

Framing Imaginaries of Anarchism in Argentina Across Space and Time

Geoffroy de Laforcade*

*“A refusal is also a commitment to continually seek to
create forms that to not exist.”*

- Marilia Loureiro¹

Ivanna Margarucci, one of the best of a new generation of historians who have redefined the field, stipulates that the uncritical use of the notion of “import” when discussing anarchism in the “New World” results in silencing anarchist voices in their dialogue with one another in the Americas, while assuming that all were separated by national histories and bear a direct lineage with Europe. She explains that the “watertight compartments” generated by methodological nationalism frame histories of resistance as unidirectionally as modernity itself, with an assumed European origin, a westward expansion, an apogee, and finally a niche in a bygone past.² By habitually periodizing anarchism’s “rise,” its “heyday” and “decline,” we miss its essential impulse as a culture of symbolic revolt prefiguring the dissolution of existing forms of domination, identification and allegiance, and directing the affect toward a culturally coded “dreamlike” future, expressed with urgency and imminence as an actionable alternative to the perceived misery of the present social condition. Everywhere the “Idea” traveled, it blended abstract, prescriptive narratives freely borrowed from a circulating material corpus of universal precepts with locally generated countercultural idioms of agency and opposi-

*Geoffroy de Laforcade is Professor of Latin American, Caribbean and World History at Norfolk State University. In addition to co-editing a special issue of *Anarchist Studies* (2020) focusing on “Indigeneity in Latin American Anarchism,” he has co-authored *The Aliens Within: Danger, Disease, and Displacement in Representations of the Racialized Poor* (2022); *Migration, Diaspora, Exile: Narratives of Affiliation and Escape* (2020) and *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History* (2015). He has also published numerous articles and book chapters on a wide range of topics, including “Anarchism and Syndicalism in Argentina” (2023) and “Resistance, Gender, and Indigeneity: Critique and Contemporaneity of Bolivian Anarchism in the Historical Imagination of Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui” (2020).

tion.³ This imaginary, like any revolutionary ideology, “fosters the creation of social relations that are radically external to customary relations; only through symbolic expression can the creation of voluntary groups grounded in the adherence to new principles be rendered possible.”⁴

Consistent with the traditional assumption that anarchist labor activism disappeared or declined in relevance, some authors have suggested that cultural anarchism continued to infuse society well beyond the first decades of the century – which makes it possible to envision the experiments I just described as more impactful, over time, than the social environment that birthed them.⁵ I coincide with Jacinto Cerdá, however, in believing that while the power of anarchists alone to shape the direction of organized labor diminished as industrial modernization reshaped the dynamics of working-class politics, the two – countercultural and labor-centered practices and discourses – were never dissociated enough to separate the analysis of culture from that of the workers for whom it crystallized their difference and dissent, and from whom many of its variants emerged.⁶ Earlier authors such as Juan Suriano and Dora Barrancos pioneered, from the perspective of social history, the study of cultural practices in the everyday lives of working-class neighborhoods in an effort to escape the trappings of earlier chronologies that were overly focused on the strategies and tactics of organizations. Yet the spaces and locales where the events and discourses they chronicled converged closely with those where labor agitation and propaganda were staged.⁷ As Adriana Petra writes, anarchists in the region

displayed a strong sense of community that combined the economic struggle with a determined militancy of cultural integration that was an alternative to that of the state. An unequal integration, discontinuous, often ephemeral, contradictory in its appropriations, but cohesive in the face of the perception of domination.⁸

This work of carving its own space for an alternative culture, Petra continues, was only possible because strikes, mobilizations, and struggles grounded in the world of labor – plus the lived experience

of conflict and persecution – generated a broader context for it to crystallize into a well-defined projection of anarchist identity, even as the cultural industry and mechanisms of integration by the state conspired to marginalize and stigmatize it as “alien” to the social fabric of the nation.⁹ Over time, this identity changed, but it remained grounded in the experience of labor conflict and its incidence on society. The cathartic experience of strikes – which impacted communities, generated solidarity, and drew clear boundaries between the cause and its enemies – brought with it a sense of euphoria and immediacy, power at its paroxysm, within which anarchist culture circulated. These dramatic interruptions in the routine of exploitation were, to paraphrase Michelle Perrot, an “antidote to isolation, to the deadly chill in which the division of labor confined workers.”¹⁰ The uncompromising formulations of anarchist discourse and the movement’s self-perception as the very incarnation of the social revolution – as a vanguard perhaps, but more importantly as an ideal – was based on a claim of total alterity with respect to the existing order, a projection of the future as imminent and of direct action as decisive.¹¹ Thus anarchists in the Río de la Plata region were never really “dominant” but rather ubiquitous, discontinuous in their visibility as permanent organizations or institutions and often embedded in others, and present as a repertoire of dissent, an assemblage of counter-cultural signifiers, which offered alternative forms of cultural integration to that of the state.

The “oppressed” whose emancipation they championed were not defined as a classical proletariat; rather, they identified as belonging to the community of the “cursed,” the “innumerable phalanx of the proscribed.”¹² *El Perseguido* had set the tone as early as 1890: “We are the vagrants, the malefactors, the rabble, the scum of society, the sublimate corrosive of the present social order.”¹³ This anti-dogmatic stance of anarchists on the subject of revolution made it possible to envision unity beyond distinctions of nationality, gender, race, social status, and even religious belief. They extended the denunciation of oppression to all human relations and centered their transformational interventions on the experience of everyday life. They incorporated popular culture into their repertoire of signs when concrete struggles demanded that local communities be drawn into the emancipatory

endeavors for which they advocated. Anarchist rhetoric dramatized the showdown between two opposites – rulers and oppressed – and this melodramatic representation of reality found its expression in ongoing confrontations with capital.¹⁴ Popular classes were portrayed as downtrodden and disinherited, as undesirable and excluded, and their enemies were designated as acting in concert to defend the privileges of the “decent” and “respectable” people who controlled the state.

John Zerzan reminds us that “capital has always reigned in fear of entropy and disorder. Resistance...is the real entropy, which time, history, and progress constantly seek to banish.”¹⁵ Living freely and anarchically is, as Petra relate, “to rebel against an order of meaning that is experienced as culturally normative and against the diversion operation by capitalism as of the meaning of life” through “nomadic, disarticulated, immediate, every day, ephemeral and minority” cultural resistance. This differs from anarchist conceptions expressed in working-class circles during the contested formation of the Argentine national state in the second half of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries in that the latter anticipated capitalism’s imminent collapse. It converges, however, with earlier anarchist culture as “a symptom of profound changes in social life” that reveals the ways in which “new subjects become social actors based on an alternative conception of the political based on desire, emotions, daily experience, relationships and local practices,” reflecting or prefiguring “the perception of unprecedented dimensions of conflict, the formation of new subjects and new forms of resistance.”¹⁶

When Agustín Nieto denounces the “autonomasia” – or naming of one entity to express a general idea – of conflating the Argentine Regional Anarchist Federation (FORA) with Argentine anarchism in general, he is suggesting that the temporality of anarchism, its narration in stages and assumption of evolutionary growth and decline, is an erroneous way to historicize the incidence of the movement as a parenthesis in the process of social integration, which erases not only diverse and divergent forms of anarchist action and organization, but also their cultural imprint and subversion of the temporality of the nation.¹⁷ Limiting the experience of Argentine anarchism

to the capital city of Buenos Aires, framing its history as one of rise and decline or as one of institutions, and ignoring the transnational dimensions of its efforts at federalist coordination across borders has been shown by recent historiography, which transcends the normative assumptions of the social democratic tradition represented by Juan Suriano and his followers, to further distort its relevance to our broader understanding of the history of the region, and of *platense* anarchism itself.¹⁸

While Suriano and others have suggested that early anarchists expressed disdain for working-class and popular cultural forms such as carnival, *saynètes* and other forms of street theater and poetry, or with drinking and disorderly behavior, the reality is that artists from their ranks participated in them. It is important to remember that there were intellectuals and educators within the FORA, but also resistance societies and community sympathizers immersed in tumult and transgressions of work and everyday life, including forms of leisure, entertainment, and licentiousness, as well as the settling of scores, not formally sanctioned by the “Ideal.” The aesthetic avant-gardism of modernist groups, such as the Ermete Zacconi Philodramatic Academy in Buenos Aires and the traveling *Caballeros del Ideal*, achieved popularity not just by spreading propaganda but by telling stories that reflected social realities with which the laboring poor could identify. Anarchist pamphlets, short stories, serial novels, and songs were anti-conformist and popular. All of this was part of a worldwide trend toward the democratization of reading and leisure. Anarchist, socialist, and syndicalist movements all participated in the promotion of cultural literacy among working women and men.¹⁹ The creation of a working-class or popular culture and the translation and dissemination of classical works of literature and thought went hand in hand in the anarchist project, in the spirit of empowering the people with the tools to resist the education of church and state. In a heterogeneous society marked by the perpetual convergence of migrations from the hinterland to the city as well as from abroad, the exaltation of dissent and struggle often took the form of epic stories of labor insurgency and creative freedom at the margins. It was an apprenticeship of autonomy and a statement of artistic and social emancipation that may have been minoritarian but forged an influ-

ential counterculture, in part because it emerged against the backdrop of an era of almost incessant strikes and solidarity movements led by a powerful and far-reaching organized labor movement that structured communities and connected localities across regions and borders.

