheap labor would fulfill the easiest labor that demanded manual work while countries of skilled labor would produce industrially superior products. In this way the Co-operation for world peace would be established.

Otherwise, what existed would be victor and vanquished nations. Justo cited the United States to strengthen his point. The Northern states never asked custom obstacles to protect themselves against the cheap labor of ten million blacks in the Southern states. Justo's ideas, which he thought to be a prerequisite for the success of the League, were found in Article 2 of the resolution on the League of Nations.[37]

Justo was disappointed by the declaration voted in Bern on the League of Nations. This document stressed the military and political, the judicial and police factors of peace. Cynically Justo related that these forces had been represented by the diplomats at Versailles. They were imposing a world peace. Disarmament was a euphemism used by the

British to make sure that it maintained its naval superiority in the world. Justo explained that the Argentine proposal stressed issues of an economic order because it was of greater urgency to suppress obstacles to a practical union than to create new ties that we-e always secondary as long as nations were not commercially united. His disappointment and annoyance were aggravated by the fact that the socialists were the principal party in several important countries.[38]

To Justo, greater time was spent on issues that he thought were of secondary importance or completely irrelevant to the Congresses. This was especially true of territorial questions. Justo reasoned that once the economic relations between nations were regulated freely the territorial questions lost their significance. It would not be important for the masses that a port or mine remained on one or another side of the frontier.

The discussions on Germany's control of her African colonies were ludicrous to him. It illustrated the absurdity of the term "equality of nations" since this question best demonstrated the inequality that existed between nations. According to Justo the colonial question was a capitalistic question as well as a question of the domination of one race by another. In the German case it was a question of military power. Because Germany was defeated it was unable to force the return of countries that did not belong to it in the first place.

Another issue that distracted the Permanent International Socialist Commission, which met April 25, 1919, in the picturesque City of Amsterdam, was the religious sectarianism injected by Jews. Justo approved of their demands for civil and political equality. He opposed their desire to constitute themselves as a nation within a nation. These

questions were a negation of internationalism and distracted the Congress of Amsterdam from dealing with the attitude it was to assume before the Manifesto of Moscow of the Third International and the project of the Statutes of the Socialist International. Justo placed the responsibility for this on Henderson. Incidentally, Henderson was responsible for Justo withdrawing a declaration that he, Justo, edited against the blockade of Germany. Henderson worried that this declaration would split the English delegation.[39]

The last major issue of these Congresses that Justo discussed was the International Labour Charter. This document was a joint labor of the International Socialist Conference and the International Conference of Proletarian Trade Unions. It was annexed to the Versailles Peace Treaty. Justo noted proudly that it included all the points on labor legislation enumerated in his speech of December 18, 1918. These concerned an eight-hour workday, weekly rest, prohibition of industrial work of children, limitations on adolescent and female labor, accident insurance, freedom of Trade Unions, freedom of migration of workers, and legally established minimum wages. Unfortunately, the Commission of the Socialist and Trade Union Conference omitted to include the statement that wages were to be paid in sound currency. However, in the plenary session of the Socialist Conference, de Tomaso proposed that the document be modified to include such a statement. Justo noted that this was as urgent for Europe as for South America. Monetary notes multiplied in France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Russia. Although the Argentine proposition was not accepted immediately, it was voted in principle under Point II of the Charter. The contracting states were to assemble to decide on measures

to take against the debasement of wages. Happily, Justo noted the general consensus that began to be visible on this subject.

The Peace Conference annexed a Charter to the treaty which covered essentially the points made at Bern. Although some important points of social legislation were omitted, the Conference of Paris did anticipate such correction when it created the International Office of Labor. Furthermore, Justo was pleased that the Charter held that human labor was not to be assimilated to a merchandise or to an article of commerce. To Justo this statement was of more importance than the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. It signalled the moment when the modern class struggle left its principally negative and critical phase. Justo said that it obliged the socialists to provide a comprehensive method of action for the complex work that the proletariat faced. Furthermore, this was necessitated by profound divisions in socialism in Germany, Russia, and Italy. This was evident at the Congresses. It caused Justo to express his doubts on the aims and procedures of the International.[40]

Justo lashed out at orthodox Marxists who disdainfully labelled "revisionist" those who differed with them. To Justo, this was ridiculous. The International could not be shackled by statements made by Marx seventy years ago. These stagements had been made before the existence of the Co-operative movement, powerful proletarian Trade Unions, universal suffrage, and the participation of the working class in public administration. Justo rejected the term "revisionist" as superfluous. To Justo, socialism was a method of free examination. This meant continued criticism of ideas and theories, institutions and systems. Justo criticized European socialists for pandering to the masses who were radicalized and disoriented by the war and the revolution. They thought it

inopportune to speak on matters not related to the Social Revolution. Justo regretted that they looked upon it as the millennium. He cited the French Socialist Party, which formed a Commission to study the organization of the future society, to demonstrate the disdain for practical daily questions.

The basis for unity, for the International as well as for the individual Socialist Party, was to know what one wished and how one wished for it. It was to affirm and practice in common only what was believed and wished in common. With prophetic insight into Argentine events, Justo reasoned that the rest was secondary. However, were these accessory questions to become important a division would be healthy and inevitable.[41]

After World War I the communists disturbed the ranks of the Socialist Party. They attacked the socialists as enemies and traitors of the working class. They agitated for the Argentine Socialist Party to affiliate to the new international. Many of the orthodox Marxists continued in the Socialist Party in spite of the unmistaken democratic resolutions of the Congress of San Nicolás in 1919.[42]

In a speech given on August 4, 1920, on the international aspects of socialism, Justo expressed his annoyance that the members of the party were more preoccupied with the international relations of socialism than questions of national politics. He noted that there were members who urged separation from the Second International; some urged the party to establish relations with the Third International; others urged that the issue of affiliation be resolved in an Extraordinary Congress. To Justo, this concern for international affiliation exaggerated the symbol rather than the substance of International Socialist relations.

In reviewing the actions of the First and Second International, Justo noted that the Congresses, until 1910, formulated abstract principles which had been insufficient for daily political action especially in international matters. To Justo, the Second International was a European organization. He noted the minor role the Argentine Socialist Party played in these Congresses. The International was concerned with European questions rather than subjects of world policy. Justo denounced the colonial prejudice that existed in European socialists. This was harmful to the interests of the world proletariat.

However, Justo also expressed his reservations on the Third International. This was created for national ends of resistance to the bourgeois governments of Western Europe. It threatened them in their colonies. Justo pointed out that it was born in the midst of civil war, in a country isolated from the rest of the world, by the Bolshevik government and some foreign comrades that did not really represent any labor organizations. It was a unique organization. It was headed by a government with all the coercive organs of government. Whereas Justo urged recognition of the Bolshevik government, he reasoned that it would be premature to criticize or ape the actions of the Russian revolutionaries from this distance.[43]

However, the next year Justo proposed to end the agitation by means of a party congress. This decided the position of the party. The purpose was to resolve the international situation of the Argentine Socialist Party. Because of the questions treated and the consequence it had on the internal life of the Argentine Socialist Party, the Fourth Congreso Extraordinario de Bahía Blanca, which met January 8 to 10, 1921 was of great significance. The atmosphere was charged. The arguments

were passionate. Two groups were defined clearly--Democrats and Communists--supporters of evolutionist methods and reason and partisans of revolution and force. The 114 delegates were asked to consider two reports, majority and minority reports. The majority report was signed by Bronzini, de Tomaso, and Repetto while the minority report was signed by Barreiro and Garcia.[44]

The majority proposition saluted the Russian Revolution and hoped that the Russian people would reach their ideals quickly. It called for the separation of the Argentine Socialist Party from the Second Socialist International. It urged the reduction of military costs in order to improve international relations. It called for the approval of the Program of Socialist Action of the Parliamentary Group. Lastly, it approved the basis of the Declaration of Principles and Statutes of the International proposed by the Argentine Socialist Party.

The minority proposal urged an intensified revolutionary propaganda campaign among the laboring masses of Argentina. It demanded that the party tell the masses that their emancipation was contingent on the violent crumbling of the capitalistic state. It prohibited all collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The minority report demanded that the Argentine Socialist Party separate from the Second International and incorporate into the Third International of recent communist creation. In other words, both groups favored separation from the Second International and this motion was approved unanimously. Indicative of the outcome of the Congress was the fact that Justo was elected to preside over the Congress by a vote of 4,315 to 4,082 for Augusto Bunge.[45]

The Socialist Senator Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, who said that he would stay in the party regardless of the decisions reached by the congress

on the issue of party affiliation, gave a lengthy speech in favor of joining the Third International. He was warmly applauded. De Tomaso, who argued that events of one country could not be transformed to another country, spoke against the Third International.[46]

The division in the ranks of socialists caused by the War and the Revolution emphasized the need for a program of international socialist action to the Argentine Socialist Party. Upon his return from the International Congresses of 1919, Justo submitted to the Parliamentary Group a Program of International Socialist Action which the delegates at the Congress of Bahía Blanca were now asked to ratify. This program was to give the socialists a more practical orientation. The program was divided into four sections: (1) Equality of races, (2) International labor legislation, (3) International economic relations, (4) Form of international relations.

In providing the reasons for this program Justo noted that until then the ties between socialists had been simply the sympathy of similar entities. The requirements to be admitted to the International were noted. They were the acceptance of the class struggle and the collective ownership of the means of production and exchange. These were of an internal character and did not obligate the groups to any common international action. To Justo, the socialists had not formed any concrete and immediate proposals. Instead, the Socialist Congresses had been clouded with vague declarations. The war illustrated the insufficiency of the action and doctrine of the socialists especially as related to economic issues.

Justo criticized the International for its failure to give an opinion on free trade. It failed to provide any norm for the Socialist

Parties to confront economic problems in international life. Instead, the International issued sonorous declarations against war and militarism. These were repeated without conviction until the outbreak of World War I.

Justo cited the International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart to demonstrate his point. Socialist dogmatism obscured the vision of the delegates. They were unable to see the commercial and financial interests that opposed war. Instead of attacking the basic problem and creating an atmosphere in which war would not exist, the International Socialist Congresses concentrated on these armaments which were means that served the antisocial interests cultivated under the name of protectionism.

