

2

**SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
IN THE ARGENTINE (BETWEEN 1914 AND 1955)**

María A.R. Sautu

The London School of Economics and Political Science

**A thesis submitted to the University of London for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Economics**

June 1968

UMI Number: U306963

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U306963

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



R

X 35,798

30-9-69

ABSTRACT

In this thesis we discuss stratification in Argentina in relation to the process of economic development, divided into two stages, before the World Crisis and between 1929 and 1955.

In chapter one we try to make explicit some basic definitions and discuss some of the reasons that justify the selection of our subject and its orientation.

In each of the following three chapters we try to isolate those peculiar features of the process of economic development in Argentina which have affected the formation and further evolution of stratified groups, namely, economic, occupational and of status.

We define an "economic group" as the set of units of production engaged in a certain economic activity: this activity and the interests attached to it are what defines a group, not its individual members. Here we discuss the formation of economic groups within specific activities. We conclude that whereas agricultural development favoured the formation of a powerful group, (estancieros), the peculiar course of industrial development obstructed the formation of powerful groups except in a few activities; in the majority of cases these activities belonged either to food-stuffs production or were branches where foreign capital had

been invested.

"Occupational groups" are defined in terms of role within the economic unit and of the branch of activity to which the unit belongs. Here we try to relate changes in the economic structure to the disappearance of old groups as well as the formation of new ones. Furthermore, we focus our attention on the impact of development on the distribution of income among different occupational groups. The first stage of development is characterized by the formation of middle strata as well as a high rate of occupational mobility. During the second stage occupational mobility continued to be high, particularly for people already located in the middle strata. The most remarkable feature of this stage was the growth of white collar and urban workers.

Finally we discuss status groups which are defined as circles of people who share a style of life and because of this a given prestige. We point out how rapid occupational mobility and changes in the material aspects of styles of life have worked against the survival of status groups.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| STRATIFICATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | 5 |
| ECONOMIC ORDER OF STRATIFICATION: | |
| ECONOMIC GROUPS | 53 |
| OCCUPATIONAL ORDER OF STRATIFICATION | 153 |
| SOCIAL ORDER OF STRATIFICATION | 196 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 224 |
| APPENDIX I. MEASUREMENT AND RANKING OF ECONOMIC GROUPS: 1914 | 236 |
| APPENDIX II. OCCUPATIONAL STRATA: 1869 | 273 |
| APPENDIX III. OCCUPATIONAL STRATA: 1914 | 282 |
| APPENDIX IV. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND: 1914-1960 | 311 |
| APPENDIX V. FOREIGN IMMIGRATION: 1857-1924 | 321 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 326 |

1. STRATIFICATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Some basic definitions

The aim of this thesis is to analyse three dimensions of stratification in Argentina as they have been affected by the process of economic development that took place between approximately 1860 and 1955. The first two dimensions are related to class stratification, the third deals with status.

The general theoretical orientation of this study has been provided by Weber's theory of stratification, which though not discussed here in detail has guided our research in the basic definitions of class and status stratification. Moreover, there are three elements in Weber's theory which have been also taken into account: first, the need to undertake a multidimensional analysis in order to achieve a better understanding of the phenomenon of stratification; secondly, the benefits accruing from an historical analysis; and finally, the conception of stratification as a phenomenon of the distribution of power within a society.

The approach to multidimensionality used here is that which considers it at the level of the society as a whole, and so enables one to discover what sort of groupings exist at a given period (1). Such an approach is to be found in historical studies which focus attention on the form-

ation of stratified groups and their change over periods of time (2). These groups, according to Weber, constitute the locus of power, either economic or social. Hence our aim is to isolate categories of people (which we shall call groups) and trace the conditions of their emergence and transformation insofar as these conditions are expressed as different chances to dispose of wealth or income, or status honour.

The central feature in Weber's definition of class is life chances, which depends on the probability of obtaining a given income (3). This probability varies from class to class and is determined by the type of source of income and the degree of control over this source of income. These are the two basic variables in class stratification, as all the distinctions Weber introduces in his discussion are organized around them. For Weber distinguishes two main categories of classes: property and acquisition classes which are further divided into different categories (type of source of income). Subsequently he divides each of them, either property or acquisition classes, into positively and negatively privileged classes, that is in terms of control over the source of income (4).

In order to find the connection between the two basic stratification variables and the economic structure we shall

start from the definition of the economy as being made up by different spheres or aspects: production, distribution and consumption (which includes savings). This is an analytical device which states that by definition at any given moment each process, or economic fact, has a simultaneous expression in each of these spheres. Moreover, the money equivalence of such processes is equal for each of them (5). Another assumption is that all goods and services belong to the sphere of production whereas all incomes, whatever their source, belong to the sphere of distribution (6).

As regards the spheres of production and distribution there are three elements which may be chosen as units of analysis, either combined or alternatively, according to the purpose of the analysis at hand. These units are: types of economic activity, separately or grouped into sectors or subsectors; units of production which carry out production and participate in income; and finally, factors of production that are combined within the economic units in order to produce goods and services, for which participation they have a share in the income obtained by the unit.

Now, if one looks at that scheme (spheres and units of analysis) from the point of view of the individuals involved, then the spheres of production and distribution account for the two basic variables in the determination of class situ-

ation. For participation in economic production constitutes the source of income which varies according to the character of such participation (i.e. either as employer, employee, worker etc.): and the share in income, ^{which is also variable,} indicates the degree of control over the source. On their part the three elements or units of analysis permit one to specify both the character of participation in production (i.e. the source of income) and the share in the distribution of income.

Several lines of analysis may be followed according to the units of analysis selected. We shall mention here only those which will be the subject of our research.

In chapter II we shall deal with heads of economic units in the agricultural and industrial sectors. In this analysis the source of income is given by the type of activity in which economic units are engaged (it is implicit in the selection of this unit of analysis that the character of their participation in production is as entrepreneurs). The size of the units of production and their share of resources and market indicates their degree of control over the source of income (that is of the income generated within the activity). Hence the discussion will centre on an analysis of how far resources and market are concentrated in the hands of a few economic units, or whether they are dispersed among a large number of units.

We shall call "economic group" the aggregate of people who control economic units within a given branch of activity. In the case of the industrial sector each activity will be considered apart and firms, whatever their size (from the largest to the one man business), will be included. Similarly all sizes of holdings will be included in the agricultural sector, even though the differentiation between farming and ranching beyond a certain size of holding is not possible because estancias are mixed holdings (7).