Suriano's critique of the elitism of early anarchists in the first decade of the century, when their press often promoted hygienist and family-oriented leisure while cautioning against some expressions of popular festiveness and depoliticized behavior (excessive drinking, circus entertainment, folkloric storytelling, etc.) is framed as a balanced assessment: that for all of their plebian claims, they "borrowed" from bourgeois culture.²⁰ Entirely derived from one city, one decade and one type of source material, this judgement not only appears rather banal (liberalism, conservatism, all doctrines do this). It also ignores the fluidity of individual and group identities in any given space or context. Anticlericalism, for example, never stopped working-class anarchists I studied on the Buenos Aires riverfront over five decades from manifesting frequent, if ephemeral affinities, and even forging alliances, with social Catholics whom the enemy deployed to compete with and contain them, but who also shared kinship or ethnic ties, social solidarities, and periodic interests during labor conflicts with the leaders of anarchist resistance societies.²¹ The conditions that made such instances possible were the same that allowed local activists to mobilize cross-class solidarity and mutual aid with shopkeepers, tavern owners, small entrepreneurs, foremen, and lawyers during general strikes or lockouts. They also fostered educational practices that garnered broad-based appeal while disseminating doctrine sharpening their critique of oppression, even in spaces where their numbers weren't strong and especially when seasonal laborers from the interior flocked to their shores during the high export season for casual work.²²

The ongoing criminalization of anarchists was a constituent aspect of their identity as embodiments of total alterity. Labels of "dangerous" and "foreign" ascribed to anarchists were a pathological representation by Argentine elites of the poor as unassimilable. Police forces, prisons, and immigration authorities kept records by nationality

from 1882 onwards as a means of documenting the sources of social unrest, and in 1889 legislator Miguel Cané proposed a legal path to the deportation of foreigners to rid the social fabric of “European vagabonds and delinquents” targeting anarchists as “sources of perversion” representing a danger to the illiterate and impressionable masses. Conservative deputy Lucas Ayarragaray saw anarchists as degenerates and fanatics, and Argentine physicians associated them with mentally and biologically fragile crowds. Even socialists, who opposed deportations, vilified anarchists as anti-social, questioning their patriotism and even their masculinity. Legislative efforts to purge them used the language of contagion and vagrancy to criminalize and even medicalize their difference.²³ Both the 1902 Residency Law and the 1910 Social Defense Law articulated a fear of threats not only to the social order but to “*Argentinidad*” itself. The Residency Law was necessary, its promotor Ayarragaray said, because it “permits the exclusion of those foreigners who come to disturb the social order and ruin Argentine laws, with foreign elements that disintegrate our character and our history.” He deployed concepts of nationalism and national identity to purge “poisonous” outsiders. The 1910 Social Defense Law was aimed at foreign but also native-born and naturalized anarchists, who were threatened with the loss of their political rights and Argentine citizenship.²⁴ Coming on the heels of the establishment of a “Special Section” of the police in 1901 and a “Social Order Division” in 1906, and in the context of close collaboration between police and diplomatic entities from other countries to track down activists wherever they found themselves, these measures criminalized all anarchist activity and forced many leaders of strikes and boycotts underground, while maintaining their legally clandestine places of operation, such as the headquarters of resistance societies, under constant surveillance. Systematic state repression of anarchists and of the organized labor activities they promoted was not merely a consequence, but rather a constituent dimension of the modernization of the Argentine state and both its liberal and conservative variants. Under the influence of their positivist Italian master Cesare Lombroso, who considered crime a biological pathology, Argentine criminologists

pointed to the correlation between immigration and

increasing criminality as proof of the connection between race and crime.... (T)hey saw criminal tendencies as inevitably transmitted by heredity, thereby creating a permanent danger to society. They expected this danger to be attenuated somewhat by the benign influence of “Saxon immigration,” but mainly by a policy of immigration control.... The claims for immigration control went beyond the issue of crime, and the concept of “inferior races” was extended to non-Latin immigrants. Russian Jews, for instance, were considered a “physiologically degenerated race” and “a moral and economic danger,” given their practice of usury. Many also attributed the wave of (anarchist) labor unrest during the “Tragic Week” of January 1919 to the influence of Russian-Jewish immigrants....²⁵

In a country where on the eve of the First World War 49% of the people of the capital city and 43% of the entire nation were foreign-born – over half of them Italian – the latter were, for Cané, “more savage than the savages of the Pampas.”²⁶ To which FORA activist Eduardo Gilimón responded: “Sure many anarchist agitators and strike leaders are foreigners. So is the working class, and so are the capitalists.”²⁷ The setting of “Argentine anarchism” in its early phases was not only transnational on its own terms – a constellation of “federative futures” through an expansive region connected by networks of shipping, migration, community organizing, and the circulation of print culture – but also as the spreading of mainly Italian and Spanish immigration through port cities and towns of the South American Atlantic in which ethnic, linguistic and national forms of identification converged with local organizations, affinity groups and circulating texts.²⁸ This formed a regional space that in the case of Italians, John Galante has shown, became a reference (“Il Plata”) often stronger than their place of origin.²⁹

Beyond the littoral of the Atlantic Coast and the Paraná River, anarchism spread through provinces and remote areas of the Argentine “interior” – which, in terms of anarchist epistemology, is a dubious name implying the objectivity of a territorial and gravitational center,

thereby naturalizing the nation-state. In her extensive review of the historiography, Ivanna Margarucci shows that anarchists themselves from Eduardo Gilimón to Diego Abad de Santillán and generations of activist historians reproduced binary oppositions that merit revisiting in light of the actual spatial and temporal reach of anarchist practices and networks: center/periphery, city/country, immigrant/native, local/national, modern/traditional, anarchism/not anarchism – all which inhibit our understanding of the heterogeneous counter-cultures and platforms that these traditions produced, as well as their incidence on the societies within which they worked.³⁰ In many ways, the bedrock of anti-statist, federalist, urban/rural, feminist, anti-fascist, internationalist, and anti-Eurocentric orientations formed by anarchist traditions project time, place, and identity in ways that invite us to rethink the “nation” in its temporally and territorially confined, teleological cultural representations and narratives of becoming.

Representations of the “*gaucho*” – historically a figure that blends cultures from Iberia, the Andes, Brazil, and Paraguay as an archetype of freedom and resistance, a precursor of working-class revolt – permeates anarchist writings in the early twentieth century. Elites regarded the *gaucho* as a barbarian to be civilized. Some anarchists concurred. For instance, alongside this current, there persisted a negative representation of rural folk and *gauchos* that was epitomized in the writing of Spanish anarchist Félix Basterra, a contributor to the first *Protesta*, who saw them as corrupt and prone to abuse, indeed the cause of ignorance and backwardness in the hinterland, and precursors of the urban figure of the “*compadrito*” – a dimwitted, duplicitous bandit and of course voter who originated in the Pampa, and who later morphed into the seductive dandy of tango fame.³¹

Other anarchists, though, exalted the *gaucho* figure as a kind of mythical ancestor, the embodiment of nature, ruse, courage, and recalcitrance to submission. Anarchist author Alberto Ghirardo depicted the *gaucho* as the “Mephistopheles of the Pampa,” an errant and persecuted figure without borders, the symbol of an oppressed people ensconced in a kind of primordial freedom that propagandists of the “Ideal” had a mission to sow throughout an incipient proletariat.³² Laura Moreno-Sainz describes the anarchist projection of a

propagandist as the messenger of a long rebel tradition, an initiate into a universal community of the oppressed, a self-taught student of knowledge and science, and an orator gifted with the ability to educate.³³ She recounts the memories of Rodolfo González Pacheco, born in Tandil on the edges of modernity, who learned of the writings of Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta, and Gori from passing guests on his parents' estate disguised as sailors and contrabandists, who left the literature behind in the peons' quarters where they slept.³⁴ The plays enacted and stories told by anarchists in fiestas, picnics, and working-class mobilizations, as well as the songs (*milongas*, *tangos*, *habaneras*, and improvised *payadas* – from the Spanish “*paguiar*” meaning wandering from village to village), transmitted this *gaucho* imaginary to workers from foreign lands, not as a borrowed “national” identity but rather as an insurgent expression of anarchist identity.