In order to illustrate how vain and verbal the fight against armaments became, Justo noted that two decades after Erfurt, where the German Social Democrats favored arbitration, they voted military credits for a government that had repudiated arbitration. Justo noted critically that during this period the International had not promoted an energetic antimilitary campaign nor the general strike in case of war. Whereas free commerce had been ignored, the colonial issue caused passionate debates in the Congresses of Stuttgart and Amsterdam. Justo noted the subconscious imperialism of many socialists who distinguished between food and raw materials on the one hand and manufactured products on the other. Therefore, he favored international control of both raw materials and manufactured products.[47]

Justo followed his criticisms of the Socialist International by pointing out the limitations of the Communist International. It lacked a plan for international political action. Justo noted that the twenty-one

conditions for admission related almost entirely to the composition and internal management of the member parties. Justo favored points 15 and 16 which demanded that the programs of affiliated parties be approved by the authorities of the International and made the decisions of the authorities obligatory. On the other hand he was critical of point 10. It urged members to fight tenaciously against the Amsterdam International of the Yellow Labour Unions. Federación Obrera Regional Argentina IX was a member of this group. Point 6 stated that without the revolutionary collapse of capitalism nothing could impede new imperialistic wars. Justo labelled this as purely negative. He pointed out the beneficial application of arbitration as seen in the boundary questions related to Argentina. More importantly, the Moscow International was silent on the fundamental economic issues. Furthermore, Clause 1, Paragraph 49, of the Russian Constitution gave the government authority to make commercial treaties. This implied the continual obstacle to free commerce. Lastly, Justo was critical of the eighth condition. This demanded that parties in countries that had colonies support all liberation movements. However, it said nothing of the attitude of parties in countries without colonies with regard to colonies nor of the daily economic relations of the colonies. Therefore, Justo judged that in the Moscow program what was not negative was subversive. The program had application in exceptional moments and circumstances such as those which carried Russia to revolution.[48]

Justo explained his program. He noted that it began with reference to the profound question of racial equality. Japan had opposed racial discrimination before the League of Nations. He recalled the racist policies of English-language countries which undermined

international solidarity. Justo emphasized the effects that the reverberations of the Russian Revolution had in Asiatic countries. The concept of racial equality, according to Justo, had to be supported by the socialists of South America. After all, South America was an immense breeder of mestizos.

Justo stated that his plan on international economic relations deserved the greatest attention precisely because they had been ignored thus far by the Socialist Party. Jaurès was a victim of a war caused by protectionism. Justo reiterated that the most dogmatic doctrinaires had failed to understand that protectionism engendered the worst form of solidarity between workers and capitalists. Justo explained this ignorance by siting the fact that the principle of free trade was of middle-class origin. It had been presented as a social panacea by many of its English supporters at the exact time Marx began his contributions to the historical theory and doctrines of socialism. To Justo, free trade was revolutionary because it directed human labor to its most productive employment, led to a higher standard of living, destroyed parasitic businessmen, and led to technical-economic progress.

Justo explained that the international legislation of labor signified the obligation of fighting for the minimal legal protection for the workers. It was based on the Charter of Labor drafted by authentic delegates of labor federations of the most advanced countries in social legislation. Although excommunicated by Moscow, Justo judged the proletariat Trade Unions to be the most capable of advancing and defending the revolutionary social work by means of strikes and boycotts.[49]

Justo recognized the need for these issues to be resolved conclusively. As President he called for separate votes on each issue. The

separation from the Second International was approved. The Program of International Socialist Action was approved by a vote of 4,494 to 4,128 with 125 abstentions. The third point of the majority proposal which urged the approval of the basis of the Declaration of Principles and Statutes of the International was rejected by a vote of 4,242 against 4,520. The minority demand of unconditional adhesion to the Third International was rejected soundly by a vote of 5,013 to 3,656 with 98 abstentions. This precipitated a new split in the Argentine Socialist Party. The schism that began in 1917 formally ended with the separation of the communists in 1921.[50]

A sad aftermath of the Congress of Bahía Blanca was that Enrique del Valle Iberlucea was denounced as a traitor to the state because of his speeches at the Congress. His colleagues in the Senate voted to revoke his senatorial privileges against prosecution. Shortly thereafter Iberlucea died. Justo, who had been requested to appear before the Federal Tribunal as a witness in the trial, refused to attend. Justo responded that he favored freedom of speech and therefore was pained to see somebody denounced before the authorities. He considered Law 7029 to be anti-social. Justo had condemned it on numerous occasions as a law of class. He questioned how he could comment in a case in which this law was applied. Furthermore, he wanted the Socialist Parliamentary Group to conserve its numerical strength. He noted that del Valle Iberlucea was the only socialist in the Senate. Del Valle Iberlucea helped the working class by his legislative programs. Lastly, Justo thought that he was disqualified to be a witness because he was an accomplice in the crime. He proposed and presided over the assembly that dealt with subversive themes.

Furthermore, he did not stop del Valle Iberlucea from speaking and he had opposed his ouster from the Socialist Party.[51]

The years prior to his death on January 8, 1928, were extremely painful for Justo. Another schism and another purge took place as Justo battled to maintain the moral integrity of the party. The schism was not caused by doctrinal or tactical differences. It resulted from personal ambition. Power was wanted. The theoretical and practical principles of the founders of Argentine socialism were rejected. The leader of this group was Antonio de Tomaso, Secretary-General of the party and National Deputy. He had presidential ambitions. He believed that his destiny was being obstructed by the party elders. The group that supported de Tomaso was expert in political skulduggery. The followers of de Tomaso wanted to use the party for their own ends. For four years the party suffered their ominous influence.

The roots of the schism were issues of morality.[52] Justo, concerned lest the party be contaminated, proposed an amendment to the Statutes at the Sixteenth Congress in October 1921. Members were not to ask elected officials for favors. In 1922, when de Tomaso was Secretary-General of the party, socialist aldermen of Buenos Aires voted the concession for the development of the Teatro Colón to Faustino Da Rosa. He had promised to comply with an ordinance that called for collective bargaining. When he failed to live up to his obligations the socialist aldermen brought suit. Da Rosa was defended by de Tomaso. The Executive Committee, which included Justo, resolved that this was incompatible with his party position. De Tomaso resigned as Secretary-General of the party. He and his supporters also objected to a proposal that party members declare their income and source of income. This was to enable the party

to tax the membership equitably. Justo successfully proposed that all members who held elected offices in or out of the party, who married in the church would be ousted from the party.[53]

Notwithstanding these reforms, there was a great deal of corruption in the election of party officers. Fictitious centers sprang up. Many centers increased their membership fraudulently. Thereafter, these political intriguers got control of the Executive Committee of the party. During the period 1921 to 1923 the Executive Committee was composed of six anti-Justo representatives and five pro-Justo delegates. By the period 1925 to 1926 the Executive Committee was composed of nine anti-Justo representatives and two pro-Justo supporters. They were on the verge of gaining control of La Vanguardia. The old guard fought back. At the Eighteenth Congress on October 11 to 13, 1925, a proposal was approved that gave the general membership the right to reform the Statutes and established the direct vote of the members in the selection of all officials. With the approval of this measure by a vote of 3,845 to 115 a new Executive Committee was selected. This was composed of seven Justo supporters and four anti-Justo delegates. The situation reached a crisis in 1927 on the eve of the Presidential election.

The anti-Justo faction supported anti-Yrigoyenistas groups that opposed the election of the Radical caudillo to a second term as President. These groups saw Federal intervention in the Province of Buenos Aires, a Yrigoyen stronghold, as a means of preventing his re-election. They needed the nineteen socialist votes in the Cámara de Diputados to get approval for intervention. The socialists did not oppose intervention in principle. However, they did not favor political reasons for intervention. They supported intervention for economic and social reasons. They had

voted for intervention in the provinces of San Juan and Mendoza to stop the circulation of worthless money used to pay salaries. They favored intervention to suppress burdensome taxes in Tucuman, Salta, and Jujuy. The ostensible reason given for intervention in the Province of Buenos Aires was that the privincial legislature violated the Provincial Constitution when it authorized, in 1926, the creation of various horse race tracks and gambling casinos. The socialists were going to vote in favor of intervention. However, the provincial legislature, controlled by Yrigoyenists, repealed the gambling law. Race tracks that had existed before 1926 were closed. Therefore, when the socialist delegation, guided by Justo, refused to vote for intervention the fight between the anti-Justo faction and the pro-Justo faction erupted.[54]

Raúl Carballo, an insignificant socialist deputy, attacked the Socialist Parliamentary Group, especially those who favored withdrawing the project of intervention. The party leadership submitted the issue to a general vote. By a vote of 4,149 to 356 the party accepted his resignation as a National Deputy. By a vote of 3,925 to 580 it expelled him from the party. This triggered the resignation of Alderman Carlos Manacorda. Thereafter, H. González Iramain, Augustín S. Muzio, and Antonio Zaccagnini resigned from the Executive Committee. On July 1, 1927, a petition signed by 179 members appeared in the bourgeois press. It condemned the action of the old guard of the Executive Committee. It insulted them. Another manifesto appeared July 2. It protested, in more reasonable tones, the actions of the Executive Committee. This was signed by Antonio de Tomaso, Fernando de Andréia, Alfredo L. Spinetto, Pedro Revol, Augusto Bunge, Augustín S. Muzio, Héctor González Iramain in the name of socialists in the capital. Ricardo Belisle, Juan F. Remedi, and

Edmundo S. Tolosa signed for those in Cordoba. The Aldermen for the city, Manuel González Maseda and Carlos Manacora, signed the petition. Two days later the Executive Committee denounced the attitude of these deputies and Aldermen. It urged the socialist centers to expel members that signed the petition. Those who signed the manifesto were expelled from the party by a vote of 4,064 to 252. According to Enrique Dickmann, this ended the most absurd, unexplainable, and unjust division in the party.[55]

At the Nineteenth Congress, which met in October 1927, Justo was elected President of the Congress. Justo mentioned his disgust at the actions of the anti-Justo faction which eventually formed the rival Partido Socialista Independiente. He denounced their accusations against the founders of the party as lies. Events proved that the Independientes were closer to the política criolla than to the labor movement. Justo explained the decision of the Executive Committee. He stated that it was impossible to live with men who did not obey nor respect any of the norms given for the internal life of the party. They debilitated the force of the party by their actions. He noted that personal ambitions and fraudulent practices were completely counter to the socialist idea. Proudly Justo proclaimed that what was really difficult in Argentina was to develop a group as the Socialist Party. The last time Dickmann visited with Justo they spoke about the schism. Justo saw this as a premeditated conspiracy to destroy the Socialist Party.[56]

Dickmann last visited with Justo on December 22, 1927, approximately three weeks before Justo died. Justo was ill. He had an inflamed throat. Dickman described his face as sculptured and energetic. His black eyes were shining. His hair was partially grey. Yet his looks

disturbed his old friend. Justo's face seemed discolored. He was unusually pessimistic. Perhaps this was because of his ill health, for Justo had been customarily optimistic. Most probably it was due to his realistic assessment of Argentine politics. He told Dickmann that the re-election of Yrigoyen would have fatal consequences for Argentina. He feared for the republican and democratic institutions of Argentina. On January 8, 1928, Juan B. Justo died at the age of 63. Hundreds of thousands of people in Argentina mourned his death.[57]

CHAPTER III

FOOTNOTES

[1]Juan B. Justo, Teoría y práctica de la historia (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Liberia, 1969), p. 470 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas IV); Juan B. Justo, Internacionalismo y patria (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1933), pp. 121-124 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas V); Mario Bravo, "Organizacion, programa y desarrollo del partido socialista en la argentina," Revista Argentina de Ciencias Politicas, X (1915), 131-133, 136-137; Enrique Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949), pp. 227, 252-253, 469; Emilio Frugoni, "El socialismo en los paises del Rio de la Plata," Humanidad Neuva, VI (1916), 25-34; Jacinto Oddone, Historia del socialismo argentino (Beunos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), II, 208-209.