The subject of chapter III, the study of the third type of units of analysis, factors of production, is the most inclusive, as it implies the consideration of all individuals who are engaged in economic production performing different economic roles. This analysis deals with occupations as they are the sociological expression of factors of production (8). The source of income is given by the type of economic activity and the category of employment (employers, employees, workers, etc.), that is, by the factor of production to which different occupational roles may be ascribed. The degree of control over the source of income is indicated by the share that different categories of employment, within given activities, have in the income generated through their participation in production (9).

Neither economic groups nor occupational groups constitute

classes, but they are dimensions of class stratification insofar as membership of these groups expresses different life chances (different sources of income and degrees of control over the source of income).

The discussion of the connection between the economic process and the two basic variables in the determination of class has been useful to us because changes in the economic structure brought about by economic development can also be traced as changes in occupational and economic groups. In this respect we shall try to isolate the main factors in the process of economic development which have affected the degree of participation of different activities in the whole economy, as well as the number and size of economic units and the number and quality of economic roles within such units. Furthermore we shall be concerned with factors affecting the concentration of resources and ^{of control over the} market and those which have worked either in favour or against a more egalitarian distribution of income.

As regards the social order of stratification its link exists with the economic process, through the sphere of consumption, but in a rather weaker form, as the level of consumption is only one element in the determination of styles of life. Following Weber, status groups are defined in terms of their style of life which makes membership of a

group recognizable to other members of society. Moreover, status groups are conceived of as bearing differential status honour (or prestige) which is attached to individuals through their membership (10).

Economic development affects the social order insofar as it affects the members of the status groups as consumers. The level of consumption and access to different goods and services depends on the amount of income individuals enjoy, that is, the economic position fixes limits to material consumption. Material consumption is not the only element in the style of life albeit an important one. The specific way such consumption is carried out, social participation, as well as family origin and traditions, are other components of styles of life. As K. Mayer^s says "the whole range of people's behaviour and outlook, their entire way of life" "varies from group to group (11). These latter components change more slowly than standards of material consumption, but on the other hand they form slowly. The crystallization of traditions and development of peculiar status characteristics is a matter of time (12). Therefore one of the points we shall discuss in chapter IV is to what extent economic change has contributed to the disappearance or survival of status differences (other than differences in material aspects of the style of life).

Economic groups

Two conclusions emerge from our analysis of economic groups. The first is that agricultural development favoured the formation of a powerful group of large estancieros. The second, that industrial development in its turn failed to produce a similar effect except in a few branches of industry, to the extent that the industrial sector at the end of the period under study was made up by a large number of small and medium industrialists engaged in a large variety of activities.

Our conception of economic groups is that their members are tied together by common interests. These interests are attached to the activity in which they are engaged, which means that they share a common fate as regards a large range of events, even though these events may affect them with different degrees of intensity. Public decisions have to be included along with any event that affects the size of the market, access to resources and availability of inputs. This is the basis for the existence of common interests which make common actions possible though they do not compel them.

In spite of their common fate, competition among firms engaged in the activity exist, as much as between them and firms in other fields to which they are related. This is the best known approach to the analysis of members of econ-

omic groups. Nonetheless, our concern with the existence of a common basis for action, and the probability of success, leads us to emphasize the sharing of a common fate by members of a group.

The second important element in our conception of economic groups is that the capacity to overcome disadvantageous conditions or benefit from positive ones, depends greatly on the power members of a group are able to exert and on their chances to organize common action. Losses and gains will vary from firm to firm and with the particular case at stake, but in substance the existence of a concentration of resources and market in a few large firms will enhance both the chances of undertaking common actions and of being successful in the endeavour.

Our definition of economic groups as made up of people who are engaged in the same activity, and the discussion whether they constitute powerful groups, is not used in sociological research. The most frequent definition of economic groups considers the interlocking of economic interests controlled by a small group of individuals or families, who are located in the upper ladders of wealth and control a large part of a nation's economy. In other words the economy "comes into the hands of a relatively few large firms, linked together, and with the main financial

institutions - the banks and insurance and trust companies - through interlocking directorships" (13).

Whereas sociologists have been mostly interested in overall economic concentration, which leads to the above definition of economic groups, economists have usually been concerned mainly with control over the market. Our own approach differs from both, though it shares some of their most relevant features. It differs from the sociological definition in that groups are considered at the level of each market separately; and from the economic approach in that we are interested in the actors, the people who do or do not control given markets, inasmuch as that control gives power to them.

The analysis of groups, defined as an interlocking of interests, is useful in countries where a high degree of concentration exists at the market level. Such a definition is not operational in countries like Argentina where economic production in many important economic activities is controlled by a large number of small firms. The existence of groups which control firms in several activities does not provide us with enough information as to the conditions prevailing in each activity separately. Moreover, such groups may possess firms which even though large do not control a substantial proportion of their own market. In

events affecting any one firm in particular, their power of retaliation is weakened. This is not to say that they are not powerful and may still resort to devices to protect their interests (many more indeed than the isolated owner of just one firm), but the setting and particular conditions of each activity have to be looked at carefully if one is not to misunderstand their significance. In the following pages we shall look at a number of examples which should make this point clear.

Before 1943 three big cereal traders largely controlled the ^{marketing} ~~commercialization~~ of cereals in Argentina, besides possessing shares in many industrial activities. When the I.A.P.I. (Instituto Argentino de Promoción del Intercambio) was created, there was nothing they could do to prevent the Peronist government from monopolizing the cereal market.(14) As a group of firms engaged in the same activities they were powerless, though on other occasions they might have protected their interests with different degrees of success.

Two conclusions may be drawn. As we said above the existence of economic groups (in the sense of an interlocking of interests) is not enough to permit the exercise of power when individual firms are affected, above all because in a country like Argentina the degree of concentration of wealth has not reached the level of more industrialized countries.

The second conclusion is that the concentration of resources and of control over the market is not a sufficient condition, though a necessary one for the exercise of power in every instance. Other conditions may either weaken or strengthen the power of bargaining and retaliation that comes with concentration.

The case of the estancieros will illustrate these two conclusions as well as show more clearly the reasons for our discussion of power at the level of activities and in exclusively economic terms.