The so-called “*criollista*” tradition in popular literature permeated discourses of Argentine national identity. It offered symbols and archetypes with which plebeian sectors of society could identify and rooted stories of belonging in a world marked by cosmopolitanism and xenophobia. The telluric representations of rurality in Ghiraldo's work inflected intellectual discussions of the “oppressed” and the idioms of resistance that cultural practices conveyed.³⁵ The genre depicted the *gaucho* as a “noble spirit,” “loyal to a firm code of values, valiant and selfless, incapable of betraying friendship or confidence” – all fundamental traits of anarchist self-representation.³⁶ Ghiraldo and the journal *Martín Fierro* acknowledged the appeal of *criollista* literature and mobilized its repertoires to reach an increasingly literate readership of foreign and native-born urban workers.

This story of how the myth of the figure of the *gaucho* came to epitomize anarchist readings of the Argentine past does not undermine our traditional understanding of Italian, Spanish, and other newcomers' importance in disseminating ideas and representations of the future inherited from a European anarchist tradition. As Michel Foucault argued, mechanisms of biopolitical securitization developed by modern states, marked by urban quarantining and strategies to isolate and confine the “abnormal” – the displaced, the destitute, the degenerate, the disorderly – resulted from the fear of contagion by

foreign elements. Ethnically, early anarchist activists reflected the composition of the urban working class, with Italians, Spaniards, and Eastern European Jews featuring prominently in their ranks, until the overrepresentation of immigrants declined after the First World War. Legislative efforts to purge them used the language of contagion and vagrancy to stigmatize, and even medicalize their difference. No longer viewed as “agents of civilization” who would erase the memory of the pre-Rosas era of plebian chaos and colonial backwardness, these immigrants were, at the turn of the twentieth century, racialized and stigmatized as dangerous in their own right, because of their participation in anarchist and socialist labor protest. Fears of invasion colored elite depictions of their large numbers and perceived delinquent lifestyle, and these “*indeseables*” [undesirables] became the target of measures to protect the social order through expulsion and social control.³⁷ Whereas the political language and classical references of Argentine anarchism sometimes reproduced eugenicist and ethnocentric tropes, the European origins of early anarchist activists is too often read, as in the oft-cited work of Juan Suriano, as signifying their removal from popular culture and diverse working-class expressions of identity.³⁸

Italians, who were at the forefront of the early Argentine anarchist movement, remained prominent throughout the first half of the twentieth century, but it is a mistake to characterize them as European imports who were and remained culturally “foreign” to the working class in formation, as nationalist and even anarchist scholars sometimes do. Indeed, it is questionable to call them “Italians” at all since their presence in Argentina preceded the unification of Italy and national identity. Little prevented them from retaining their regional-based cultures and dialects within working-class communities.³⁹ Even before Buenos Aires was definitively declared the capital city of Argentina in 1880, “Italians” played central rather than peripheral roles at every step of the constitution of a new post-colonial nation. Indeed, they had settled the estuary of the Río de la Plata and traveled the Paraná River as master mariners, ship captains, and sailors since the early days of Spanish colonization. Their presence grew substantially from 1821 onward, when Ligurians and other northern Italians fleeing Sardinian domination added to an already flourishing

population of Genoese mariners and craftspeople. With the growth of coastwise shipping along the littoral in the 1830s, they dominated navigation, ship building and small commerce.⁴⁰ By 1850, many of them spoke in Genoese dialect, despite the presence of numerous Piedmontese, Lombard, Tuscan, and later Napolitan and Sicilian immigrants throughout the broader *porteña* city. The Riachuelo district of Buenos Aires was commonly referred to as “La Piccola Italia.”⁴¹ During the second half of the nineteenth century, small entrepreneurs of French, British, German and Portuguese origin, Dalmatian and Spanish immigrants, Afro-Argentine dockworkers, *criollo* laborers from Paraguay and the interior provinces, and transient sailors from around the world lived and toiled alongside these established Italian residents, whose domination of the cultural and commercial spheres in the community survived the growing cosmopolitanism of their surroundings.⁴²

Necochea street in southern Buenos Aires, the bustling center of La Boca del Riachuelo popularly remembered as the “*calle del pecado*” (street of sin), was riddled with cafés and canteens associated in Argentina with the birth of the tango. It was a community of intense social and cultural interaction in which unskilled and uprooted workers crossed the paths with bohemian artists and intellectuals, promiscuous single men and women, middle-class married couples, rebellious anarchist activists, and “reputable” Italian immigrants who owned the boardinghouses, shops, restaurants, cafés, and dancehalls. Mariners spread news and stories of remote localities, and from La Boca transnational networks of anarchists and socialists connected communities as far south as Tierra del Fuego and as far north as the Andes. Anarchist resistance societies in La Boca organized cultural activities in the early years of the century. The most popular were Sunday picnics and open-air marketplace theatre presentations that contributed to their advocacy of rationalist education and other labor-initiated social campaigns while also serving as both platforms for ideological proselytizing and bridges between migrant laborers and the broader working-class community.⁴³

In Buenos Aires, low-income families of precariously employed workers were housed in pluri-ethnic tenements known as *conventil-*

los, where seasonal migration swelled their numbers and slum conditions worsened by the year. It was a social landscape which colored anarchist depictions of an implacable ruling class conspiracy against hard-working common people.⁴⁴ Resistance societies affiliated with influential organized transportation workers and small artisanal and semi-artisanal professions where immigrants prevailed served as vehicles for an oppositional working-class culture of revolt and transgression of authority, channeled by their propagandists into a discourse of solidarity, direct action, and workplace insubordination. Insofar as this culture enabled unsettled workers to evade the stigmas of nationality and ethnicity within which existing institutions – governmental, religious, capitalist, or mutualist – framed their rhetoric of inclusion and exclusion, it legitimated the emancipatory representation of individual freedom and collective force offered by anarchists linked to the early FORA. “The foreigners,” stated a *Federación obrera* local flyer in the early 1900s, “are those who preach hatred and practice exploitation, not the hard-working and brave men who come from distant lands to offer each other friendship and solidarity in the valiant endeavor of work.”⁴⁵ In their efforts to hunt down anarchist agitators, local police investigators regularly patrolled the bars and canteens of the bustling streets of Necochea and Ayolas streets, the heart of anarchist organization, where “drifters and lazy men of all sorts take advantage of the drunken workers’ ingenuity to spread their ideas about violence and strikes,” and where “singers, strangers and pimps (*cafishios*) teach very young boys the immoral ways of their irresponsible elders.”⁴⁶ As internal migration from the interior increased during the First World War and migration to and from Europe declined, the strong identification of anarchists with the local community of this part of Buenos Aires provided nationalist political interests with ammunition to discredit anarchists as aliens. Terms such as “*gringos*” (foreigners) and “*tanos*” (Italians) – as well as “*negros*” to designate non-white plebian migrants – were employed generically by nationalist groups to designate insurgent working-class communities as symbols of “otherness.”⁴⁷ That markets and *conventillos* continued to reflect the cosmopolitanism and ethnic diversity of resident day workers, or that native and naturalized Argentines outnumbered European immigrants in the anarchist movement by the 1920s, did not deter locals and outsiders from evoking the “foreign”

essence of their neighborhoods, fueled by nationalist propaganda against the “European” ideologies they represented.

The legend of a mythic Genoese “Republic of La Boca” speaks to the strong identification of the neighborhood with its seafaring and shipbuilding heritage, but also to the stigma attached to it from the late-nineteenth century: a fiercely independent and lawless “mafia” or “black hand,” recalcitrant to municipal government and perilous to visitors from the rest of the city. The first nominally independent Republic of La Boca fancied itself a replica of the Republic of San Marino, modeled on the Free Commune of Montmartre. Another strand of Italian thought that impacted La Boca was freemasonry, which formed a group of lodges called the “*Comitato Italiano*” in the 1870s and built a Logia Liberi Pensatori in 1875, incubator of radical labor traditions.⁴⁸ Many of the spaces in which anarchists converged for meetings, harangues, performances and strike committees, such as the *Sociedad José Verdi*, the *Unione Operai Italiani*, and the *Società Ligure*, were Italian mutual aid societies founded in the late-nineteenth century.⁴⁹ In 1901, the first meeting of the Argentine Workers’ Federation (FOA), precursor of the FORA, was held in the *Sociedad Ligure* in La Boca. In 1906 Italian Masons founded a school, the *Unión Fraternal*, an important center of secular education and anticlerical activism that hosted anarchist and socialist activities during the period of trade union and resistance society formation that saw Buenos Aires play a leading role in the international labor and revolutionary movements of the first two decades of the twentieth century.