[2]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 205-211; Enrique Dickmann, Democracia y socialismo (Buenos Aires: Serafin Ponzinibbo y Cia., 1917), pp. 114-134; Nicolás Repetto, Mi paso por la política:De Roca a Yrigoyen (Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1956), pp. 178-180.

[3]El Diputado Palacios: sa separación del Partido Socialista (Buenos Aires: L. J. Rosso y Cia.), pp. 25, 52-123.

[4]Rodolfo Pueggrós, Las izquierdas y el problema nacional (Buenos Aires: Jorge Alvarez S.A., 1967), p. 74.

[5]Robert Alexander, Latin American Political Parties (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), p. 113.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Dardo Cuneo, Juan B. Justo y las luchas sociales en la argentina (Buenos Aires: Alpe, 1956), pp. 371-372; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 253, 278-280; John J. Johnson, Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sector (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), pp. 95-102ñ Luis Pan, Vision socialista de medio siglo argentino (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 84-89; Manuel Palacín, "Para el anecdotario del Maestro," Acción Socialista XV (15 February 1928), 464-466. Justo was the Presidential candidate. However, the Socialist Party was not significant in the Presidential elections. Justo also headed the socialist slate for Congressmen. He was re-elected to the Cámara.

[8]Juan B. Justo, La Moneda (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1928, pp. 175-176; Juan B. Justo, "Discurso en homemaje a Juan Juares," Revista Socialista, II (July 1939), 3-4.

[9]Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 181-189, 296-297; Loranzo Sitano, "Justo, educator," Accion Socialista, XV (15 February 1928), 509-511.

[10]El Socialista, 9 June, 1916, p. 1; Boletín del Partido Socialista, XXIV (July 1916), 135-136. The Argentine Socialist Party raised money to pay the transportation costs for Pablo Iglesias to come to South America in 1916. Iglesias did not make the trip. El Socialista printed numerous articles about Juan B. Justo.

[11]Repetto, Mi paso por la política, pp. 193-196; Agustín de Arrienta, "Juan B. Justo--Al entrar en la historia," Acción Socialista, XVI (29 February 1928), 565-566.

[12]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 120-139.

[13]Ibid., p. 486; Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 18-19, 124-128.

[14]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 251-254.

[15]Ibid., pp. 128-129, 160-168, 263-265.

[16]Ibid., pp. 131-134, 155-159, 263-265.

[17]Ibid, pp. 254-256.

[18]La Vanguardia, 18 April 1917, p. 1; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 213.

[19]La Vanguardia, 30 April 1917, pp. 1-2.

[20]Benito Marianetti, Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, una honesta conducta frenta a la revolucion rusa (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Silaba, 1972), pp. 16-23.

[21]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 140-151.

[22]Beneito, op. cit., p. 22.

[23]Ibid., pp. 10-11, 13-16; Jose Rodriquez Tarditi, Juan B. Justo Parlamentario (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934), pp. 87-91; Ricardo Levene, A History of Argentina, trans. William Spence Robertson (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1937), p. 506. Yrigoyen did not break off relations with Germany.

[24]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 89-97.

[25]Ibid., pp. 151-153; Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, p. 212.

[26]Jacinto Oddone, Declaración de principios y programa del partido socialista (Buenos Aires: Partido Socialista Democratico, 1972), p. 75. In the 1918 election the socialist vote decreased from 1914. In 1918 the socialista received 61,692 votes.

[27]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 153-155.

[28]Ibid., pp. 129-131.

[29]Ibid., pp. 160-167.

[30]Ibid., p. 150.

[31]José P. Barriero, Socialismo teorico y socialismo practico (Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1966), pp. 187-195; Francisco Dagnino, "Pensamiento y accion," Acción Socialista, XV (15 February 1928), 531; Enrique Dickmann, El partido socialista argentino en los congresos internacionales (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1946), pp. 23-29; José Luis Pena, "Apuntes," Acción Socialista, XV (15 February 1928), 460-461.

[32]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 15-17.

[33]Ibid., p. 15; Barreiro, op. cit., p. 15; Antonio de Tomaso, La internacional y la revolucion (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1919), p. 128. The officers were: President Branting of Sweden; Vice President Wibaut of Holland, and Justo of Argentina. Juan Comorera, "Como conoci al Dr. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 February 1928), 491. Comorera knew of Justo while he, Camorera, was a member of the Agrupación Socialista of Barcelona. Luis Pan, Justo y Marx: El socialismo en la Argentina (Buenos Aires: Ediciomes Monserrat, 1964), p. 60. Garcia Quejido wrote a letter to Justo, dated September 27, 1903, in which he noted that Justo's literary works were geared not for the mob but for intellectuals. He stated that Justo's works were very valuable. El Socialista, November 1925, p. 1. This paper printed a picture of Justo above an article on "Socialism in Argentina." Justo was well known in Spain.

[34]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 17-18, 32-33; Centro Editor de America Latina, Congresos de las internacionales obreras (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de America Latina S.A., 1969), p. 48.

[35]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 18-20; de Tomaso, op. cit., pp. 154-157.

[36]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 18-27; de Tomaso, op. cit., pp. 163-167.

[37]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 23-27; de Tomaso, op. cit., pp. 164-165, 221-232.

[38]Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 23.

[39]Ibid., pp. 30-32; de Tomaso, op. cit., pp. 211-212, 218-219, 244-245.

[40]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 27-35ñ de Tomaso, op. cit., pp. 185-188.

[41]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 47-49.

[42]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 225-227.

[43]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 172-185.

[44]Marianetti, op. cit., pp. 43-56; Repetto, Mi paso por la politica, pp. 236-237.

[45]Marianetti, op. cit., p. 53; Juan Antonio Solari, Enrique del Valle Iberlucea: Primer Senador Socialista de America (Buenos Aires: Editorial Bases, 1972), p. 70.

[46]Marianetti, op. cit., pp. 48-50.

[47]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 51-56.

[48]Ibid., pp. 56-59.

[49]Ibid., pp. 59-62.

[50]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 225-227; Marianetti, op. cit., p. 53; Oddone, Declaracion de principios y programa del partido socialista, p. 75. In the election of 1920 the Socialist Party received 86,420 votes. After the communist schism, in the 1922 election, the Socialist Party received 83,488 votes.

[51]La Vanguardia, 23 June 1965, p. 4.

[52]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 228-235.

[53]Miguel Navas, La escision socialista de 1927: Cartas a Espana (Buenos Aires: 1928), pp. 9-17.

[54]Emilio J. Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestión nacional," Todo es Historia, LXII (June 1972), 13. It was not known at the time that Justo and Yrigoyen met in private prior to Justo's decision. There is not any information to indicate that Justo profited personally by this action.

[55]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 228-235; Navas, op. cit., pp. 9-17.

[56]Dickmann, Recuerdos de un militante socialista, pp. 234-235.

[57]Ibid., p. 473.

IV.--LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM A STUDY OF EVENTS IN RUSSIA, THE UNITED STATES, AND MEXICO

Throughout his life Justo was a keen observer of world events. His comments and observations on the Russian Revolution, the United States, and Mexico reflected his theories, encyclopedic knowledge, and astute judgments on important contemporary events. Although his comments and observations had value for people throughout the world, they were especially geared to the people of Latin America.

The Russian Revolution had a profound effect on Argentine Socialism. Justo's comments must be judged in terms of his theoretical differences with Lenin and his practical concern for the visibility of Argentine Socialism. His thoughts on the Revolution showed a number of significant changes between 1919, when he first reflected publicly on events in Russia, and 1927, when he evaluated the situation in Russia on the tenth anniversary of the Revolution.

Rooted in his scientific background, Justo characterized revolution as an indefinite, constant, and continuous action. Therefore, revolution was contingent on technology and the application made of technology. Opposed to revolutionary preachings and barricades, his preference for the methodical action of the proletariat was evident in his enlightened and perceptive report submitted to the Executive Committee, upon his return from the International Socialist Congress, on June 27, 1919.[1]

Justo viewed violent change as a moment in the historical process. But it was not the entire process. Justo complained that Marx's exaggerated emphasis on the role of manual salaried work in the creation of wealth obscured the essential role of superior technological and economic work in the development of a nation. Justo thought that this point was best illustrated by events in Rusia.

He reported that on the eve of the Revolution the intelligentsia, technicians, and administrators were affiliated primarily with the Revolutionary Socialists. Once locked in the irreconcilable fight, the Revolutionary Socialists and Mensheviks were denounced and persecuted by the Bolsheviks as allies of privilege. The Constituent Assembly with its Revolutionary Socialist majority was forcibly dissolved. The Bolshevik dictatorship, according to Justo, broke with the most indispensable and capable people for superior labor. However, after these people were expelled from their posts or abandoned them disheartened, they were again denounced by the Bolsheviks. This time they were criticized for sabotage and for undermining the state.

Justo cited Trotsky to emphasize that during the first moments of the Revolution this superior personnel was destroyed mercilessly. However, when the dictatorship seemed consolidated and disorder had become acute in Russian production, the government worked to transform the technical directors for the new regime.

Justo again quoted Trotsky who wrote that unless this happened the revolutionary military battle had been completely useless. Trotsky had mentioned the uselessness of elected councils of the best labor representatives. They lacked the necessary technical knowledge and were unable to replace one experienced technician. Justo noted that Karl

Radek, sent to Germany to promote something similar to Russian Bolshevism, complained that even in Germany, the land por excelencia of organization, the number of workers capable of directing production was extremely small. The revolution should not renounce the services initially of middle-class specialists, according to Radek.