It is a well known fact that estancieros in Argentina have enjoyed a great deal of economic power. Moreover, in the past they exercised political power and enjoyed high social prestige. The emphasis frequently laid upon their political standing has obscured the real roots of their power, which, we believe, were undoubtedly economic.

Though in origin, political links and membership of the social elite led sometimes to the acquisition of land, it would be a mistake to believe that all, or even the majority, of estancieros reached their economic positions through such means. Nonetheless, even on the assumption that all land was distributed amongst the politically powerful, and that it remained in the possession of their families, the conditions of their survival as a powerful group in spite

of subsequent political changes have still to be accounted for. The best known example is found during the Peronist government.

An important element in the economic policy of Peron was the series of measures which eventually led to a transfer of income from the agricultural to the industrial sector. This transfer was produced through the manipulation of agricultural prices and rates of foreign exchange (15). As a result of that policy agricultural production decreased, though cereal farming comparatively more than cattle ranching, as cattle prices declined less than the prices of cereals which were fixed by the government (as there was inflation we are referring to real prices). The decrease in cereal farming was partly due to the fact that part of the arable land was transformed into pastures (16). Though there are no studies on this subject it is accepted that such a shift took place primarily within large holdings, as the size of the holding imposed a limit to the type of exploitation small farms were able to undertake (17).

The decrease in agricultural production, when internal consumption was increasing, had very critical repercussions on the balance of payments. Agriculture was, and always has been, almost the only source of foreign exchange, as it supplied the major items of the export trade. On the other

hand, industry depended greatly on the availability of imported inputs. The fall in agricultural production and therefore in exports led to shortages of foreign exchange, to the extent that very strict measures of exchange control were introduced. In mid 1949 only the most needed raw materials and fuel were imported, and machinery only in cases of extreme urgency. The realization that no policy of industrialization could be successful unless foreign exchange was available, forced upon the government a loosening of controls and the introduction of economic stimuli to spur agricultural production.

The above event cannot be explained either in terms of political links or social prestige. On the contrary, an explanation based on the existence of economic power seems to us more illuminating. Agriculture was a sector where there has always existed a high degree of concentration of resources as the conditions of agricultural development favoured the survival of large holdings. Though there is a difference between holdings of fifty thousand or more hectares to the estancia of five or ten thousand, the important fact is that they maintained a considerable size in spite of all the important changes in agricultural production.

Large estancieros, because of the size of their holdings, could survive decreasing prices without being impelled to

divide and sell their land. In some cases the opposite may have happened. In appendix IV the distribution of land by size of holding is compared in different periods. Figures show that between 1947 and 1952-60, not only did large holdings not lose ground, but there was a slight trend towards even greater concentration. This probably indicates that large estancieros were not the most affected by the Peronist policy of prices, and the freezing of land rents undertaken at the same time, but the smaller producers.

Our contention is that concentration brings power into the economic units and that this sort of power is vested in the individuals who happen to control such units, disregarding who they actually are, or whether or not they control units in other activities. As the case presented shows, the power of estancieros stemmed from the size of their holdings and from the fact that their decisions might affect the working of the whole economy. If they had political contacts who spoke out for their interests, or controlled firms in other activities as well, these could have worked to reinforce the power, which in any case they possessed within their own sphere of influence. Nevertheless, not even the existence of all the most favourable conditions as regards economic power permit us to predict either its actual exercise or its success once it is exercised. The revolt of

tenants known as Grito de Alcorta is a good example.

In July 1912 share-croppers in the Province of Santa Fe demanded a reduction in the share due to their landlords, besides other claims such as freedom to commercialize their own share of crops (18). They refused to harvest and abandoned the land. This movement of protest expanded quickly to other zones within the Pampean region (particularly within the zone of maize cultivation).

A constellation of interests supported the share-croppers' demands: the railways, country traders and dealers in cereals. Moreover, the newly elected government of the Province of Santa Fe refused to enforce any repressive measure and declared itself in favour of the share-croppers (19). On the other side, the national and other provincial governments supported the landlords.

The conflict eventually came to an end through direct negotiation between the farmers and their landlords, who had to accept a reduction in their shares, and in some cases even to grant other privileges (20).

Nonetheless, the existence of concentration in activities which play an important role in the economy as a whole leads to the existence of power and creates strong bases for potentially successful actions in defence of common interests. On the other hand lack of concentration is a drawback for

menaced groups. The best case we can bring here is the present day situation of many small industrialists in the Argentine.

It is frequently stated (21) that the present government is undertaking a series of measures which eventually will do away with many of the small inefficient firms (22). Economic measures hardly ever affect the whole of the industrial sector, rather they affect certain activities and in specific aspects. In this case small firms have very little power of retaliation, particularly when they do not control key resources and can be replaced by other firms (23).

Small firms in large numbers are not completely powerless. They can still organize and petition for their interests and may even gain the support of other groups. This type of behaviour may lead to success if other means for the exercise of power are available. Thus large numbers count under constitutional governments, as voting is a means of exerting pressure; or in political situations when the government is striving to gain popular support. With no prospects of elections in the near future, the final decision rests in the goodwill of the elite now in power (24).

The present situation of small industrialists is in any case extremely unstable. The present government may be only accelerating their destruction with its economic policy. If

Argentina is in for a new stage of economic development (and this is the crucial point) sooner or later many of the small and more inefficient firms will be absorbed by larger ones, for small size hinders the incorporation of higher levels of technology (25). Small firms have survived for several reasons, among others, the decisive support granted by the Peronist government and the unwillingness of successive governments to undertake measures which might lead to unemployment and loss of support among the independent middle class, (26); for shortages of foreign exchange that obstructed the incorporation of new machinery; and also for the reluctance of foreign capital to invest in Argentina (27). If this situation changes, the days of many small industrialists are numbered. However, there is still a point to be argued. If the process of concentration takes place within the nationally owned firms, then industry in the future will give rise to a powerful industrial bourgeoisie; but if foreign companies eventually move to Argentina they will replace native groups who are already in the market. This seems to us the real question in present day Argentina (28).