The slang spoken by workers in Buenos Aires, and reflected in their print media, was a mix of Italian dialects known as *cocoliche* that contributed to the emergence of Argentine *lunfardo*, which is a term that originated in the Lombardi dialect to identify criminals and delinquents, and mixed with Genoese, Tuscan, Galician, Portuguese, and even indigenous Guaraní and African Bantu – an original blend that remains a popular mode of communication in Argentina today.⁵⁰ Cultural and artistic life in the *barrios* where anarchism flourished was intense and diverse at the onset of the twentieth century. The *Negra Carolina* bar, a popular center of sociability frequented by anarchists in La Boca, was operated by a Black priestess born of

enslaved parents in Virginia who had befriended Josephine Baker in New Orleans, in an era when Galicians, Basques, Dalmatians, Lebanese, Brazilians, Chileans, British, Portuguese, Paraguayans, Swedes, Russians, and other immigrants flocked to the neighborhood.⁵¹ The dialect of the older Ligurian community referred to as *xeneizes* (or *zeneizi*) was the *lingua franca* of everyday life.⁵² Garibaldian and Mazzinian movements for the unity of Italy played important roles in the civic life of the *barrio*, as did Italian anarchist circles and resistance societies – the nucleus of the powerful FORA – and socialist clubs who elected Alfredo Palacios the first socialist deputy in Latin America in 1904.⁵³

The FORA's anarchist organ *La Protesta* and the socialist newspaper *La Vanguardia* routinely published articles in Italian. Ettore Mattei, Cesare Batacchi, Fortunato Serantoni, Errico Malatesta, Pietro Gori, as well as Severino Giovanni – the feared “expropriator” and sworn enemy of Mussolini – are some of the most prominent figures of Italian anarchism to have agitated in the streets of La Boca and elsewhere in Argentina. They were self-described cursed, banished, starved, and unkempt exiles identified by the Argentine state as dangerous interlopers who contributed to the working-class city's stigma of dangerousness and rebelliousness.

As Argentina had received an enormous number of immigrants by the eve of the First World War, its elites became obsessed with the “quality” of European arrivals. One cartoon from the early 1900s shows an Argentine official telling a matronly shopkeeper what he wants from her shop of European migrants: “I need immigrants, but from now on they must be sifted, because I don't want agitators, revolutionaries, strikers, communists, or socialists.” The shopkeeper responds, “Enough, I know what you want: an immigration made up purely of bankers and archbishops.”⁵⁴ The cartoonist was mocking a longstanding belief among Argentine elites that immigration policy would select the right kind of European, a notion that dated to Juan Alberdi's preference for northwestern Europeans.

Even as Argentina became white/European in its national discourse, Italians and other Mediterranean immigrants were stigmatized as

outcasts due to their proclivity for revolutionary agitation and undisciplined culture of poverty and licentiousness. In the 1920s, Italian anarchists through groups such as “*L’Avvenire*” and “*Renzo Novatore*” (in which Aldo Aguzzi and Severino Di Giovanni played prominent roles) and the *Unione Antifascista Italiana* (UAI) continued to articulate their activities with older sections of the FORA. From his exile in Uruguay, Italian anarchist Luigi Fabbri issued a supplement in *La Protesta* called “*Pagina in lingua italiana*” (published bi-monthly between 1929 and 1930). The anarcho-bolshevik Antorchistas also printed the Italian-language column “*L’Alba dei Liberi*” in the newspaper *Pampa Libre* based in General Pico.⁵⁵ María Migueláñez Martínez argues that the struggle against Italian fascism radicalized Italian political exiles, polarizing anarchist internal debates on the role of violence and drawing fierce retaliations from authorities, who saw the “expropriator” movement led by Severino Di Giovanni as epitomizing the dangerousness and lawlessness of anarchists in general.⁵⁶ For Davide Turcato, “the transnationalism and border crossing of Italian anarchism was vital to its struggle precisely because it contrasted with the territoriality and limited sovereignty of the Italian nation state. In other words, the mismatch in scope between people and state is problematic for long-distance nationalism, but it was advantageous for anarchism.”⁵⁷

Notwithstanding their unity of language with their host societies, Spanish immigrants were targeted as “foreigners” with the same virulence as Italians, and they were as fundamental to early anarchism in the Río de la Plata region.⁵⁸ Only Madrid and Barcelona had a more Spanish anarchists than Buenos Aires. Spanish exiles from the first Spanish republic flocked to the city in the late-nineteenth century, followed by a second generation in the first two decades of the 1900s. In the 1920s and 1930s, Spaniards flowed into Argentina, followed by refugees from the Second Republic who facilitated links between anarchists during the Spanish Civil War. The cultural influence of these émigrés extended to Spain itself, where Argentine publications, including anarchist ones, outnumbered those produced locally.⁵⁹ During the Civil War, hundreds of Argentine activists joined the CNT and FAI, among them Jacobo Mafud, Jacobo Prince, and José Grunfeld of the *Federación anarco-comunista Argentina* (FACA) and

FORA militant and publisher Diego Abad de Santillán, all prominent anti-fascists.⁶⁰

Cabinetmaker Gregorio Inglán Lafarga, writer José Prat, and Francisco Rós – the founder of the important dockworkers’ resistance society in the early 1900s – were all prominent Catalán anarchists and key founders of the early anarchist movement in Argentina, along with Antonio Pellicer Paraire, who had been a founding member of the *Federación de trabajadores de la región española* (FTRE) in 1881. His articles in the Argentine anarchist newspaper *La Protesta Humana* in 1900 and 1901 theorized the organization of craft-based resistance societies and their coordination by local federations based on concerted direct action and solidarity pacts. Resistance societies, as defined by the first Argentine workers’ congress of May 1901, were to be “working-class collectives organized for the economic struggle of the present” devoid of organic ties with either socialist or anarchist movements.⁶¹ Pellicer Paraire saw them as models of organization, propaganda, communication, education, and economic direct action in the spirit of local autonomy and grass-roots empowerment. They were also the nuclei for diffusion of libertarian socialist ideals throughout the region, across national boundaries, and above institutional politics.⁶² These resistance societies, quickly abandoned by socialist unions, became an anarchist movement under the umbrella of the FORA.

It is also necessary to consider, more broadly, people who were not immigrants and whom the movement touched, the cultural environment in which it moved (beyond well-known circles of Italians and Spaniards who dominated not just the working class but Argentine society in general), and the processes of racialization that underpinned their history as undesirables in the oligarchical republic. Argentines of African origin, for example, were present in the first three decades of the twentieth century, particularly in neighborhoods adjacent to the country’s ports and especially in Buenos Aires. While new immigrants from southern and eastern Europe predominated at the time, Afro-Argentines, as they are referred to today, who a century earlier had been a majority on the riverfront, still constituted an everyday presence whose association with vagrancy, dissolute

lifestyles, and popular performances made them frequent victims of the same police persecution as labor and political activists. They were racialized by elites as remnants of the untamed *gaucho* era of pre-liberal national organization, the heritage of which anarchist authors sought to wrestle from the hands of nationalists, for whom “*negro*” and “*cabecita Negra*” were common derogatory designations. Such epithets were aimed not at the descendants of African slavery but the *mestizo* or culturally blended masses of seasonal migrants who flooded Buenos Aires every year during the high export season. Prior to 1910, before the cultural practices they championed diluted these prejudices, even foreign-born anarchists generically derided Afro-Argentines as politically and culturally unsophisticated.