To Justo, the Russian Revolution confirmed his conviction of the indispensable need for superior technical and economic labor. He believed that this maxim ought to be confirmed by the Socialist International. Justo urged that this personnel be incorporated into the working class both in Trade Unions and politics. Technical and economic skills need not be sought in enemy ranks. The proletariat had to develop these capabilities in governmental administration and free Co-operatives.[2]

He was also skeptical of the role of the council of factories in areas where the labor democracy had developed its political, electoral, and Trade Union organs. He recognized the important role they played in Russia since 1905. There the autocratic government impeded the normal organization of revolutionary forces. Justo stressed that these councils did not have the same reason for existing outside Russia. He urged the Socialist International to declare that if they existed outside Russia they were to be subordinated to the central organisms of the Trade Union movement to avoid difficulties in the Trade Union movement.[3]

Justo wanted the Socialist International to define the method by which the collective ownership was to be realized. Justo reasoned that, notwithstanding the confiscations, divisions of large estates, and the council of factories, the Russian Revolution had not brought about the collective ownership in a clear, rational form that may serve as a model for the working people of the more cultured countries of Central and

Western Europe and America. He urged that the socialists accept in principle the idea that the political maturity of the working class consisted in the power to modify property relations by legislation without depressing the technical-economic level at the same time. All changes of property relations which disorganized and reduced productivity Justo labelled as premature, detrimental, and ephemeral. Justo denied that the ends of socialism were realized if workers took possession of a factory and managed it as a producer Co-operative. This still constituted a privilege or monopoly although distributed among a greater number of people. The same conflicts existed. To Justo, collective property was used for all the people. It was used for their welfare.[4]

Justo analyzed the agrarian situation in Russia. To Justo, the agrarian question burned wherever property was distributed badly and laws to rectify the situation were lacking. He pointed out that the Russian Revolution resolved the most immediate aspect of the problem. Campesinos were authorized to seize the latifundios. However, he predicted that this would create new sources of personal profit without any correlation to the work of each person. This empirical solution was incomplete and provisional. It was an inadequate solution for the rest of the world which was generally more developed and cultured than Russia. He thought that the Socialist International should press for the abolition of property as a source of private revenue before advocating its individual appropriation as a means of production. Realistically, Justo commented that the nationalization of land would be incompatible for a long time with efficient forms of agricultural work. His reform was immediate and gradual. It could be achieved by means of a tax.[5]

In 1920 Justo made a number of observations on events in Russia. In the prologue of the third edition of La Moneda, Justo said he was pleased by the monetary policy of the Bolsheviks. The continuous debasement of the paper ruble was judged to be the systematic confiscation of bourgeois wealth. Internationally, the Bolsheviks demonstrated greater ability than some governments of Western Europe. They did not hoard gold. To the contrary, they used gold for foreign payments. They were aware that in order to valorize the ruble they had to stop emitting more paper currency.[6]

An article written by Justo and published in La Vanguardia on November 7, 1920, demonstrated that he was not an obsessive anti-communist. His criticism of Democratic Centralism and the dictatorship of the proletariat coincided with the opinions of Rosa Luxemburg on the dangers of authoritarianism and bureaucratization. Justo noted the widespread political repression in Russia in the decade prior to the Revolution. He recalled the effects of the three long years of disastrous war. The failures of the Kerensky government were noted. Justo pointed to its duplicity. It compromised with reactionary generals. This triggered the rebellion of the Soviet soldiers. They wanted to advance the revolution.

Justo pointed out that the Bolsheviks established the dictatorship of the proletariat. It claimed to support proletarian ideals and rights. Justo claimed that the Bolsheviks undertook the most profound social transformation in history. The Lenin government was a revolutionary government por excelencia. Justo viewed the proselytizing activities of the Russians as an attempt to free the revolution from external enemies

rather than a belief on the part of the Russians that the revolution was to be duplicated throughout the world.

At this time Justo limited his comments. He emphasized the clear class character of the communist revolution. It had undertaken a gigantic social reconstruction in accordance with new economic political and moral principles. Therefore, Justo claimed, it deserved the sympathy of the universal working class.[7]

However, by 1921, the Argentine socialists were quarrelling over the ideas and actions of the Russian Revolution. Justo was concerned. It was unfortunate that many socialists were more aware of Russian events than of factors in Argentina that raised the cost of living. He urged the membership to show some prudence. He did not want events a thousand kilometers away, whos final success he thought difficult to prognosticate, to split the party. His fears were confirmed at the Congress of Bahía Blanca.

Thereafter Justo looked at the communist government with a more critical eye. In three conferences given March to April 1920, Justo provided an extremely critical evaluation of events in Russia. Justo urged Argentine socialists to direct their attention not to Russia but to a country such as Australia that was similar to Argentina. There the labor governments understood intuitively the fundamental idea of the scientific writings of Marx which related to the technical-economic of history. The Australians, aware of the limits of the state and law, directed the force of the state and law to enable the proletariat to develop their capacity for social organization.

The process was different in Russia. First Justo praised the heroism of the revolutionaries who overthrew the Czar. He reiterated

that Trotsky recognized the technical-economic functions of the bourgeoisie. He noted that the Russian Revolution demonstrated that the technical cooperation of the masses was not spontaneous nor free. Labor councils were abolished. Dictators headed all the important enterprises. Justo reported that the Russians went back to piece work, bonuses, blacklist, and fines. To Justo this demonstrated the complete failure of free cooperation in the technological field.[8]

Following this, Justo lashed out against the authoritarian features of the Russian movement. He pointed out the periodic appearance of "authoritative fanaticism" in the labor movement and the contradiction it implied for socialists. Under the influence of the Russian Revolution it had reappeared in the Socialist Party. To Justo, the dictatorship of the proletariat was the dictatorship of a determined party or group of men. Dictatorship, no matter how enlightened, was always an exceptional means. Regardless of its immediate benefits, it failed to develop many essential aptitudes. Regardless of the standard of living, people were always passive, unconscious instruments of the dictatorship. It menaced basic economic institutions. In Russia the labor economic Co-operatives were burdened by taxes and virtually destroyed by the government. The Bolsheviks tried to make them into obligatory consumer communes. With great emotion Justo urged his audience not to seek a dictatorship but to develop the aptitudes each lacked for the historic action.[9]

Justo turned his attention to the military--the destructive technical labor--to further indicate that there were aspects of the capitalist society which existed even in the most revolutionary governments. The military played an important role in external relations and internal developments. Russia had created an enormous army headed by a former

officer of the Czar. Justo reasoned that military fanatics who judged the grandeur of a nation by its military force had to respect Russia, since it resisted reactionary and foreign forces. In this light Justo praised the military work of General Roca against the Indians. It permitted the development of Argentine society.[10]

Justo's final comments on the Russian Revolution appeared on the tenth anniversary of the revolution. He summarized the background of the revolution. He reiterated the lesson of the revolution. It showed the value of the managerial class. Justo urged this truth to be incorporated into socialist doctrines which offered too great a respect to the formulas of Marx. These were of relative truth, according to Justo. This lesson was reaffirmed by the N.E.P. of the Lenin regime.

To Justo, the most unpleasant aspect of the revolution was the political side. Painfully Justo compared the political and electoral practice of the dictatorship of the communist party with fascism and the política criolla of Hispano-America. The supremacy of the party was maintained by violence, fraud, and subterfuge. He reported that functionaries, similar to the political chiefs of Cordoba and Santa Fe, controlled elections. Bitterly he recalled that the Communist Party, with 1,210,000 members, imposed its will on 160,000,000 people.

Justo was interrupted by some communists who objected to his comments. Justo responded that he admired the anti-clerical work of the revolution. It was as monumental as that of Mexico. However, he urged the Russian government to permit other political parties to function freely. He was distressed by the attacks launched by the Russian revolutionaries on socialists of other countries. He found it intolerable that

a man such as Emilio Frugoni, his Uruguayan disciple, was ostracized because of formulas imported from Russia that were meaningless in Uruguay.

To Justo the revolution was of enormous historical consequence. It was a field of observation and inspiration. However, it was not to be copied servilely. It was to be equalled and surpassed. This was the purpose of the Plan of International Socialist Action, approved in the Congress of Bahía Blanca. He believed that the Argentine socialists benefitted from the lessons of the Russian Revolution. Optimistically, he concluded that in this freer atmosphere the Argentine socialists were capable of surpassing the accomplishments of the Russian Revolution.[11]

In 1895 Justo had visited the United States while on his way to Europe to meet with the leading socialists of the world. His views were reported in La Vanguardia. Eventually they were printed in book form. To Justo, the United States was the personification of an industrial society. Thus, it demanded the attention of the world. It was in the United States where it was most convenient to study the evolution of capitalism.[12]

Because human labor was precious in the United States it served as a powerful stimulus for technological advancement. Justo credited competition as an important factor in the industrial progress of the United States. It was well organized for industrial tasks. There human work was used very intensively and efficiently. The increased output of each worker was explained by the existence of huge industrial organizations, powerful machinery, and the division of labor. Justo noted that between 1850 and 1890 industrial establishments increased threefold while the value of products increased ninefold. He emphasized that this

centralizing movement was taking place in industry, agriculture, and commerce in the United States. However, centralization had led to destructive and violent conflicts. Thus competition, in other times and element of freedom and progress, was also an agent of oppression and retardation. To illustrate this, Justo cited the railroads, Armour and Company, and Western Union Telegraph.

Justo noted the rationale for the creation of trusts. He recorded the growth of these business combinations between 1875 and 1895. The Standard Oil Company was cited to illustrate the fact that monopolies were tyrannical. They dictated price and controlled inventions. With statistics Justo demonstrated that prices increased when competition ceased. When competition existed price tended to approach the cost of production. Justo claimed that monopolies followed a law in which profits were the largest possible vis-à-vis production. He cited Hobson's The Evolution of Modern Capitalism to make his point. The moderate price for an article produced by a monopoly should be ignored. Justo reasoned that the price might be moderate in terms of another article or other times. However, these prices were high in relation to the actual cost of production. According to Justo, articles of basic necessity did not experience any great reduction. This was the area where the public had been extremely abused.