To sum up, the existence of concentration is the basis of economic power; however other factors may affect both the exercise of power and its effectiveness. On the other

hand, lack of concentration is prima facie an element which presumes the non-existence of economic power. Nonetheless when other means for the exercise of power are available large numbers may count. The case of estancieros was presented as an example of a successful exercise of power; the revolt of share-croppers shows that under certain conditions groups lacking economic power may be successful; and finally, the unstable situation of many small industrialists in present day Argentina results from their lack of power, and from the fact that other channels of exerting pressure are closed to them.

Occupational Groups

As in the case of economic groups our interest is to describe the emergence and transformation of occupational groups as they were affected by the process of economic development.

Occupational groups are defined as aggregates of people who performed similar occupational roles, that is, have a similar position in the economic structure, and enjoy similar shares in the distribution of income. For these reasons we shall be concerned with structural mobility, that which follows underlying changes in technology and division of labour. We shall argue as to how far economic development

has influenced chances of economic achievement and to what extent access to occupational positions has been open.

The analysis in chapter III will be carried out on two levels. On the one hand we shall try to trace changes in the share of different activities in the economy as a whole, as much as in the number and size of the economic units within those activities. On the other hand we shall discuss what occupational roles accompanied those transformations. Moreover, we shall try to infer what patterns of income distribution most likely underlay the process of occupational transformation.

Two conclusions emerge from our analysis. First, during the period under study there existed a high rate of occupational mobility, which, with peculiar characteristics at different stages, has affected the largest section of the Argentine population. Second, one can infer that the characteristics of economic development and concomitant occupational changes were such that they favoured a better distribution of income (when one stage is compared with the former one).

We do not sustain that chances of upward mobility were absolutely equal for everybody, nor that differences in income disappeared. Our contention is that the polarization between the small group at the top and the very poor at the

bottom which existed a century ago tended to close with the growth of intermediate strata. Furthermore, the chances of reaching the upper ladders of wealth increased considerably.

From an occupational point of view Argentina has been a very fluid society. As we said before not only was the rate of structural mobility very high, but also the quick expansion of occupational opportunities affected the majority of the population. Several groups were affected by this process, even though they attained different degrees of economic achievement: estancieros who made large fortunes supplying the export market; foreign immigrants who found in industry, commerce and farming a means of making a living and frequently a considerable one; and workers who in a later stage moved from low income occupations to urban occupations where wages were higher and conditions of labour more stable.

Though ranching during the Colony had been the prime economic activity of the Litoral (29), in the course of the second part of the nineteenth century deep technological changes took place in the agricultural sector, which demanded from estancieros the performance of a new role. Whereas the old breeder of long horned cattle supplied the demand for tasajo (30), the new type of estanciero transformed his ranch and improved his breeds in order to supply the European

market. As a result of this transformation the amount of income estancieros were able to enjoy increased considerably. Even on the assumption that many of the old families remained in possession of their land (which is less true than many people believe) (31) it is still possible to speak of estancieros as a highly mobile group. They were mobile because their occupational role changed profoundly, and also because through the performance of this new role they came to control an amount of wealth as never before.

Foreign immigrants found in farming opportunities of economic improvement. They started as colonists, tenant farmers or share croppers achieving different degrees of economic success; not unusually many became large landowners after successful performance in farming. The fact that Argentina had a shortage of population and needed to attract foreign immigrants permits us to infer that the level of income amongst farming groups - taken as a whole - cannot have been low; on the contrary, and there are many references to this, farming must have been a good means of accumulating wealth (32).

The possibility of economic achievement was readily available in industry, commerce and services. As in the case of farming foreign immigrants engaged in these activities and many, though not all, reached the upper strata

of wealth. As regards entrepreneurial opportunities, one aspect of industrial development has to be kept in mind: favouring dispersion of resources it spread opportunities among a large number so that in Argentina the formation of an entrepreneurial middle strata took place at a very early stage.

Judged by the size of her middle strata and the distribution by sector of the economically active population, Argentina does not differ significantly from more developed countries (though she lacks the more advanced technological structure). The early development of industry and its quick expansion in the 1930's, urbanization and the formation of a large tertiary sector are among the most important elements to be mentioned.

The growth of the tertiary sector is a phenomenon which intensified in the late nineteen forties and fifties when the rate of industrial development slowed down and services, particularly public bureaucracy, started absorbing a larger share of all increases in the economically active population. However, the proportion of tertiary occupations/had always been large (26.5% in 1869 and 40.7% in 1914) as commerce and services were themselves very dispersed sectors. Moreover, the development of educational facilities and the creation of clerical jobs, private and public, all contri-

buted to the enlargement of the middle strata.

Similarly, an urban working class formed early in this country and increased greatly during the second stage of industrialization (after the World Crisis of 1929) with the incorporation of internal migrants. The increased demand for labour and Peron's wages policy both contributed to the rise in their standard of living, particularly when this is compared with that prevailing in their places of origin (33).

The fact that in Argentina the occupational structure changed profoundly during the past century permits one to explain, though perhaps only partially, many important — historical events. The best example we can offer here is the formation of the Radical and Peronist parties which, we think, emerged as a result of the transformation of the occupational structure. The Radical Party found its support within the middle strata and some sections of the working class. Several decades later Peronism came into existence backed by the working class. Undoubtedly Peron had also the support of many members of the middle class, but its political standing was particularly strong among workers (34).

The birth of the Radical Party was the result of pressure from the middle class for political participation, which made its way to power in 1916 (when Hipolito Irigoyen won

the presidential elections). With the formation of the Radical Party, politics were no longer the unique domain of the upper class (35). Universal franchise had always existed in Argentina (36), but it was not until a large middle stratum emerged that the monopolization of power by the upper class was questioned.

In its turn, the role of Peronism was to incorporate into politics the working class, particularly the recent internal migrants. Small working class parties existed before, but the Peronist was the first large working class party. Peronism emerged when the second stage of industrialization had already begun and the urban working class had considerably increased with the incorporation of internal migrants (37).

Status groups

The analysis of status stratification in chapter IV will be centred on: first, a discussion of the status system during the Colonial Era and early period of Independence and its transformation as a result of the process of economic development; and secondly a description of status groups and of their evolution over time.

We conceive of status groups as being made up of people who share some peculiar features in their style of life which make membership recognizable to other members of society.

Hence our aim is to isolate groups who at least in certain crucial features may be considered as differing from the rest of the population. Moreover, it was because of these features that they were considered different during their own life time. Subsequently we shall be concerned with the impact of economic change upon their styles of life, that is, with changes in their economic position that have affected those peculiar features of their style of life.