However, in the 1910s, anarchist publications pushed back against Radical Civic Union and Socialist Party-supported criminology and atavistic nationalism by increasingly celebrating the plebian figures and cultures of the multi-ethnic communities in which they lived and worked. While loaded with racism when used in elite circles, the term “*negro*” in anarchist rhetoric was devoid of stigmatization or inferiorization, as well as common in *apodos* or nicknames of anarchist detainees defined as dangerous in police reports. Unlike some anarchist literature on the indigenous questions (noted below), no reflection on the colonial inheritance and the importance of ethnicity in describing specific social and labor conflicts occurred. Nor does one find explicit identifications of Black culture as dissolute or marginal, other than in early twentieth century denunciations of carnival in Buenos Aires, which was often conflated with drunkenness, sexualization, and depoliticized crowd behavior.⁶³

Mixed-race and Afro-Argentine influence was felt in manifestations of popular culture that received growing attention in anarchist publications after the First World War. They dominated the *payador* singer genre and were frequent characters in *sainete* plays produced by Italian immigrants in La Boca del Riachuelo, where virtually all the actors of the revolutionary movements and their conservative nationalist nemeses that traversed the first half of the century were based.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, Cape Verdean mariners and shipyard workers who arrived in large numbers in the 1920s – and who unlike Black

Argentines were concentrated in a single working-class enclave in Dock Sud adjacent to La Boca and Avellaneda to the south of Buenos Aires – participated in anarchist activism. They did not put forward their African identity, as they were regarded by Argentine law as Portuguese and therefore “European” immigrants. In the 1940s and 1950s, many joined the FORA and other groups like the Maritime Workers’ Federation (FOM) where anarchists were embedded and the *Federación Obrera en Construcciones Navales* (FOCN) to oppose nationalism and defend labor protests. They also led the resistance to Peronism and to the regime of General Pedro Aramburu after 1955.⁶⁶ All of this speaks to the absence of an inherent racial prejudice among anarchists. In all, there was little discussion in the anarchist media and literature of Afro-Argentine identity. Yet, this did not preclude Black figures from appearing in anarchist-inspired culture as workers and community members rather than as a distinct racial group. Black musicians, shoe-shiners, and women caretakers of children were commonplace in Italian descriptions of everyday life in Lezama Park at the entrance of La Boca near San Telmo, historically an Afro-Argentine neighborhood of Buenos Aires and the location of popular anarchist picnics for decades. Anarchists transmitted their revolutionary messages not just through newspapers, pamphlets, and books but also through music and dance. For instance, *habaneras*, *milongas*, and *tangos* originated in the Black culture of the Río de la Plata and became popular cultural forms in the early stages of radio broadcasts, recording, and film.⁶⁶

Argentine anarchists also tackled the indigenous question. Organizations of various tendencies, including the FORA, denounced violent campaigns of so-called “pacification” in terms that behooved them to address indigenous peoples and their resistance. In an article published in 1911 in *Ideas y Figuras* edited by Alberto Ghirardo, for example, Constancio Vigil wrote: “The White man is taking over everything, and granting the Indian the mercy of life compels him to behave like a domestic animal.”⁶⁷ Ayelén Burgstaller has shown that this position, while consistent with the movement’s opposition to the church, the state and the oligarchy, was generally articulated in paternalistic terms, promoting literacy and anarchist education as solutions to indigenous “docility.” By the 1920s, however, activists of

the FORA and their “anarcho-bolshevik” rivals both promoted agrarian revolution in more systematic and inclusive terms, an outcome of their immersion in federalist networks of local committees throughout localities of Salta, Jujuy, Tucumán, and other regions of Argentina where the demands of real conflicts brought anarchists from Buenos Aires in contact with diverse outlooks on “the people.” They proposed viewing indigenous peoples as subjects with their own agency, naming them revolutionaries, and ascribing to them struggles over land ownership as well as harsh working and living conditions. “Civilization” – a notion which anarchists had not historically contested – became synonymous with the oppression by the bourgeoisie, a mere pretext for achieving its conquering goals.⁶⁸

By comparison, indigenous peoples were absent from mainstream and socialist depictions of Argentine identity.⁶⁹ Joaquín González, one of the most influential voices in the early-twentieth century debate on the social question, believed that the country “had the enormous advantage of not having inferior ethnic elements in her population.”⁷⁰ Similarly, Estanislao Zeballos, an influential politician and foreign affairs minister, remarked in 1906 that Argentina, among all the Spanish American nations, had been “the one to go forward the most rapidly and with the greatest uniformity,” because the country had a homogeneous population “consisting of pure-blooded Europeans or *mestizos* produced by the crossing of more than three centuries.”⁷¹ For José Ingenieros, a socialist and one of the period’s foremost advocates of racial interpretations of social phenomena, the “Argentine White race” was as an emergent substitution for “indigenous races.”⁷²

By the 1920s, anarchism in Argentina had diversified in its organizational expressions, its literature, and its regional contours. Historian Hélène Finet refers to the “anarchist heterodoxy” of the Argentine movement. It comprised the FORA and its deeply rooted traditions of local, transregional, and international federative networking among resistance societies and affinity groups. It contributed to forging a working-class counterculture of resistance to capitalism and the state. And it featured a diversity of expressions prior to 1905 and again in the wake of the First World War, particularly the emergence of insurrectionist tendencies and anarcho-bolshevism in the 1920s.⁷³

Leaders of the FORA throughout the 1920s defended a model of anarchist organization that – while it coexisted, interacted, and sometimes even blended with revolutionary syndicalist movements in action – always retained its autonomy and originality. Beyond the Río de la Plata region, anarcho-bolsheviks engaged with revolutionary movements throughout Latin America such as those of Augusto César Sandino in Nicaragua and Emiliano Zapata in Mexico. French-born anarchist Joaquín Falconett, a historic leader of *La Protesta*, corresponded with Mexican anarchist Ricardo Flores Magón and related news of the Mexican Revolution, as did Rodolfo González Pacheco and Teodoro Antillí. After Flores Magón's death in 1922, Mexican and the Argentine anarchists linked to the FORA coordinated actions as transnationalism gained momentum throughout the decade. Julio Díaz, then co-director of *La Protesta* with López Arango, participated in the organization of Central American anarchists in the mid-1920s in conjunction with the Mexican CGT. In 1929, these anarchists helped establish an ephemeral anarchist international, the *Asociación Continental Americana de los Trabajadores* (ACAT), affiliated with the International Workingmen's Association (IWA-AIT) and defined by Diego Abad de Santillán as a “regional and supra-national body defined by the federalism and autonomy of its component parts.”⁷⁴ It pledged to overcome economic and geographic divisions, denounced imperialism, and called on an increased understanding among anarchists of different ideas, social realities, and traditions in the various regions of America.⁷⁵

Formed in 1923, the *Alianza Libertaria Argentina* (ALA) federated a loose alliance of small craft societies, radical ethnic associations and political groups associated with anarcho-bolshevism, among them a group of dissident FORA activists led by González Pacheco. The group edited its own newspapers and worked within *La Protesta* until 1915 before launching *La Obra* (1915-1919), *El Libertario* (1920), and *La Antorcha* in 1921. The Italian “anarchist expropriator” Di Giovanni also published *Culmine* (1925-28) and *Anarchia* (1930), two of many short-lived newspapers that reflected an effervescence of dissensions within anarchism throughout the period, culminating in the creation of the *Comité Regional de Relaciones Anarquistas*

(CRRA) two years after the 1930 military coup and the establishment of the *Federación Anarco-Comunista* (FACA) in 1935. The FACA would become an ancestor of the contemporary *Federación Libertaria Argentina* (FLA), a pioneer of what would later become the doctrine of “*especificismo*” based on the “social insertion” of anarchist organizers in autonomous and social movements and unions.⁷⁶ This diversity within and among anarchist movements was a key factor in their growing immersion in struggles of the Argentine interior, including rural areas and indigenous communities.

There were revolts of seasonal workers in the Pampa of Buenos Aires province, rural uprisings in Santa Fé, Chaco, and in the southern province of Santa Cruz. All were actively supported by local workers’ associations or *Uniones de Obreros Locales* (local anarchist steering committees) that coordinated with anarchists in the capital. Convergences and tensions between the rival anarcho-communist, anarcho-bolshevik, and “expropriator” tendencies played out in far-flung, remote localities where urban-based resistance societies fanned out as far south as Chubut and as far north as Salta.⁷⁷ From there, Argentine activists promoted solidarities throughout the Andean region. Antonio Fournakis, a Buenos Aires-based organizer of the *Unión Anarquista Balkánica Sud-Americana* which advocated abolishing national borders and federating anarchist groups across the continent, participated along with FORA activist Armando Triviño and printer Tomás Soria, an anarcho-bolshevik leader in Salta and Tucumán, in the organization of indigenous Bolivian anarchists in the 1920s. One of the leaders of the Oruro section of the Bolivian *Federación Obrera del Trabajo* (FOT) was Luis Gallardo of the Argentine FORA. Anarchist ideas circulated across the Andes to Peru, aided by the presence of activists from Argentina and Chile, many of whom passed through Salta on their way north. Pietro Gori addressed a fledgling early anarchist movement in Salta in 1901, prior to its consolidation within the *Federación Obrera de Salta* in 1904. As in northern Patagonia, local resistance societies and anarcho-bolsheviks expanded their influence in the context of the Russian Revolution, the “Tragic Week” of 1919 in Buenos Aires, and the ensuing surge in labor organization nationwide. The *Agrupación Comunista Anarquista Despertar* was a local branch first of the *Unión Comunista Anarquista Argentina* and

then of the ALA, which waged a fierce battle for hegemony in the region with the FORA through the pages of the newspaper *El Coya*. Alberto Bianchi and Vicente Ferreiro, correspondents of *La Protesta* and *La Antorcha* in Buenos Aires, organized conferences and cultural events in Salta, where the anarcho-feminist newspaper *La Tribuna*, edited by Juana Ruoco Buela, also circulated between 1922 and 1925, and where women organized in the seamstresses' *Sindicato de Obreras de la Aguja de Salta* led by Petrona Arias. The FORA organized urban and domestic workers, artisans, street vendors and other resistance societies into the *Federación Obrera Local Salteña* (FOLS).⁷⁸ Anarchist propagandists in the Argentine northwest often came from northeastern towns along the Paraná River linking Buenos Aires to Asunción del Paraguay. They traveled via the vast network of syndicalist branches of mariners' unions coordinated by the FOM, spreading news and returning to the capital with dispatches from far northern reaches of Salta and Jujuy.