Monopolies viewed any event as justification to raise prices and thus increase profits. He detailed the machinations of the meat industry. When there was a slight increase in the quantity of cattle in the United States in 1895, the three or four companies that controlled the meat industry used this as a justification to raise meat prices to an exhorbitant level even though the prices paid to suppliers had not increased.[13]

These developments had been accompanied by the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and the impoverishment of the masses. Justo cited statistics from the census of 1890 which showed that whereas 52 percent of the population of the United States possessed 4-1/2 percent of the private wealth, 8-3/5 percent of the population possessed 71 percent of the private wealth. This was reflected in the difference between the West Side and East Side of New York, Lincoln Park, and the slums of the south and west parts of Chicago, and between Pullman town and Newport.

Justo was aware that the salaries of workers in the United States were higher than workers in countries that were not technologically as advanced. However, he cautioned that this had to be compared with the immense wealth of the country. He questioned the well-being of the working class in the United States when 1,118,000 children worked in factories, mines, and commerce. Women and children were contemptibly exploited. Justo stressed this depressing picture when he pointed out that children between the ages of 14 to 16 work ten hours daily for fifty cents. Although the United States worker lived better than the Argentine worker, Justo thought that they did not have a secure, regular, and abundant life.[14]

Justo reported the crisis that the United States suffered. They were of greater frequency and gravity as a result of the country's incorporation into the world market. There were the panics of 1837, 1847, 1857, 1873 to 1878, 1882 to 1886, and 1893 to 1894. Each of these resulted in widespread unemployment but never as extensive as the last crisis. Justo reported that whereas there were no unemployed in Massachusetts in October 1889, unemployment skyrocketed to 22.33 percent in September 1893. With irony he noted that during the Chicago Exposition

of September 1893 there were 100,000 unemployed in the streets of Chicago. Tramps were found everywhere. He noted that the government prepared to use force to resolve social and economic problems. Justo noted that there was a reduction in the number of men needed in transportation and production. Sadly he noted that men sought jobs in useless and parasitic occupations. Employmania was as great as in Argentina and Spain. Prostitution increased.[15]

With the limited statistics of the Bureau of Labor, Justo charted the frequency of strikes in the United States. Whereas there were only four strikes before 1801, in the period between 1881 to 1887 there were 4,755 strikes. To Justo, some of these strikes had the proportion of a revolution. This was true of the railroad strike in Pennsylvania in 1877 and the miners' strike in 1894. The army camped in the streets of Chicago reminded Justo of a South American capital during a revolution. Justo reasoned that strikes were more frequent and violent where wealth was concentrated and where neither traditions nor customs existed that mitigated the antagonisms between workers and capitalists.[16]

Justo did not think that the country was intellectually advanced. To Justo, the United States was intellectually backward compared to Europe in the theoretical and philosophical field. Justo explained the failure of the United States to produce a great philosopher by the religiosity of the people of that country. Justo noted that the large number of intelligent men who became ministers could be explained by the good salaries ministers received in the United States. Sarcastically he wrote that they received five or six pesos gold annually to pronounce Sunday service and wear black ties. Although there was no official religion, Justo noted that in the United States, God was invoked for all important acts and

official documents. To Justo this explained the piety of the boldest reformers and the timidity with which they undertook questions related to the church.[17]

He provided an economic interpretation of United States history. Justo reasoned that until 1867 politics was motivated by issues of national interest. Truth and energy were the characteristics of its heroes. By 1895, United States politics seemed, to Justo, jaded. There were sterile fights between Republicans and Democrats. Justo pointed out that the decisive element in United States politics was the political boss. He was extremely critical of the program of the Populist Party. Its demand for free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold in the proportion of 16:1 was detrimental to the workers. It was deceitful to pretend that the working class benefited from this action. However, Justo reasoned that the appearance of the Populist Party was symptomatic of the economic and political chaos in the United States. It exposed the difference of classes. However, the working class still needed a powerful and revolutionary movement.

Justo discussed the reasons for the socialist weakness in the United States. Regretfully, he noted that, notwithstanding that its program was constructed well, that its membership was intelligent, and that the party used modern propaganda methods, it was of limited importance in the United States. It never received more than 33,000 votes in a country that had 12.5 million voters. Its only representative was an alderman in Patterson. Justo explained this, in part, by the foreign character of its membership. Principally formed by Germans and Jews, its propaganda was not tuned to the people of the country. However, Justo stressed that the greatest obstacle to the spread of socialism was the intellectual state of the

people. They were concerned with rather insignificant questions. They gave these a position of ridiculous importance. The Prohibition Party credited alcohol with the cause of all evil. Intellectually they had not dealt with the ideas of socialism.[18]

He commented on the widespread public corruption in the United States. Justo noted that the public administration was corrupt. Legislative bodies resolved economic questions in line with individual interests. Legislators represented capitalists. Politicians were deceitful. Justo reported that ex-President Harrison, who ran for re-election, never gave his opinion on free silver during the campaign. Bribery flourished. Standard Oil Company bought the votes of judges and legislators. Justo was saddened by these events. He was dismayed by the fraud, grovelling ambition, and petty interests that were found in Washington. Justo predicted that this would continue as long as United States politics did not express the class struggle that engendered great ideas and sentiments.

Justo did not believe that the United States would continue being the embodiment of deception and corruption. Justo predicted that with the concentration of wealth the proletariat had to recognize its inferior status. This had to be aggravated by United States ties with Asia. Justo noted the dire consequences for United States industry and labor with the opening up of Asia to universal commerce. In China and Japan salaries were lower. He observed that coarse cotton was shipped from the United States to Japan. He pointed out that there was an emigration of capital. Justo foresaw a time when United States factories in Asia would process the raw materials from the United States.

Notwithstanding his critical comments, Justo emphasized that the habits of free inquiry, discussion, vote, and respect for the majority

decision were rooted in the national conscience. It made the United States superior to other nations for collective action, even those more intellectually developed. Prophetically Justo noted that regardless of what a superficial examination revealed, the United States might become the most advanced nation in terms of social evolution.[19]

Many of the observations made by Justo in 1895 were reaffirmed and updated with more recent data and cited liberally to illustrate points in Teoría y Práctica de la Historia and other works. The United States was cited to illustrate points on the division of labor, the role of women in industry, the correlation between technical progress and industrial unity, trusts, class consciousness, strikes, employment, and salaries.

Justo made some interesting comments on piece work, legislation, and the fortunes of socialism. Justo noted the widespread development of piece work in the United States. He pointed out that its extension was proportional to the technical-economic development of a country. Although piece work did not change the essence of the relationship between management and labor, Justo stated that it did increase production anywhere from 20 to 100 percent according to the class of workers and the technology. Yet Justo recognized the negative features of piece work. The workday was not shortened. It was prolonged. Capitalists exploited the situation. The health of the worker was menaced. His real wage declined in the long run. However, Justo did not preclude the beneficial aspects of piece work. All that was necessary was to educate the workers to resist the negative features.[20]

Justo regretted that the labor movement in the United States was deformed by racism. However, he was pleased to see that strikes were

better organized. To Justo, this proved the growing vigor of the proletariat. Yellow-dog contracts were outlawed in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevade, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Justo viewed this as a step in the right direction. He also noted that Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, and Wisconsin excluded labor unions from the application of anti-trust legislation.[21]

In 1922, Justo cited the United States to illustrate the setbacks suffered by international socialism. He called the United States a school of liberty and democracy. Its working class enjoyed the highest standard of living. Justo emphasized that it had provided examples for Argentine socialism. Therefore, he was shocked by the violent and arbitrary expulsion of Victor Berger, the socialist Representative from Wisconsin, from the House of Representatives, and the five socialist Assemblymen from the New York State Legislature.[22]

By 1916 the United States was Argentina's <u>bête noire</u>. She stood in the way of Argentina becoming the leader of a South American bloc. Perhaps that explained why Justo was chided in the Cámara de Diputados when he referred to the United States to illustrate a point. A more reasonable explanation would be that his colleagues were exasperated by his continuous citation of the United States.[23]

The United States was cited by Justo to support his position that <u>latifundios</u> be destroyed. The evolution in agriculture was not centralization but decentralization. Justo noted the absence of trusts in agricultural production. The number of agricultural farms increased. Justo noted that in 1850 the medium-size farm in the United States was 203 acres

while in 1910 it was reduced to 138.14 acres. He noted that, unlike Spanish America, the United States developed as a country of farms. Each farmer had sufficient land for working and living. This type of subdivision was necessary for the population and cultivation of Argentina. Justo lamented that it was hindered by the traditional forms of landownership. They were an obstacle to the technical-economic evolution of the country. Justo saw the agricultural question as the most important problem in Argentina. Obviously this was not a problem in the United States.[24]

He cited the United States to illustrate that in agriculture as industry there was a tendency for a separation to exist between those who own the means of production and those who use the means of production. He noted the increased tenant farming in the United States when he presented his proposal to indemnize tenants for improvement to the soil to the Cámara in 1913. In 1880, 74.5 percent of farms in the United States were cultivated by their owners while in 1910 the figure was lowered to 64.1 percent. However, Justo reported that the United States farmer was intelligent enough to make use of mutual aid societies. Twenty percent of Michigan farmers belonged to some form of mutual aid society in 1894, according to Justo.[25]

Justo wanted to forge a greater solidarity between rural and urban workers. In Teoría y Práctica de la Historia he noted that a delegate from the League of Farm Workers of Texas spoke to a Congress of the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Justo wanted to demonstrate the importance of reciprocal aid between agricultural and labor organizations. This type of solidarity was extremely necessary in Argentina. Here there were enormous latifundios. There was an encamped agricultural class.

The soil was used for cattle instead of farming. Every winter tens of thousands of people emigrated because they were not able to sink their roots into Argentine soil.[26]

Justo was extremely critical of the A.F.L. He regretted that the political activity of the working class was not commensurate with its numbers. The policy of the A.F.L. had been to support bourgeois candidates who were less harmful to the organization. Justo noted the futility of that policy. In 1908 the A.F.L. had voted against Taft because he had obstructed the labor movement with his judicial mandates. Notwithstanding the fact that the Trade Union vote for the Democratic Party candidate for President increased, between 1904 and 1908, by 1,315,211 votes, the Republicans won. In spite of the 720,000 votes cast for socialist candidates and the election of one socialist Congressman, Justo was annoyed that the United States labor force did not exercise an influence in line with its numerical strength.