The main conclusion in this section of the thesis is that changes in the economic position of members of status groups have been so deep that today material aspects of styles of life are of paramount importance in the determination of status honour. This is particularly valid in the case of the middle and largest part of the lower strata who differs among themselves in material components of their styles of life and in formal education (which is also highly dependent on income). In the case of the so called aristocracy, material aspects of their style of life are also crucial because they happen to be among the wealthiest. However much emphasis they may lay upon traditions and family origin, very few in fact can trace their origin back to the Colonial period.

The aristocracy has been as highly economically mobile as the middle class. An aristocracy of lineage did not exist

in the River Plate, with the exception of very few families in the Northern region (by this we mean families who in Spain belonged to the gentry or nobility). In this respect the River Plate differed profoundly from Lima and Mexico where members of the Spanish upper class settled down.

The aristocracy that emerged in the late nineteenth century had little in common with the old families of the Colonial Era, or the early period of Independence. The origin of the new aristocracy has to be found in the fantastic transformation of their style of life that followed their acquisition of large fortunes (38). Moreover, this aristocracy has always been an open group as a large fortune and the acquisition of the appropriate style of life could sooner or later overshadow an immigrant origin. On the other hand, a very old traditional name did not suffice very long for maintaining membership, when lack of wealth prevented the bearing of the required style of life.

Differential economic achievement has also been a crucial factor in the disappearance of foreigners as a status group and in the diversification of their styles of life.

Whatever their national origin or professional start, there were certain features foreigners had shared initially, their humble origin, hard work and orientation towards

money-making (of course there were exceptions). Their styles of life diversified with the passing of time; some became wealthy, others never departed from their modest beginnings. They and their descendants, first generation, at most second, constitute today the largest section of the Argentine population. If any basis for status honour exist it must undoubtedly be economic.

The last status group to be analysed are "cabecitas negras". This is a pejorative name given in the nineteen forties to the darker skinned people of the Interior (39). We shall keep this name (it means little black heads) because it indicates the rejection and prejudice against them by other members of society.(40).

One of the points we raise in this thesis is how long after 1955, the end of the period under study, the rejection of cabecitas negras has lasted or is likely to last. Unfortunately there is not much evidence on this subject and all we can do is to draw conclusions on past experience. Our prediction is that if cabecitas negras move up economically they will vanish as a separate status group, as their rejection is more based on the fact that they are poor and live in shanty-towns than on racial considerations. Amongst a population so heterogeneous as the Argentine, the small difference in the colour of the skin is hardly noticeable

when other external symbols of status are not present.

As regards the rejection of cabecitas negras we should like to call attention here to a further point. Most frequently the origin of their rejection is associated with the support cabecitas negras gave to the Peronist party. Our findings contradict this interpretation: long before this they were already objects of prejudice.

During the Colonial Era Indians were considered inferior. Long after, members of the lower classes, mestizos and gauchos (41) were stereotyped as lazy, uneducated and dirty (the same arguments are used today against cabecitas). In their turn, foreign immigrants despised the criollo, as much as criollos distrusted them.

However, as long as cabecitas negras remained in rural areas or small towns of the Interior, the prejudice did not acquire national standing. With the large waves of internal migrations in the nineteen thirties and forties, their existence became apparent. The upper class and descendants of foreigners repeated the attitudes of their parents against the "lazy, filthy criollo". The support cabecitas negras gave to Peron contributed to the reinforcement of a prejudice that already existed (42).

Sources of empirical data

At the end of this study five appendices are added.

The first three deal with computational procedures as no detail is given in the body of the thesis to avoid interference with the analysis itself.

Census data have been used to isolate economic groups and measure the degree of concentration in different activities. To start with, census categories in the industrial sector had to be reclassified in order to make them comparable for different periods. The code of the industrial census of 1954 was chosen and categories in previous censuses re-adapted to this code.

Though the census' categories were designed to cover similar products, we cannot expect that goods within every category were complete substitutes. For this reason all our references to concentration in given markets have to be understood cautiously. We have used the smallest census category (branches of activity) as no other data with a higher degree of differentiation are available, so that our picture of concentration is much more accurate than that based on subsectors or on the industrial sector as a whole. Moreover, the problem of the degree of aggregation is not general as in fact in many branches of industry products are highly substitutive (the code of industrial activities is included at the end of appendix I).

The units of analysis in this chapter are economic

units, either agricultural holdings or industrial firms. Neither in the agricultural nor in the industrial sector are we concerned with units of ownership. That is in any case beyond our means as census data only give information on units of production. This is the case of the estancia which by definition is a unit of production. We have kept the name in Spanish because it has a very precise local meaning. An estancia is a large ranch where arable farming is also undertaken. It implies a centralized management over a given track of land. One person or family may own several estancias but this information cannot be obtained from the censuses because they record "explotaciones" (which we have translated as holdings). Furthermore, a track of land under unique ownership which is divided into plots and given, partly or wholly, in tenancy by no means constitutes an estancia (43).

The measurement of concentration itself had to be adapted to the data available for different periods, though all followed the same general criterion: that is the control over resources and market (the knowledge of one permits one to predict the other with a high accuracy). Whereas in 1914 capital investment and employment were used as indicators of the degree of concentration, in subsequent censuses this was estimated as a relationship between size of

firm, measured in employment, and output. The measurement of concentration is in fact an adaptation to the index most widely used in economic analyses: that which takes a small group of firms at the top and computes the proportion of the market and resources controlled by them.

Similar adaptations of the available data were necessary to isolate occupational groups. These were formed at the level of branches of activity and then grouped into sectors. The type of activity and category of employment (employers, professionals, workers etc.) indicated the source of income, and the position within the category of employment, based either on amount of wealth or degree of training or skill, was used as an indicator of control over the source of income. This constituted the criterion of group ranking. In the case of entrepreneurs, they were ranked according to the size of their economic units, for which purpose we combined the information on occupations with that provided by complementary censuses (on units of production in different activities). Here we assumed that the larger the size of the economic unit, the higher was their share of income. Salary and wage earners were ranked according to their degree of training and skill. Here we based our judgement on the information we had gathered on occupations (see below). As to the accuracy of our rankings there may be some errors between

two contiguous sub-strata but not between the final strata as the dividing lines were clearly established; that is, errors may exist between subdivisions within the final strata.