Anarchists made inroads into the struggles of indigenous peoples from Chaco province to Patagonia. Emilio López Arango of the FORA advocated not only for inclusion of rural workers and peasants (representatives of the “genuine physiognomy of American peoples”) but also the “elevation of the *gaucho* (*mestizo* transfrontiersman) and the Indian by anarchist movements.” He decried nationalism as a product of “stupid pride,” and described its advocates as “ashamed of their humble origins, of the Indian or African blood that runs through their veins; [they] even despise the native language, the habits and customs of the native-born, anything that might identify them with the terroir (*la tierra*, or the heartland).”⁷⁹ In the same vein, the ALA's Badaraco, founder of *La Antorcha* and the *Alianza Obrera Spartacus*, wrote in 1932 that Argentines were a “people nourished by many streams: Indians, Blacks, *gauchos* and immigrants endowed with knowledge in the noblest sense of the word, armed over the years with creativity from below, their own means of expression, democratic and combative memory...” Indigenous cultures, he continued, “remain alive in so many parts of our land, and are present in the struggles and the dreams that we share as libertarians...”⁸⁰

Maia Ramnath has described anarchism as “a body of practices and

performative acts that seek collective liberation in its most meaningful sense, by maximizing the conditions for autonomy and egalitarian social relationships,” constantly engaged with other components of society to achieve a “proper balance between a whole constellation of key pairs: freedom and equality, liberty and justice, the individual and the collective, the head and the heart, the verbal and the sensual, power relations and economic relations.”⁸¹ In any local or regional context, within or beyond the boundaries within which it explicitly took shape as an internationalist variant of socialism, anarchist practices were bound to steer a course to educate the “oppressed” through militant interventions in social and labor conflict, print, and performance. They drew from a corpus of literary and doctrinal writings by prominent authors in Europe, while their militant intellectual activists simultaneously reached into folk and popular repertoires to better blend with their environment and broaden their appeal.

Culture, as understood here, cannot be dissociated from representations of space and time implicit in the paradigms of federalism and social revolution that guided their expressions of identity and alterity. German anarchist Rudolf Rocker, who was widely read by anarchists in Argentina, defined federalism as “an organic collaboration of all social forces towards a common goal on the basis of covenants freely arrived at.... It is a unity of action, sprung from inner conviction, which finds expression in the vital solidarity of all.... Liberation of economics from capitalism! Liberation of society from the State!”⁸²

The “social revolution” as a broad project of social transformation was conceived as an alternative to the “revolution” in tradition of late-eighteenth century France, which was based on the seizure of political power and establishment of a state. Power was conceived instead as countercultural, ubiquitous, achieved from below through association and solidarity of the oppressed, without hierarchies and in the spirit of local autonomy.⁸³ The temporality of anarchist representations of collective redemption blended immediacy with futurity. Their militancy of urgency and promise of autonomy led them to interact fluidly with broad sections of society, including ethnic and mutualistic societies, ideological competitors, unorganized workers, and the poor in general, less in a theorized fashion than through

direct action and the periodic fashioning of alliances in situations of conflict. Through the symbolic deployment of promethean imagery and the immanence of freedom, cultural practices and propaganda were geared toward a universal audience of the oppressed. For Ilham Khuri-Makdisi, their history “is first and foremost about people interpreting and giving meaning to vocabularies, concepts, and practices that had recently emerged on the local scene.” It is not a matter, she continues, “of importing but of adapting, and adaptations cannot take place outside of the local framework...”⁸⁴ Beyond the hidebound nationalist framework of determining whether or not Argentine anarchists were guided by the “foreign” ideals ascribed to the ethnic origins of their initial proponents, or by an openness to “national identity” – a concept which they resisted in the name of the universality of their aspirations – their specificity should be understood as a reflection of the society in which they operated: diverse, changing, and inextricably bound with the emancipatory future to which they aspired.

Notes

¹ “Captura e fuga: notas para imaginar espaços-refúgio,” *Leituras*, Sao Paulo: Pivô, 2022, <https://www.pivo.org.br/blog/de-montanhas-submarinas-o-fogo-faz-ilhas/>

² Ivanna Margarucci, “Repensando el anarquismo en América Latina. ¿Del nacionalismo metodológico a un giro transnacional incompleto?” *Prohistoria*, no. 34 (December 2020): 263.

³ Laura Moreno-Sainz, “Anarchisme argentin (1890-1930): Contribution à une mythanalyse” (PhD diss., University of Grenoble 2, 2003): 275; Cf. *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World, 1880-1940*, Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt, eds. (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2011) and *The Cambridge History of Anarchism and Socialism* (2 vols.), Marcel van der Linden, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023).

⁴ Pierre Ansart, *Les ideologies politiques* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), 99.

⁵ Cf. for example Pablo Pérez, Juan Manuel Heredia and Hernán Villasemín, “El trabajo cultural del anarquismo. La Biblioteca Archivo de Estudios Libertarios de Buenos Aires (1995-2005) y el Instituto de Documentación Social CNT-FAI (1938),” *Germinal. Revista de estudios libertarios* no. 2 (2006); Luciana Anapios, “Prensa y estrategias editoriales del movimiento anarquista en la Argentina de entreguerras,” *Anuario del Instituto de Historia Argentina* (FAHCE, Centro de Historia Argentina y Americana) vol. 16, no.2 (2016); Lucas Domínguez Rubio, “Un itinerario por los proyectos editoriales del anarquismo en Argentina: cambios, maniobras

y permanencias, *Izquierdas* no.33 (2017).

⁶ Jacinto Cerdá, *Negras tormentas. La FORA anarquista en Buenos Aires, 1930-1943* (Tesis de Maestría, Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina, 2021) : 21. Cerdá's thesis was recently published as *Negras tormentas. La FORA anarquista en la ciudad de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires : Grupo Editor Universitario, 2023).

⁷ See Juan Suriano, *Anarquistas: Cultura y Política Libertaria en Buenos Aires, 1890-1910* (Buenos Aires: Manantial, 2001); translated by Chuck Morse as *Paradoxes of Utopia: Anarchist Culture and Politics in Buenos Aires, 1890-1910* (Chico, Calif: AK Press, 2019); Dora Barrancos, *Anarquismo, educación y costumbres en la Argentina de principios de siglo* (Buenos Aires: Contrapuntos, 1990).

⁸ Adriana Petra, *Anarquistas: cultura y lucha política en la Buenos Aires finisecular. El anarquismo como estilo de vida*. Informe final del concurso "Culturas e identidades en América Latina y el Caribe" (Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2001), 5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹⁰ Michelle Perrot, *Les ouvriers en grève. France, 1871-1890* Vol.2 (Paris: Mouton/ Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1974, 724.

¹¹ Adriana Petra, *op.cit.*; cf. Roberto Pittaluga, *Un imaginario utópico restaurador en el anarquismo de la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: El Cielo por Asalto, 2000).

¹² Hélène Finet, "Le débat 'Anarchie ou syndicalisme' à la lumière de la réalité argentine: la F.O.R.A face aux tentatives d'union syndicale du mouvement ouvrier (1901-1915)," in *Le Congrès anarchiste d'Amsterdam 1907-2007. Un siècle d'anarcho-syndicalisme*, ed. Hélène Finet (Orthez: Éditions du Temps Perdu, 2007), 19.

¹³ *El Perseguido*, 05/18/1890, cited by José Moya, "The Positive Side of Stereotypes: Jewish Anarchists in Early Twentieth-Century Buenos Aires," *Jewish History* no.18 (2004): 22.