This was the reason for the disorientation and decadence of United States politics. The A.F.L. was ridiculed for its support of the silver party which favored a monetary policy that devalued wages and benefited debtors and businessmen. This disorientation was seen in the war against trusts carried out in the name of free competition. The government did not understand the historical significance of centralization. It wasted its time creating legal restrictions against monopolies while it supported these monopolies with high custom duties.[27]

His annoyance with the A.F.L. reached the boiling point in 1925 when delegates from Argentina were excluded from a Pan American Congress sponsored by the American Federation of Labor. The Executive Committee

sent a letter, drafted by Justo, to the American Federation of Labor, which illustrated clearly Justo's socialistic and nationalistic position.

This letter, one of the most representative documents of Argentine socialism, noted the conceptual differences that existed between the Argentine Socialist Party and the American Federation of Labor. Justo noted that in Latin America racial mixture and class divisions were so profound that both social characteristics separated Latin American from North American society. The racial mixture was positive for Latin America while the class division was harmful. He reasoned that only the labor movement could unite the workers in a common historic consciousness. Justo was emphatic when he said that only when the working class was enlightened and spiritually homogeneous would the nations of Latin America truly exist.

To Justo, it was necessary for the Latin American labor movement to be nationalistic. The labor movement was to redeem the proletariat materially and morally. The Hispanic-American working class was motivated by ideas of social justice. It did not know, however, how always to translate them into a methodical action. Unlike the United States, it was inconceivable to have in Latin America a Trade Union movement simply concerned with material problems. Because the problems were so immense and urgent, the Latin American working class was motivated by social sympathy. Justo proclaimed the basic solidarity between the Trade Union movement and the political movement of the working class. Justo thought that these movements would be successful only when they were motivated by vast social ideals. Therefore, it was necessary for the Latin American labor movement to be nationalist, internationalist, and socialist.[28]

By 1895 Justo viewed the Argentine fight against imperialism as an international socialist fight. Within this framework he dealt with the actions of the United States in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Mexico. Under his guidance Orgentine socialists supported Cuban independence. Prior to his debate with Dr. Carlos Malagarriga, Justo had requested the opinion of Pablo Iglesias, the "grandfather" of Spanish socialism, on this issue. In a letter dated April 19, 1897, Iglesias wrote:

> . . . the major responsibility for the was was the Spanish bourgeoisie, that had not given to their inhabitants (Cubans) the rights that belong to them; it ought to grant them autonomy, and if this did not satisfy their inhabitants and they wish independence, they should be given it also. It is certain that if Spain lost Cuba, its political and economic power (Spain) will diminish . . . and this diminution of economic power must aggravate the work crisis that we suffer today. If with autonomy the sons of the Isle of Cuba were satisfied, in which they left from the inferior condition in which they are today with respect to the Peninsula, who do we have to ask for their independence that, little or much, harms Spain? If they will demand this, it was another thing; whether we would lose or we would not lose, we did not have the right to oblige them to live in a way that did not please them.
>
> On the subject of Cuba the Party had not adopted a more resolute attitude, because its strength is small, and one ought never to attempt a business that can not be completed.[29]

In his debate with Dr. Malagarriga, Justo verbally attacked him. He criticized Malagarriga for not becoming a citizen and remaining politically tied to Spain. Bitterly Justo denounced Dr. Malagarriga as a jingoist. To Justo, justice was a relative term. He declared that he was not too angry because the English exterminated black tribes in South Africa. He was more concerned about the absurdities committed in the name of patriotism. He lamented Spain's ruinous war to maintain its domination over Cuba. It was disastrous for Spain and for Cuba which Spain was unable to administer properly. To Justo these were two completely different countries that lacked the common historical tradition cited by Dr. Malagarriga.[30]

Justo viewed the Spanish-American war as a clash between two completely different worlds. Spain ignored the United States. United States intervention had been necessary to end the bloody and destructive war between Spain and Cuba. To Justo, the disproportionate losses suffered by the United States and Spain was analogous to a war between civilization and barbarism. Justo had a mixed reaction on the effects of the Spanish-American war. Justo noted his criticisms of United States action in Cuba. He denounced the United States protectorate over Cuba and discounted all the platitudinous statements made by the United States on Cuban liberty. Justo noted that blacks were persecuted cruelly in the United States. Therefore, he anticipated that Cubans would be mistreated by the United States. However, in 1915, when he analyzed the results of the war in terms of Spanish-Cuban relations, he found them to be positive. Cuba was closer to Spain. Mail costs were no longer double that of the costs between any two other nations. Land values had increased. Spanish landlords, who owned great extensions of land, benefited. Spanish immigration to Cuba increased in the post-war period. Between 1904 and 1906, 76,558 Spaniards entered Cuba. This figure had never been reached in an equal period of time when Spain controlled Cuba.[31]

In 1902, when he denounced United States imperialism in Puerto Rico, Justo showed his genuinely Latin American spirit. Santiago Iglesias, President of the Labor Federation of Puerto Rico, had been sentenced to three years in prison. He had been a member of an "illegal society" and used violent means to raise the salaries of workers.

Justo used United States socialist literature to supply his readers with background material on this issue. Once conquered, Puerto Rico was invaded by Yankee capital. The United States monetary system was

established. Prices increased. Justo mentioned that only salaries were paid with the old money. In the sugar plantations of Canovenas and Buena Vista strikers asked for higher salaries. Justo stated that although there was not any serious violence, the authorities and English-language newspapers launched a systematic, cruel campaign against labor leaders. Iglesias was the most active and prestigious leader. More serious conflicts existed in the United States. There the most dangerous views were expressed freely.

Therefore, Justo concluded that this event demonstrated that the United States viewed Puerto Ricans as an inferior race and wanted to keep them as a subjugated caste. Obviously the United States saw the labor movement as the embryo of Puerto Rican nationalism. It wanted to suffocate it. Justo noted that Admiral Dewey was the most celebrated hero in the United States. He warned that a truly imperialistic spirit reigned in that country. To Justo, Puerto Rico served as a lesson for all South Americans. He urged them to forcibly resist all imperialistic nations which treat South America like Puerto Rico.[32]

However, Justo was not blind to the positive actions of the United States in Puerto Rico. In the parliamentary session of September 13, 1913, he noted the attempt of the United States to make Puerto Ricans literate. The 1899 census noted that 83 percent of Puerto Ricans were illiterate. Within fourteen years the United States built 1,168 common schools. Student enrollment increased continuously. Whereas the Island's matriculated students make up 15 percent of the total population, Justo noted sadly that in Argentina they made up only 10 percent of the total population of the country.[33]

Justo reported on United States-Mexican relations. To Justo, the Mexican-American war was the logical outgrowth of differences in the technical-economic development of these countries. He was not surprised that the exuberant North American civilization seized vast territories from the turbulent oligarchy that governed Mexico. Mexico had developed slowly. It was oppressed by dogma and privilege. From this territory six flourishing agricultural and mining states were created. Justo, who had an extensive knowledge of Mexico through wide reading, said that the Mexican Revolution had united all the progressive forces of the country against the monstrous social situation in Mexico. Justo reasoned that one of the principal objectives of the Revolution was to emancipate the peasants from servile contract and enable them to become autonomous farmers.[34]

He had a thorough knowledge of the legal precepts in Mexico that regulated the priesthood. Justo hoped that Argentina would benefit from the events in Mexico. To Justo, the church-state war in Mexico was the most acute manifestation of this fight that the present age had known. The corrupt, despotic Catholic Church fought against constitutional reform. Justo pointed out that this reform had been initiated three-quarters of a century ago. It was ratified by the Carranza government in 1917. President Calles ventured to implement it.

Justo was pleased to note that for the first time a fundamental distinction was established between religion and the church. He noted that there were two sections of the Mexican Constitution that should calm Argentine Senators who were believers. Article 130 prohibited legislation for either establishing or prohibiting any religion. Article 24 affirmed the right of all men to practice their religion. Justo noted that a

socialist alderman in Junín had proposed that the holy water be sterilized because of microbes in the water which caused illness. With tongue in cheek, Justo noted that with this sterilization, the holy water would be much more holy.

Justo urged his colleagues in the Senate to be aware of the nationalistic background of these measures on the Church in Mexico. Justo noted Mexico's physical contact with the imperialistic United States. Mexico had taken these measures in order to separate itself from the North American psychology which was extremely religious. Therefore, the Constitution reflected a belief in positive science, experimental truth, and the moral human solidarity and labor. It repudiated all dogma and churches. Justo thought it interesting that Mexico was now more respected by the United States than ever before. This was also the reason that all clergymen had to be Mexican. The Mexicans hoped to avoid an invasion of Protestant ministers. It was to make sure that there would be no moral and intellectual conquest of Mexico by rich and powerful churches.[35]

On June 16, 1925, Justo demonstrated his concern for the welfare of Mexico, one of the Latin American countries menaced by United States aggression. He requested that the Agentine Senate support President Calles in his dispute with the United States. Justo held the United States oil interests responsible for the difficulties between the United States and Mexico. These companies wanted to extend their tentacles throughout the world.

Therefore, Justo emphasized the need for Latin American governments to control foreign commerce. It was necessary to defend the native worker against the greedy foreign capitalists. He criticized the highhanded

treatment of Mexico by the United States. President Calles headed a sovereign, autonomous, progressive, popularly supported government which did not threaten the existence of the United States.[36] Justo served as a Latin American spokesman when he said:

> In Mexico, an autochthonic native nation tries to emerge from darkness and misery, by means of a new policy that has been established there. We know all the hatred of races, characteristic of the United States, we know the national disdain of that great nation for the nations of other races that it considers inferiors, and we that have so many natives, we Argentines, that have entire provinces populated still by autochthonic races whose development we desire, whose future we wish to raise, we ought to feel ourselves also in that sense in solidarity with Mexico.[37]

Through his comments on Russia, the United States, and Mexico, Justo demonstrated his genuinely Latin American spirit. He rejected the idea that the developments in Russia could serve as a complete model for the people of Latin America because there were substantial differences between the two areas. To Justo, the racial mixture of Latin America required that Labor Unions in Latin America serve as vehicles for the development of the nations in Latin America. Notwithstanding his comments on the Mexican-American War, Justo urged the people of Latin America to oppose United States and European imperialism. His death on January 8, 1928, deprived Latin America of one of its most able spokesmen.

CHAPTER IV

FOOTNOTES

[1]Juan B. Justo, Internacionalismy y patria (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1933), pp. 15-49 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas V); Salomon Rodriquez, "Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XIX (14 April 1928), 656-658.

[2]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 37-40.

[3]Ibid., pp. 42-43.

[4]Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[5]Ibid., pp. 45-46.

[6]Juan B. Justo, La moneda (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1928), pp. 4-5 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas I).

[7]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 286-289.