We had to resort to the described criterion of group ranking because there were no data on the distribution of income among different occupational groups. The only information we possessed on the correlation between occupational status and amount of income is for a more recent period, when survey data showed that they were highly correlated (44).

To overcome the lack of information on income distribution our method of analysis has been to isolate those factors which one can logically expect to have affected the distribution of income among groups. On the basis of such premises we have inferred the patterns of income distribution most likely to exist. For example, if between one period and the next we discover that in a given activity there has been a trend towards a lower degree of concentration of wealth we can soundly infer that there must also have been a trend towards a more egalitarian distribution of income. Or if there was a transfer of labour from an activity where we know that the level of wages was low to other of higher wages we may presume that the final outcome, when the distribution is looked at as a whole, must be one of a more

egalitarian distribution; similarly, when one discovers that between one period and the next, skilled labour partly replaced unskilled labour. Moreover, in every instance we have tried to bring as much auxiliary empirical evidence as possible to support our inferences.

Census data to estimate occupational strata have been widely used in Argentina and elsewhere (45). However, this fact does not solve the problem of the reliability of censuses, particularly as regards those of 1869 and 1914. We assume that there must have been errors of enumeration but any control is absolutely impossible as other demographic statistics for those periods are far less reliable. As regards the information on occupations itself, errors are more unlikely as the census give the names of occupations as the respondents stated them (46).

In this section of our research the classification of occupations demanded a great effort. As we said above, the names of occupations are given by the censuses of 1869 and 1914. To start with, the interpretation of names was not always straight forward as there were many which no longer existed in present day nomenclature. Moreover, the meaning of some names, as indicative of occupational role, has changed considerably with the passing of time. In search of information all sorts of qualitative materials were consulted:

novels, stories, travellers' accounts, monographs etc. References had to be found here and there by chance as there was no precise source of information on this subject. The information gathered during this research was of great help in the determination of all three dimensions of ranking (type of activity, category of employment and position within the category).

As regards the census of 1947, no new estimates of occupational strata were computed. Instead our analysis is based on the figures obtained from Germani's "Estructura Social de la Argentina". The first reason is that his basic criterion for forming and ranking groups does not differ significantly from the one applied here; the second, that information from the complementary censuses of 1947, which was unpublished, though Germani used it in his estimates, is no longer available (47).

Finally, qualitative material was used in the analysis of status groups. As regards the amount of information available, this section did not present great difficulties, except for the fact that as in the case of occupations, a large number of books had to be consulted before finding points relevant to our subject. The only subject on which we lack sufficient information is on the present situation of cabecitas negras.

NOTES

- (1) We agree with Goldthorpe and Lockwood who affirm that "while class situation and status situation are analytical distinctions referring to different aspects of the position of an individual or category of individuals in a society, the concepts classes and status groups refer to variable properties of the society itself." So that "societies may be classified in terms of their degree of class formation ... or status groups stratification." "Affluence and the British Class Structure", The Sociological Review, XI,2, July 1963, pp.133-163.
- (2) These studies deal with systems of stratification: classes, estates and castes. Good examples are Kurt Mayer's "Class and Society" (New York, Random House, 1955); and Luis Costa Pinto's "Estructura de clases y Cambio Social", when he speaks of the co-existence of residual classes and emergent classes (Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1964, p.35).
- (3) Weber understands by class situation or class-status "the typical probability that a given state of (a) provision with goods, (b) external conditions of life, and (c) subjective satisfaction or frustration will be possessed by an individual or group. These probabilities define class-status insofar as they are dependent on

the kind and extent of control, or lack of it, which the individual has over goods or services and existing possibilities of their exploitation for the attainment of income or receipts within a given economic order.

A class is any group of people occupying the same class-status". "The Theory of Social and Economic Organization", T. Parsons (ed), Glencoe, III., The Free Press, 1947, p.424. Cf. "Class, Status and Party", in R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset (ed), "Class, Status and Power. A Reader in Social Stratification", Glencoe, III., The Free Press, 1953, p.64.

- (4) The following scheme has been deduced from Weber's "The Theory of Social and Economic Organization", *ibid.*, pp.424-427. The arrangement of classes follows the distinction between the two basic stratification variables: type of source of income and degree of control over the source of income.

Source of income

Degree of control over the source of income

Positively privileged property classes: income derived from property such as land, slaves, ships, mining, fixed equipment etc.

Positively privileged acquisition classes: entrepreneurs such as merchants, shipowners, industrial and agricultural entrepreneurs, bankers and financiers.

Middle classes: officials, liberal professions, workers with exceptional skills, peasants and craftsmen.

Negatively privileged acquisition classes: workers of various types, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled.

Negatively privileged property classes: objects of ownership (slaves), proletarians (in the sense meant in Antiquity), debtor classes, and the poor.

Note: the position of the different categories has also been deduced from Weber.

- (5) The statistical representation of the three economic spheres is known as national product and income. By definition these computations include all goods and services produced within a given geographical area (which includes exports), all incomes received (or generated) within the area, and all goods and services consumed (including imports).
- (6) Estimates of national income compute even those incomes which strictly speaking are not generated within economic units; the definition is widened to include educational institutions, charity organizations, political parties, and the like (for all these entities use resources which must at least include labour, that is they constitute sources of income).
- (7) An estancia is a large ranch where arable farming is also performed.
- (8) For example employees of different types, foremen, workers, etc. correspond to the factor "Labour".
- (9) Undoubtedly the category of employment and share of income are closely related, to the extent that the first permits us to predict the second, particularly when the type of activity and size of the economic unit concerned are known.
- (10) Weber designates as "status situation" every typical

component of the life fate of men that is determined by a specific, positive or negative, social estimation of honour" (Class, Status and Power, *ibid.*, p.69). And "status groups are the specific bearers of all conventions" (Class, Status and Power, *ibid.*, p.72).

(11) Mayer, K., *ibid.*, p.45.

(12) See Weber, "Class, Status and Power", *ibid.*, pp.73-74: "When the basis of acquisition and distribution of goods are relatively stable, stratification by status is favoured. Every technological repercussion and economic transformation threatens stratification by status and pushes the class situation into the foreground. Epochs and countries in which the naked class situation is of predominant significance are regularly the periods of technological and economic transformation. And every slowing down of the shifting of economic structures leads, in due course, to the growth of status structures and makes for a resuscitation of the important role of social honor".