¹⁴ Eliseo Lara-Orde, "La literatura anarquista del Cono Sur. La imagen del pueblo en los cuentos de la prensa obrera anarquista de Chile y Argentina (1897-1927)," *Revista Pacarina del Sur* no.37 (October-December 2018): 17.

¹⁵ John Zerzan, *Time and Time Again* (Olympia (WA), Detritus Books, 2018), 88.

¹⁶ Petra, *op.cit.*, 20-21, 26.

¹⁷ Agustín Nieto, "Notas críticas en torno al sentido común historiográfico sobre 'el anarquismo argentino'" *AContraCorriente* vol. 7, no.3 (Spring 2010): 235.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 240-248.

¹⁹ Cf. Mariana di Stefano, "Políticas de lectura y escritura en las escuelas del anarquismo en la Argentina a principios del siglo XX," *Cuad Sur* nos. 35-36; Martín Albornoz, *Cuando el anarquismo causaba sensación: La sociedad argentina, entre el miedo y la fascinación por los ideales libertarios* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2021).

²⁰ Juan Suriano, *Auge y caída del anarquismo* (Buenos Aires: Capital Intelectual, 2014): 46-51, and *Anarquistas, op. cit.*, 145-178.

²¹ Cf. Geoffroy de Laforcade, "Straddling the Nation and the Working World:

Anarchism and Syndicalism on the Docks and Rivers of Argentina, 1900-1930,” in *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World, 1880-1940*, eds. Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt (Leiden: Brill, 2011); “The Ghosts of Insurgencies Past: Waterfront Labor, Working-Class Memory, and the Contentious Emergence of the National-Popular State in Argentina” in *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib, eds. (Oakland, CA: Institute for Comparative Modernities/PM Press 2015).

²² Cf. Geoffroy de Laforcade, “A Laboratory of Argentine Labor Movements: Dockworkers, Mariners, and the Contours of Class Identity,” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2001): chapters 2 & 3.

²³ Julia Rodríguez, *Civilizing Argentina: Science, Medicine, and the Modern State* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 232.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 234-235; cf. Gabriela Constanzo, *Los indeseables. Las Leyes de Residencia y Defensa Social* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Madreselva, 2009).

²⁵ David Fitzgerald and David Cook-Martin, *Culling the Masses: The Democratic Origins of Racist Immigration Policy in the Americas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014), 35.

²⁶ Cf. José Sáez Capel, “Los migrantes y la discriminación en Argentina,” *Scripta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales* vol.94, no.31 (2001); Fernando Devoto, “Los orígenes de unbarrio italiano en Buenos Aires a mediados del siglo XIX,” *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana “Dr. E. Ravignani”* Third Series, no.1 (1989): 95.

²⁷ Eduardo Gilimón, *Un anarquista en Buenos Aires (1890-1910)* (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, 1971), 41.

²⁸ Cf. Geoffroy de Laforcade, “Federative Futures: Waterways, Resistance Societies, and the Subversion of Nationalism in the Early 20th Century Anarchism of the Rio de la Plata Region,” *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* vol. 22, issue 2 (2011). José Arico defined anarchists as “mobile agitators: in *La hipótesis de justo* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1998): 18. See also Martín Albornoz and Diego Antonio Galeano, “Los agitadores móviles: Trayectorias anarquistas y vigilancias portuarias en el Atlántico sudamericano,” *Dossier historia marítima y portuaria, Atlántica* no.21 (January-April 2019).

²⁹ Cf. John Galante, *On the Other Shore: The Atlantic Worlds of Italians in South America during the Great War* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2022); Lila Caimari, “Rasgos de una vecindad informativa Buenos Aires-Montevideo a fines del siglo XIX,” in *Política y cultura de masas en América Latina: espacios, escalas, temporalidades*, eds. Mercedes García Ferrari, Carolina González Velasco and Mariela Rubinzal (Los Polvorines: Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento, 2023).

³⁰ Ivanna Margarucci, “El ‘anarquismo argentino’ en la historiografía anarquista. De la construcción de una noción centralista a la ampliación de la escala geográfica,” *Historia Regional* (Sección Historia. Instituto Superior del Profesorado No 3, Villa Constitución) no. 48 (January-April 2023): 17.

³¹ Ibid., 457; Félix Basterra, *El crepúsculo de los gauchos* (Buenos Aires: Buena Vista, 2005 (1st edition 1903), 65.

³² Alberto Ghirardo, “Mephispholes of the Pampa” in *Alma Gaucha. Drama en 3 actos y 8 cuadras* (Buenos Aires: Pascual Mediano Editor, 1909, first edition 1906): 11; Laura Moreno-Sainz, *op.cit.*, 83-98.

³³ Laura Moreno-Sainz, *op.cit.*, 101.

³⁴ Ibid., 101-103; Osvaldo Bayer, “El santo ácrata,” *Página/12* (April 9, 1994).

³⁵ Cf. Adolfo Prieto, *El discurso criollista en la formación de la Argentina moderna* (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 2006); Armando Minguzzi, “Estudio introductorio” in *Martín Fierro. Revista popular de crítica y arte* (Buenos Aires: Academia de Letras/Cedinci, 2008).

³⁶ Carina Peraldi, “Imágenes en conflicto. Las representaciones del pasado rural como instrumento de pugna política al interior del movimiento anarquista argentino, 1900-1910,” *A Contra Corriente* vol. 10, no. 1 (Fall 2012): 55.

³⁷ Cf. Gabriela Constanzo, *Los Indeseables. Las Leyes de residencia y Defensa Social* (Buenos Aires: Madreselva, 2008).

³⁸ Cf. Diego Armus, “Eugenics in Buenos Aires: Discourses, Practices, And Historiography,” *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* vol. 23 (2016).

³⁹ Fernando Devoto, “Los orígenes de unbarrio italiano en Buenos Aires a mediados del siglo XIX” *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana “Dr. E. Ravignani,”* Third Series no.1 (1989): 98.

⁴⁰ Juan Carlos Chiariamonte, *Mercaderes del litoral. Economía y sociedad en la provincia de Comentes, primera mitad del siglo XIX* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991), 93-94.

⁴¹ Cf. “La Boca. El color de la ribera,” *El Observador Porteño. Boletín Mensual del Observatorio del Patrimonio Histórico-Cultura* yr. 2, no. 8 (June 2018).

⁴² Cf. Antonio Bucich, *Rasgos y perfiles de la historia boquense* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Ergon, 1962); *La Boca del Riachuelo en la historia* (Buenos Aires: Asociación Amigos de la Escuela-Museo de Bellas Artes de la Boca, 1971).

⁴³ Cf. Geoffroy de Laforcade, “Repertoires of Memory: The Foreigner and the Nation in La Boca del Riachuelo, Buenos Aires, mid-19th to mid-20th Century,” *Latin American Essays, MACLAS* vol. XIX (2006).

⁴⁴ Guillermo Ariel Aramayo, “Mujeres migrantes, conventillos y conflicto social en la consolidación de un espacio de contrastes: Buenos Aires (1870-1915),” *Geograficando* vol. 17, no. 2 (2021).

⁴⁵ “¿Quiénes son los extranjeros?” loose flyer, undated; probably from the 1904-1905 period. Consulted courtesy of the late FORA activist Humberto Correale.

⁴⁶ Giuseppe Vespignani, *Per la salvessa delle famiglie* (Buenos Aires: Colegio Pio IX, December 1910), 3.

⁴⁷ Luis Romero & Luis Alberto Romero, eds., *Buenos Aires, historia de cuatro siglos*, Vol.2 (Buenos Aires: Editorial Abril, 1983), 181; José Barcia, “La amarga realidad de

los años 30,” *Todo es Historia* no. 145 (June 1979): 7.

⁴⁸ Cf. Alejandro Martín Yaverovski, “Tres Repúblicas Barriales y sus Universidades. Las Universidades Populares en la ciudad de Buenos Aires en el período de entreguerras: un esquema preliminar,” *Historia Caribe* vol. XVI, no. 38 (January-June 2021): 38-46.

⁴⁹ Roberto Payró, *Los Italianos en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Imprenta de “La Nación”, 1895).

⁵⁰ Cf. Neva Petralli, “Lenguas en contacto: el cocoliche rioplatense,” *Lingüistas y lengua en Hispanoamérica en el siglo XIX* (Fall 2020); Oscar Conde, *El lunfardo en la literatura Argentina* (Buenos Aires: USAL/UCES/Academia Porteña del Lunfardo, 2009); Federica Goldoni, “Los italianos, el lunfardo y el tango,” *The Coastal Review* vol. 9, no.1 (2017).

⁵¹ Cf. Nélica R. Pareja, “La Boca. Lo que fue, será” in *La Boca : Identidad y pertenencia*, comp. Pablo J. Rey (Buenos Aires: Asociación Civil Rumbo Sur, 2014).