[8]Juan B. Justo, La realización del socialismo (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 304-315 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas VI).

[9]Ibid., pp. 316-325.

[10]Ibid., pp. 329-330; Justo, Obras Completas V, p. 292.

[11]Juan B. Justo, "La Revolución Rusa," Acción Socialista, IX (12 Nov. 1927), 256-258.

[12]Justo, Obras Completas VI, pp. 69-71.

[13]Ibid., pp. 72-87.

[14]Ibid., pp. 87-89, 93-99.

[15]Ibid., pp. 99-106.

[16]Ibid., pp. 106-110.

[17]Ibid., pp. 110-114.

[18]Ibid., pp. 114-120.

[19]Ibid., pp. 120-126.

[20]Juan B. Justo, Teoría y práctica de la historia (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Libera, 1969), pp. 258-261 (hereinafter referred to as Obras Completas IV).

[21]Ibid., p. 479; Juan B. Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos (Buenos Aires: El ateneo, 1933), pp. 105-106.

[22]Justo, Obras Completas VI, p. 304.

[23]Juan B. Justo, La obra parlamentaria: May 1913-Abril 1914 (Buenos Aires: Editorial Prometeo, 1914), p. 77 (hereafter referred to as La obra parlamentaria 1913-1914). Sr. del Barco asked whether Argentina was to duplicate everything in the United States. Justo responded, in the session of May 19, 1913, that Argentina should only copy the positive features of the United States; John J. Johnson, Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 97.

[24]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 101-102; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 140-141.

[25]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 49, 147-148.

[26]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 483-484.

[27]Ibid., p. 469; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 131-132.

[28]Emilio J. Corbiere, "Justo y la cuestión nacional," Todo es Historia, XVII (June 1972), p. 14: Dardo Cúneo, Juan B. Justo y la declaración de principios de partido socialista (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947), pp. 31-35; Alfredo L. Palacios, Estardistas y poetas (Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1952), pp. 28-29.

[29]Juan Antonio Solari, Pablo Iglesias (Buenos Aires: Editorial La Vanguardia, 1957), p. 118.

[30]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 105-109.

[31]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 138-139; Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 230-232.

[32]Justo, Obras Completas V, pp. 220-224; Robert Alexander, Latin American Political Parties (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), pp. 171-173. According to Professor Alexander, Santiago Iglesias favored statehood for Puerto Rico.

[33]Juan B. Justo, Educacion Publica (Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1930), pp. 78-79 (hereafter referred to as Obras Completas III).

[34]Justo, Obras Completas IV, pp. 136-137; Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, p. 142; Carlos L. Gracidas, "Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 272-275.

[35]Justo, Discursos y escritos políticos, pp. 262-269.

[36]Argentina, Cámara de Senadores, 13th session, June 16, 1925, Proyecto De Declaracion De Los Senores Senadores Justo y Bravo, De Solidaridad Con El Gobierno De La Republica De Mejico, 13th Sess., Cámara de Senadores, 1925, I (Buenos Aires: Imprenta y Encuadernacion de la H. Cámara de Diputados, 1925), pp. 184-185.

[37]Ibid., p. 188.

CONCLUSION

Justo the Argentine, who became a socialist because he loved all humanity, created the Socialist Party to serve the working class, the true constructors and producers of society. For three decades he guided the Socialist Party through a hostile political environment. Although organized democratically, the major policies of the party were determined by Justo, who mastered the art of manipulating the party's membership. He exemplified a man within whom theory and action were well blended. His rigid discipline explained the moral force of the Argentine Socialist Party.

Because of Justo, Argentine socialism was distinguished by its puritanism. Continually Justo cautioned the working class about the evils of alcohol. The ouster of Palacios was justifed on moral grounds, as was the purge of de Tomaso. Justo always emphasized that the Socialist Party wanted to raise the working class not only materially but morally.

However, his critics have charged that this morality was symptomatic of his desire to "Europeanize" Argentina. They point out that Justo championed European immigration because of his contempt for the ability of the native population. They note that his economic policy was detrimental to the development of Argentine industry.

Justo's economic policy of free trade, expounded by the Argentine Socialist Party, was unique among Socialists throughout the world.

It was Justo's contention that protectionism was harmful to the welfare of the Argentine working class who would have to pay the cost for protected industry. Furthermore, Justo reasoned that free trade was the most important force in keeping world peace.

Justo viewed himself as a nationalist. He wanted to end capitalist exploitation of Argentina and increase the ability of the Argentine working class. In this sense Justo was undoubtedly a nationalist.

Throughout his political life he struggled to improve the material and moral life of the proletariat. The material improvement of the working class was to come about through the democratic processes in order to guarantee the dignity of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat was anathema to him, as was any type of dictatorship. The economic, social, and political emancipation of the working class was an evolutionary process brought about by the education of the proletariat. Workers were to develop their skills by participating in the Socialist Party, Co-operatives, and Trade Unions.

Justo's works not only provided great insights into the history of Argentina but also demonstrated his encyclopedic knowledge. However, his theoretical ideas and thorough studies were beyond the comprehension of the masses. Justo represented both the strength and weakness of the party. The party was made up principally of men from the professions and organized labor of the Litoral. The party made slight inroads among the unorganized masses of the interior. However, Justo recognized the consequence for Argentina should the demands of the working class not be granted. On December 16, 1915, Justo predicted the advent of Peron:

> Within a few decades, perhaps twenty or thirty years, if Argentine politics, in so far as they depend upon the governing class, follow the currents that they have followed up to now, and if the governing classes do not hurry to come to terms with the clear and fertile demands of the working class, we are going to witness a revolution in this country which is going to take place in one or another form; and we will see then that there has been formed in the Argentine nation, throughout the extent of its territory, a class of citizens which will make up the majority and will eventually take over the government of the Nation, upon conditions of realizing in it what we are saying today in the order of criticism and initiative.
>
> It will be a change of serious and transcendental consequences and of disagreeable effects to those who govern, then ex-governors who will have lost brilliant opportunities to show themselves capable and useful to the country.[1]

However, Justo recognized that the lot of the Argentine working class was interwoven with the fortunes of the international working class. As one who loved Argentina, he was concerned for the welfare of all peoples. He provided a great deal of information on the problems facing the countries of Latin America. His views on United States actions vis-à-vis Latin America made it clear that Justo was a staunch defender of the people of Latin America. Justo also exemplified the ties that existed between South American Socialism and International Socialism. He had a warm relationship with the leaders of European Socialism, especially with those of Spain. Justo provided a keen analysis of the problems of the Second International as well as the effects of World War I and the Russian Revolution on non-industrial, non-European nations.

Because of his work, his name deserves to be listed beside such esteemed Argentine national figures as Bernardino Rivadavia, Juan Bautista Alberdi, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, and Bartolomé Mitre, and with such figures of International Socialism as Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Karl Kautsky, Jean Jaurès, and Pablo Iglesias.

CONCLUSION

FOOTNOTE

[1]Argentina, Cámara de Diputados, 54 Reunion, December 16, 1915, Prespuesto General Para 1916, 54 Reunion, Cámara de Diputados, 1915, I (Buenos Aires: La Gaceta de Buenos Aires, 1916), p. 539.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Works by Justo

Books

Justo, Juan. Cooperación Líbre. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1929.

_____. Discursos y Escritos Politicos. Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1933.

_____. Educacion Publica. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1930.

_____. Internacionalismo y Patria. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1933.

_____. La Obra Parlamentaria del Diputado Socialista por la Capital Juan B. Justo Mayo 1912-Abril 1913. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1913.

_____. La Obra Parlamentaria (Mayo 1913-Abril 1914). Buenos Aires: Editorial Prometeo, 1914.

_____. "Porque no me gusta escribir para una hoja que se dice Israelita," El Marxismo y la cuestión judía. Buenos Aires: Editorial Plus Ultras, 1965.

_____. Precios y salarios. Buenos Aires: Lolito y Barberis, 1913.

_____. El Programa Socialista del Campo. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1915.

_____. La Realización del Socialismo. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947.

_____. Socialismo. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1920.

_____. Teoría y Prática de la Historia. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Libera, 1969.

Magazines

Justo, Juan. "Base Biológica de la Historia," La Universidad Popular, 1 (1905), 27-31; 2 (1905), 27-31; 3 (1905), 30-32.

_____. "Como se manejan los dineros del Banco de la Nación," Accion Socialista, XII (13 Dec. 1924), 355-359.

_____. "Discurso en homenaje a Juan Jaurès," Revista Socialista, II (July 1939), 3-4.

_____. "Economía, Valor, Interés," Anales de Facultad de Derecho III (1913), 438-463.

_____. "Epistolario inédito," Revista Socialista, II (Sept. 1939), 163-164.

_____. "La explotación de los yerbales," Revista Socialista, II (Sept. 1940), 83-89.

_____. "La producción azucarera en la economía argentina," Accion Socialista, II (10 July 1926), 34-38; II (24 July 1926), 67-68; IV (14 Aug. 1926), 104-110.

_____. "La reforma de la ley agraria," Acción Socialista, XXIII (29 May 1925), 714-715.

_____. "La Revolución Rusa," Acción Socialista, IX (12 Nov. 1927), 256-258.

_____. "Testamento de Juan B. Justo," Anuario Socialista (1938), 82.

Newspapers

El Dario del Pueblo, 1 October-30 November 1899.

El Socialista, 1902-1925.

La Vanguardia, 1894-1966.

Documents

Argentina Republica. Dario de Sesiones de la Cámara de Diputados 1912. Buenos Aires: La Gaceta de Buenos Aires, 1912-1924.

_____. Diario de Sesiones de la Cámara de Senadores 1924-1928. Buenos Aires: Imprenta y Encuadernación de la H. Cámara de Diputados, 1925-1929.

Partido Socialista. Boletín del Partido Socialista, June 1914-December 1922.

Secondary Sources

Books

Alexander, Robert J. Communism in Latin America. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1957.

_____. Labor Relations in Argentina, Brazil and Chile. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

_____. An Introduction to Argentina. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

_____. Latin American Political Parties. New York: Praeger, Publishers, 1973.

Ayarragaray, Lucas. Socialismo Argentino y Legislación Obrera. Buenos Aires: J. Lajouane y Cia., 1912.

Barreiro, José. Socialismo Teorico y Socialismo Practico. Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1966.

Belbey, José. "Juan B. Justo," La aventura de la libertad en el hombre. Buenos Aires: Bases, 1957. Pp. 67-85.

Belloni, Alberto. Del Anarquismo al Peronismo: Historical del Movimiento Obrero Argentino. Buenos Aires: A. Pena Gillo, 1960.