(13) Porter, J., "The Vertical Mosaic. An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada", The University of Toronto Press, 1965, p.22.

(14) The I.A.P.I. (Instituto Argentino de Promoción del Intercambio) monopolized the marketing of cereals and

fixed prices. Its aim was to maintain stable internal prices in spite of changes in international prices. In fact, during the first years of operation the I.A.P.I. made large profits with the difference between the price paid to producers and the international price. Part of those profits served to finance industrial projects.

- (15) See above note (14). As regards exchange control, the rates were fixed well below their free market value. This enabled the government to provide the industrial sector with cheap inputs.
- (16) See E.C.L.A., "El desarrollo económico de la Argentina", 1956 (mimeograph edition), particularly "Anexo", p.308.
- (17) Due to the low cost extensive basis of ranching, small holdings have specialized in cereal or dairy farming, whereas estancias can perform simultaneously both ranching and arable farming, within the limits imposed by the need to rotate crops and cattle.
- (18) We shall discuss in chapter II, pp.61-62 the typical three year share-cropping contracts.
- (19) The Radical Party came to power for the first time in Santa Fe; four years later, in 1916, they won the national elections. In the year of the revolt all other provinces were in control of Conservative parties.
- (20) In Santa Fe for example landlords accepted a reduction

of their shares from 33 per cent to 26 per cent of the crops. More detail may be found in a forthcoming book by Ezequiel Gallo, St. Antony's College, Oxford.

- (21) The hard core opponents of the government's policy are the Unión Cívica Radical del Pueblo (in power until the coup d'etat of 1966), the Confederación General Económica (C.G.E.) and a rebel branch of the Confederación General del Trabajo (C.G.T.).
- (22) Among these measures it is worth mentioning the restrictions on bank loans, which have pushed many firms to the parallel capital market, where rates of interest range between 2 and 3 per cent monthly. More precisely the government has stopped encouraging private banks to supply small firms with credit, and therefore banks have returned to the principle of security in their credit policy. Other measures include the implementation of more strict control of tax evasion and of payments for social welfare. Taxes, particularly the indirect ones, and social welfare charges may push up considerably the cost of production for small firms. Finally, the decision to facilitate eviction from urban premises will weigh heavily on small shops which for many years have paid extremely low rents because of the freezing imposed after 1943.

- (23) The case of Propulsora Siderugica is a good example. A group of medium firms operate in steel-lamination; Propulsora (foreign owned) has been granted special facilities for the construction of a big plant, which once completed will make the smaller firms bankrupt.
- (24) The C.G.E. which represents small and medium sized firms, mostly in the less concentrated branches of industry, has frequently rallied against many economic measures. The C.G.T. rebel branch, almost in every issue of its newspaper condemns strongly the economic policy. The government does not seem to pay much attention to their claims.
- (25) Technological reasons are not the only factors in concentration albeit important ones. See Paolo Sylos-Labini, "Oligopoly and Technical Progress", Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1962.
- (26) The Unión Cívica Radical del Pueblo, during its period in power, explicitly sponsored a programme of economic development which would not have seriously harmed, in the short run, the small industrialists.
- (27) We shall come back to this point at the end of chapter II.
- (28) Two examples will suffice. In the last two years in the tobacco industry the firms which were not already foreign owned have been bought up by international

companies. The same has happened with many of the largest private banks.

(29) The Litoral consisted of the provinces along the lower section of the Parana and Uruguay rivers and of the northern part of the province of Buenos Aires.

(30) Tasajo (jerked meat) was sold in the plantations of Brazil and Cuba. Several attempts to sell it in the European market failed.

(31) The number of families who retained their land was not very large. To start with, landowning families were very few. The origin of the large holdings in the Pampean region has to be traced back to the time after Independence with the actual occupation of the Indian territory. The first distribution of land on a large scale took place under Rosas. Then some of the "enfiteutas" (tenants for long periods of public land) became proprietors. The second distribution occurred after the "Campaña al Desierto" late in the nineteenth century. In both cases most of the new proprietors came from cities, some had never before been landowners. Ezequiel Gallo in his Ph.D. thesis shows that the origin of many large landowners in the Province of Santa Fe was in trade and other urban professions.

(St. Antony's College, Oxford.)

- (32) Most of the literature dealing with the poor living conditions of "chacareros" (farmers) refers to a later period, during the crisis of 1923-24 and after the World Crisis of 1929. This literature has contributed greatly to the creation of an image of a submerged peasantry, which is unreasonably believed to have always existed.
- (33) We shall see in chapter III that unbalanced regional distribution of income has been an important characteristic of Argentina, though much larger in the past than today.
- (34) For the national elections of 1952 and 1956 the correlation between working class and Peronist voting was .9 in Greater Buenos Aires. These figures were worked out in 1958 and used to design a stratified sample (Department of Sociology, University of Buenos Aires). Germani in "Estructura Social de la Argentina" (Buenos Aires, Raigal, 1955) also gives figures on the correlation between voting for different political parties and working class membership.
- (35) The Radical Party was formally founded after the Revolution of 1890, though it existed before with a different name.
- (36) This is a fact political essayists have frequently

failed to remember. The Radical Party claimed for compulsory voting and the use of military conscription rolls as a means of preventing fraud.

- (37) Gino Germani in several essays has discussed the emergence of Peronism and its appeal for recent internal migrants.
- (38) There are many stories about the new rich Argentinians touring Europe. Some are fictitious, but some are real, as was the case of a well known lady who travelled with a cow/^{so}that she could always have fresh milk for her children. The picture one obtains from these stories is one of parvenues.
- (39) The Interior includes every region except Buenos Aires.
- (40) It is difficult to find another name. In the past they were called criollos, but the meaning of this word varies with its context, i.e. it depends on emphasis and the construction of the sentence. Criollo had also a positive meaning as everybody born in this region were criollos, even those of pure Spanish ancestry.
- (41) The figure of the gaucho was poetically vindicated at the end of the nineteenth century, though perhaps the reason was that with the transformation of country life, all gauchos disappeared.
- (42) What is important to remember here is that Peronism

incorporated them into politics not as the inferior people they were supposed to be but as the supporters of a party in power. The actual role of Peronism towards *cabecitas negras* was to give them a sense of self-esteem and make them feel that after all they formed part of the "most powerful political party ever known in the Argentine". This, in fact, was not very far from reality, as Peronism even today counts a great deal in the political life of Argentina.