⁵² Cf. Fiorenzo Toso, “Il Genovese in America meridionale,” *Oltreoceano* No.1 (2007); Meo Zilio, *El elemento italiano en el habla de Buenos Aires y Montevideo* (Firenze: Valmartina Editore, 1970).

⁵³ Cf. Fernando Devoto, *Historia de los italianos en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2008).

⁵⁴ David Scott FitzGerald, David Cook-Martín, *Culling the Masses the Democratic Origins of Racist Immigration Policy in the Americas* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014), 299.

⁵⁵ Cf. Andreas Doeswijk, *Los anarco-bolcheviques rioplatenses, 1917-1930* (Buenos Aires: Centro de Documentación e Investigación para la Cultura de Izquierdas—CeDinCI), 2013).

⁵⁶ Cf. María Migueláñez Martínez, “Atlantic Circulation of Italian Anarchist Exiles: Militants and Propaganda between Europe and Río de la Plata (1922-1939),” *Zapruder World: An International Journal for the History of Social Conflict* no.1 (2014).

⁵⁷ Davide Turcato, “Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement, 1885–1915,” *International Review of Social History* no. 52 (2007): 417.

⁵⁸ Cf. Moya, Jose C., *Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997).

⁵⁹ Cf. Víctor Manuel Lucea Ayala, “Anarquistas españoles en la Argentina. Experiencias de ida y vuelta (1890-1910),” *XII Jornadas Interescuelas/Departamentos de Historia* (San Carlos de Bariloche: Universidad Nacional del Comahue, 2009); El Hossayne Charef Lakrad, “La emigración anarquista como nexo de unión entre España y Argentina,” *Trabajo de Fin de Grado* (Castellón de la Plana: Universitat Jaume, 2022).

⁶⁰ Cf. James A. Baer, *Anarchist Immigrants in Spain and Argentina* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2015).

⁶¹ *La Protesta Humana*, 11/17/1900-06/01/1901; Diego Abad de Santillan, La

F.O.R.A., *ideología y trayectoria* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Proyección, 1971): 53; Rubén Eduardo Bittloch, *La théorie de la violence dans l'anarchisme argentin, 1890-1910* (Paris: Memoire de Diplôme de l'EHESS, 1982), 108-111.

⁶² Antonio Pellicer Paraire, "Carta abierta a los obreros estibadores de la República," quoted by Gonzalo Zaragoza, *Anarquismo argentino (1896-1902)* (Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre, 1996), 298-299.

⁶³ Cf. Laura Caruso, "La fiesta y la comunidad: el carnaval en el barrio obrero del Puerto de Buenos Aires a comienzos del siglo XX," *Revista de Estudios Marítimos y Sociales* (June 24, 2020).

⁶⁴ Donald S. Castro, "'El sainete porteño' and Argentine Reality: The Tenant Strike of 1907," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* vol.44, vos.1/2 (1990).

⁶⁵ Cf. Geoffroy de Laforcade, "Memories and Temporalities of Anarchist Resistance: Community Traditions, Labor Insurgencies and Argentine Shipyard Workers, Early 1900s to Late 1950s" in *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History*, eds. Geoffroy de Laforcade and Kirwin Shaffer (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2015/2017).

⁶⁶ Cf. Robert Farris Thompson, *Tango: The Art History of Love* (New York: Knopf, 2019).

⁶⁷ *Ideas y figuras*, 07/25/1911.

⁶⁸ Ayelén Burgstaller, "El anarquismo y la cuestión indígena. De la represión del Centenario a Napalpí," *Archivos de historia del movimiento obrero y la izquierda* yr. XI, no. 21 (September 2022-February 2023): 125-129.

⁶⁹ Cf. Eduardo A. Zimmerman, "Racial Ideas and Social Reform: Argentina, 1890-1916," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* vol. 72, no. 1 (February 1992).

⁷⁰ Joaquin V. Gonzalez, "El juicio del siglo," *La Nación* (May 25, 1910).

⁷¹ Estanislao Zeballos, *The Rise and Growth of the Argentine Constitution* (Buenos Aires: Albion Printing Press, 1906), 29.

⁷² José Ingenieros, *La législation du travail dans la république argentine* (Paris: Cornely, 1906), 10.

⁷³ Hélène Finet, "Hétérodoxie anarchiste en Argentine: analyse d'une deviance contre-démocratique," *Nuevo Mundo, Mundos Nuevos* (2009).

⁷⁴ Diego Abad de Santillán, *La F.O.R.A.: Ideología y trayectoria* (Buenos Aires: Proyección, 1971—first edition 1931): 26-32; cf. Diego Téllez Anta, "Redes anarquistas de apoyo mutuo en Latinoamérica. Relaciones entre México y Argentina en la década de 1920," (Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad Autónoma de México, México: Ciudad Universitaria, 2018); María Miguelañez Martínez, "El proyecto continental del anarquismo argentino: resultados y usos de una propaganda transfronteriza (1920-1930)," *La historia transnacional* no.94 (2014); María Miguelañez Martínez, "Más allá de las fronteras: El anarquismo Argentino en el período de entreguerras," (Tesis de Doctorado, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2018).

⁷⁵ *La Protesta*, 05/17/1929.

⁷⁶ Cf. Fernando López Trujillo, *Vidas en rojo y negro: una historia del anarquismo en la década infame* (Buenos Aires: Letra Libre, 2005); Javier Benyo, *La Alianza Obrera Spartacus: anarquismo, vanguardia obrera e institucionalización del movimiento sindical en la década de 1930* (Buenos Aires: Libros de Anarres, 2005); Nicolás Iñigo Carrera, *La Alianza Obrera Spartacus. Documentos y Comunicaciones* (Buenos Aires: PIMSA, 2000); Agustín Nieto and Oscar Videla, eds., *El anarquismo después del anarquismo: una historia spectral* (Mar del Plata: Gesmar, 2018); María Eugenia Bordagaray, “Controversias libertarias: La interplelación anarquista en tiempos del peronismo” (Tesis de Doctorado, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, 2014).

⁷⁷ Héctor Daniel Guzmán, Pablo Cosso and José Saravia, José, eds., *Anarquismo en el noroeste argentino. Los movimientos obreros en el siglo XX* (Santiago del Estero: Biblioteca Sarmiento, 2017); Cosso, “Entre la violencia y el racionalismo: Im-prontas y avatares del anarquismo salteño en torno a la década de 1920,” *Historia para todos* (December 2021): 46-59; Cosso, “Apuntes sobre el anarquismo salteño entre principios de siglo y el Golpe de Estado del Gral. Uriburu (1901-1930). La fructífera, abigarrada y represiva década del '20,” *XVIII Jornadas de Investigación y Docencia de la Escuela de Historia-VII/Jornadas de Intercambio y Cooperación entre Equipos de Investigación y Docencia del Instituto de Estudios e Investigación Histórica (I.E.I.His)* (November 28-30, 2018): 1-24; Hernán Scandizzo and Jorge Etchenique, “La represión política en Río Negro en las décadas de 1930 y 1940. El caso de los anarquistas,” *Archivos de historia del movimiento obrero y la izquierda* yr. II, no.3 (September 2013-February 2014): 107-129; Hernán Scandizzo, “Neuquén, el límite de la organización anarquista en la Patagonia Norte (1918-1923),” *Revista de Historia* no.18 (November 2017): 32-55.

⁷⁸ Juan Posales, *Badaraco, el héroe prohibido: Anarquismo y lucha de clases en tiempos de infamia* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones La Rosa Blindada, 2001), 94, 221.

⁷⁹ Emilio López Arango, *Ideario* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la A.C.A.T., 1942), 173-177.

⁸⁰ Juan Posales, *Badaraco, el héroe prohibido: Anarquismo y lucha de clases en tiempos de infamia* (Buenos Aires: La Rosa Blindada, 2001), 221, 286-290.

⁸¹ Maia Ramnath, *Decolonizing Anarchism. An Antiauthoritarian History of India's Liberation Struggle* (Chico, Calif.: AK Press/Institute of Anarchist Studies, 2011), 37-38.

⁸² Rudolf Rocker, *Nationalism and Culture*, trans. Ray E. Chase (Los Angeles: Rocker Publications Committee, 1937), 535.

⁸³ Daniel Colson, *Pequeño léxico filosófico del anarquismo. De Proudhon a Deleuze*, trans. Heber Cardoso (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión, 2003), 230.

⁸⁴ Ilham Khuri-Makdisi, *The Eastern Mediterranean and the Making of Global Radicalism, 1860-1914*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 9.