Centro Editor de América Latina. Congresos de las Internacionales Obreras. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina S.A., 1969.

Coca, Joaquín. El contubernio. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Coyoancán, 1961

Comision de Prensa del Partido Socialista. La Vanguardia. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1948.

Costa, Luis Cerruti. El sindicalismo: las masas y el poder: historia del movimiento obrero argentino. Buenos Aires: Trafac, 1957.

Cúneo, Dardo. Juan B. Justo y la declaración de principios del partido socialista. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947.

_____. Juan B. Justo y las luchas sociales en la largentina. Buenos Aires: Alpe, 1956.

Dickmann, Adolfo. Nacionalismo y Socialismo. Buenos Aires: 1933.

Dickmann, Enrique. Democracia y Socialismo. Buenos Aires: Serafin Ponzinibbio y Cia., 1917.

_____. El Partido Socialista Argentino en los Congresos Internacionales. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1946.

_____. Recuerdos de un militante socialista. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949.

_____. Pensamiento y Acción. Buenos Aires: Sociedad Amigos del Libro Rioplatense, 1937.

Dorfman, Adolfo. Historia de la industria Argentina. Buenos Aires: Escuela de estudios Argentinos, 1942.

_____. Situación actual y breve historia del desarrollo industrial en la Argentina. Rosario: Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 1941.

El Diputado Palacios: Su separación del Partido Socialista. Buenos Aires: L. J. Rosso y Cia., 1915.

Ernesto Tornquist and Company. The Economic Development of the Argentine Republic in the Last Fifty Years. Buenos Aires: 1919.

Ferns, Henry. Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Frugoni, Emilio. "El partido socialista de la republica argentina," Genesis, Esencia y fundamentos del socialismos. 2 vols. Buenos Aires: Editorial Americalee, 1947. Pp. 277-307.

Giménez, Angel. Los precursores del socialismo en la República Argentina. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1917.

Iscaro, Rubens. Origen y desarrollo del movimiento sindical argentino. Buenos Aires: Editorial Ateneo, 1958.

Johnson, John. Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965. Pp. 95-127.

Levene, Ricardo. A History of Argentina. Translated by William Spence Robertson. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1937.

Marianetti, Benito. Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, una honesta conducta frente a la revolucion rusa. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Silaba, 1972.

Marotta, Sebastian. El Movimiento Sindical Argentino. 3 vols. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Lacio, 1960, 1961, 1970.

Moreau de Justo, Alicia. El socialismo según la definición de Juan B. Justo. Buenos Aires: Editorial Polis, 1946.

Oddone, Jacinto. Declaración de Principios y Programa del Partido Socialista. Buenos Aires: Partido Socialista Demócratico, 1972.

_____. Gremialismo Proletario Argentino. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1949.

_____. Historia del socialismo argentino. 2 vols. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934.

Palacios, Alfredo. La Justicia Social. Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1954.

_____. La legislación del trabajo en la Argentina. Buenos Aires:

_____. Estadistas y Poetas. Buenos Aires: Editorial Claridad, 1952.

Pan, Luis. Juan B. Justo y la fundación del Partido Socialista. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1956.

_____. Justo y Marx: El socialismo en la Argentina. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Monserrat, 1964.

_____. Visión Socialista de Medio Siglo Argentino. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1947.

Partido Socialista. Legislación de trabajo. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1928.

Puiggrós, Rodolfo. Las izquierdas y el problem nacional. Buenos Aires: Jorge Alvarez Editora, 1967.

Repetto, Nicolás. Hombres y Problemas Argentinas. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1945.

_____. Juan B. Justo y el movimiento político social argentino. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Monserrat, 1964.

_____. Lecciones sobre cooperación. Buenos Aires: Federación Argentina de Cooperativas de Consumo, 1944.

_____. Mi paso por la agricultura. Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1959.

_____. Mi paso por la política: De Roca a Yrigoyen. Buenos Aires: Santiago Rueda, 1956.

_____. Mis Noventa años. Buenos Aires: Bases, 1962.

Santillán, Diego Abad de. F.O.R.A. Ideología y trayectoria del movimiento obrero revolucionario en la Argentina. Buenos Aires: Editorial Nervio, 1933.

Sargo, Lucas Francisco. Juan B. Justo en la evolución social Argentina. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Afrimacion, 1960.

Scobie, James. Argentina: A City and a Nation. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Sobral, Antonio (Ed.). Hipólito Yrigoyen Pueblo y Gobierno. 12 vols. Buenos Aires: Editorial Rayal, 1956.

Solari, Juan Antonio. Enrique del Valle Iberlucea, Primer Senador Socialista de America. Buenos Aires: Editorial Bases, 1972.

_____. Pablo Iglesias. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1951.

_____. Recordación de Juan B. Justo. Buenos Aires: Bases, 1965.

Spilimbergo, Jorge. Juan B. Justo y el socialismo cipayo. Buenos Aires: Editorial Coyozcan, 1960.

Tarditi, José Rodriquez. "Juan B. Justo," Semblanza de tres Líderes. Buenos Aires: Bases editorial Buenos Aires, 1960. Pp. 47-67.

_____. Juan B. Justo, Parlamentario. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1934.

_____. Juan B. Justo y Nicolás Repetto en la acción cooperativa, Sus discipulos. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Intercoop, 1970.

Tomaso, Antonio de. La internacional y la revolución. Buenos Aires: La Vanguardia, 1919.

Urruela, Rafael. Argentine Journey. New Orleans: Inter-American News Association, 1948.

Vazielles, José. Los Socialistas. Buenos Aires: Editorial Jorge S.A., 1967.

Articles

Arrieta, Augustín de. "Juan B. Justo - Al entrar en la historia," Acción Socialista, XVI (29 Feb. 1928), 565-566.

Baigorri, J. Vidal. "Justo y la cuestión agraria," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 476-481.

Bogliolo, Rómulo. "El Hogar Obrero y sus progresos," Acción Socialista, XVI (14 Feb. 1925), 509-511.

Bravo, Mario. "Organización programa y desarrolla del partido socialista en la argentina," Revista Argentina de Ciencias Políticas, X (1915), 119-150.

Campobassi, José. "La obra educacional de Justo en el campo de la enseñañza secundaria y universitaria," Acción Socialista, XVI (29 Feb. 1928), 573-576.

_____. "La preoccupación de Justo por la instrucción primaria," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 522-526.

Casaneuva, F. "La obra de Justo en Junín," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 527-528.

Castiñeiras, Alejandro. "Impresiones y recuerdos," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 467-469.

Comorera, Juan. "Como conocí al Dr. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 491.

Corbiera, Emilio, "Justo y la cuestión nacional," Todo es Historia, LXII (June 1972), 8-23.

Cortes, Robert Conde and Ezequiel Gallo. "El crecimiento economico de la Argentina," Anuario del Institute de Investigaciones Historicas Universidad Nacional del Litoral, VI (1962-63), 265-335.

Cúneo, Dardo. "Las dos corrientes del movimiento obrero en la 90," Revista de Historia, I (1957), 61-72.

Dagnino, Francisco. "Pensamiento y accion," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 531.

Dickmann, Enrique. "El major homenaje," Annario Socialista (1938), 21-24.

_____. "El pensamiento vivo de Juan B. Justo," Anuario Socialista (1948), 1-6.

_____. "Salario mínimo para los obreros y empleados del estado," Acción Socialista, XIII (27 Dec. 1924), 387-394.

Ferrara, Romeo. "La obra del Juan B. Justo en Junín," Acción Socialista, XIX (14 April 1928), 647-651.

_____. "La obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo en pro de los productores del campo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 485-490.

Frugoni, Emilio. "Justo, pensador Socialista," Anuario Socialista (1938), 29-38.

_____. "El socialismo en los paises del Río de la Plata," Humanidad Nueva, VI (1916), 25-34.

Games, Julia Garcia. "El Dr. Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XII (13 Dec. 1924), 355-359.

Ghioldi, Américo. "La formación de Justo," Anuario Socialista (1938), 47-50.

Giménez, Angel. "El sembrador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 455-456.

_____. "Juan B. Justo y la cooperación," Anuario Socialista (1938), 55-60.

Gracidas, Carlos. "Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 474.

Guevara, José. "Algunos aspectos de la vida y obra del Dr. Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 513-516.

Gutiérrez, Avelino. "Justo, Maestro Integral: En la Ciencia y en la Acción Social," Anuario Socialista (1938), 61-81.

"Homenje a la memoria de Juan B. Justo en el Concejo Deliberante de Buenos Aires," Acción Socialista, XX (28 April 1928), 691-692.

Iglesias, Pablo. "Carta," Revista Socialista Internacional, III (15 Oct. 1909), 257-258.

Justo, Alicia Moreau de. "Juan B. Justo: Algunos recuerdos de sui estada en los Cardales," Anuario Socialista (1938), 25-28.

Maradona, Waldino. "Trabajo y miseria de los campesinos," Acción Socialista, XV (24 Jan. 1925), 462-466.

Navas, Miguel. "El Dr. Juan B. Justo creador de las agrupaciones socialista gremiales," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 519-520.

Nigro, Juan. "Juan B. Justo, propulsor de la acción económica del pueblo," Revista Socialista, I (Aug. 1947), 92-95.

Palacín, Manuel. "Juan B. Justo y el concepto de la vida," Revista Socialista, II (Feb. 1938), 108-114.

_____. "Para el anecdotario del Maestro," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 464-466.

Pena, José Luis. "Apuntes," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 460-461.

Repetto, Nicolás. "Los progresos de la cooperación," Acción Socialista, V (28 Aug. 1926), 130-132.

_____. "Recuerdos de juventud," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 450-451.

_____. "Síntesis del hombre y de su obra," Anuario Socialista (1938), 11-20.

Repetto, Nicolás. "Una campaña de defamación," Acción Socialista, XXVII (25 June 1927), 760-762.

Rodríquez, Salomón. "Juan B. Justo," Acción Socialista, XIX (14 April 1928), 656-658.

Rolandi, Guillermo. "Figuras internacionales," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 529.

Sitano, Loranzo. "Justo, educador," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 509-511.

Solari, Juan Antonio. "La labor periodística de Justo," Acción Socialista, XV (15 Feb. 1928), 499-505.

Sommi, Luis. "La estructura económico-social de la Argentina en 1890," Revista de Historia, I (1957), 1835.

"Victory y Suárez," Revista Socialista, I (July-Sept. 1971), 75-75.