- (43) In Argentina there is no word to convey the meaning of the English word "estate". The nearest word is "*la propiedad*" (the property) which can be applied to any sort of property.
- (44) I am referring to "*Estratificación y movilidad social en el Gran Buenos Aires*", directed by Germani in 1960-61. On the correlations between income and occupational status see: Gino Germani, "*Indicadores Objetivos de clase y clase social subjetiva*", Departamento de Sociología, Buenos Aires, 1963. There is also an unpublished study on income distribution by occupational group (1963-64) carried out by CONADE (National Commission for Economic Development). The only data we have obtained from this research are on levels of income for salary and wage earners as they were stipulated in

in the "Convenios colectivos de trabajo" (collective agreements on salaries and wages) between 1943-1963. Here levels of income for different groups within a given trade depends on the degree of skill or training.

- (45) The best known researches in Argentina are: G. Germani, "Estructura social de la Argentina", and T. Di Tella, "Teoria del primer impacto del desarrollo económico", Universidad del Litoral, 1965.
- (46) In a recent sample of the two first national censuses we found that there is little lost in accuracy in the transcription of names from the schedules to the censuses.
- (47) As we explain in the appendices information from the complementary censuses was used to compute and rank occupational groups. This procedure was applied by Germani in "Estructura social de la Argentina".

2. ECONOMIC ORDER OF STRATIFICATION: ECONOMIC GROUPS.

In Spanish America wherever economic expansion occurred it was primary based on the development of an export sector; such was the case with Peru and Mexico.

The River Plate remained in a state of comparative stagnation almost up to the end of the Eighteenth century, though its Northern Region was rather an exception (1). There the exchange trade with The Upper Peru gave rise to the development of artisan production, foods tuffs production and mule breeding. To a lesser degree, other Central Provinces also participated as suppliers of the Upper Peru. On the other hand the Pampean Region not only lacked any considerable economic activity but was moreover scarcely populated. A. Ferrer estimates that only ten per cent of that region was under actual European control, the rest being Indian territory (2).

The main economic activity of the Pampean Region was the hun ting of wild cattle for their hides which was a small source of income until 1773 when Spain partly freed the trade to and from the River Plate. These measures encouraged ranching development, a process that was reinforced by the Liberal Reforms introduced by the new Government in Buenos Aires after Independence.

At the beginning of the Seventeenth century the free-right over cattle hunting, which had prevailed in the past, ended and local authorities started granting special permits to perform "vaquerias" (cattle-

hunts). Though illegal hunting was very frequent "vaquerias" became a privilege and marked the beginning of the private appropriation of cattle (3). Subsequently cattle breeding was organized on a permanent basis over large areas of land called "estancias". Cattle breeding by rodeos required a large area but ^a small labour force, as five men could look after four or five thousand livestock over an area of three square leagues (7,500 hectares) (4). With such a system of exploitation small or even medium-sized holdings were unsuitable for cattle breeding. Halperin Donghi points out the correlation between ranching and large holdings; he says that at the beginning of the XIX Century in the Province of Buenos Aires the North and West were typical farming areas where either medium or small holdings prevailed, whereas the South was a typical pastoral region of large estancias (5).

After the attempt to keep the public lands under State ownership had failed their sale, as well as that of the new areas conquered from the Indians, became an important source of public revenue. And the sale of land was systematically and frequently applied as a way of balancing Budget deficits. Moreover political loyalty and military services were usually rewarded with gifts of land. So that by 1880 most of the public land in the Pampean Region and Patagonia had been transferred in large holdings into private ownership and the pattern of land property so established (6).

During the second half of the XIXth. Century several factors favoured the development of agriculture in Argentina. First and above

all the increasing international demand for agricultural products. Secondly, the existence of a large plain of natural pastures where cattle could be raised on a low cost production basis(7). Thirdly the large investment in infrastructure, particularly railways and harbours, mostly financed by foreign capital. And finally, a continued current of foreign immigration during the second half of the XIXth Century and the first two decades of the XXth. (see Appendix V on foreign immigration).

Sheep-farming was the pioneer activity of ranching development. During the Colony wool had been exported to Spain, but the existing monopolistic situation had not encouraged the introduction of better breeds. The first sheep-farms started as early as 1825 and after 1840 more old cattle estancias turned to sheep breeding though cattle also remained as an important activity (8). Sheepbreeds were imported and by 1866 sheep-farming had become an important agricultural enterprise. The exportation of wool increased throughout the second half of the century and became the major export item. And the boiling of carcasses to obtain tallow also expanded into a large industry. (Table I).

In 1850 Argentina exported less than 8 thousand tons of wool; exports doubled in ten years and reached 65 thousand tons in 1870, and nearly a hundred thousand a decade later. In 1899 the top figure was reached when 237 thousand tons were exported. Thus wool gradually replaced hides and tasajo(salted jerked meat) as the main

source of income. So had sheep replaced cattle on the best fields. Saladeros (where tasajo was prepared) had been very prosperous in the past, but at the end of the century they definitely declined. This was the result: first, a marked decrease in the external demand for Argentine as the main customer, Brazil, began to breed cattle to produce tasajo; tasajo; and secondly, the improved cattle were suitable now for supplying the demand for meat in European countries.

Improvements of cattle breeds did not begin until the XIXth. Century was well advanced. In 1888, whereas only 24% of sheep-herds were of criollo type, 80% of cattle was criollo. This proportion decreased to 45% in 1908, and in the Province of Buenos Aires was only 9%. These improvements of breeds were stimulated by a favourable international demand. In 1892 Great Britain banned imports of livestock from the Continent, which coincided with the decline of exports from the United States. Though in 1900 a ban on imports of livestock closed the British market also for the R. Plate, frozen and chilled procedures had advanced enough to permit an increase in exports of meat. Thus Argentina became the first supplier of beef in the British market and the second of lamb. Whereas in 1903 Argentina supplied only 28% of the British beef market, in 1907 her share increased to 48% and a year later to 67%.

The replacement of sheep by cattle on the best fields of the Pampean Region was due to several factors. First, beef could compete

more efficiently than lamb with Australian and New Zealand production. Secondly, the long depression of the European Textile industries during the 1890's had deeply affected the demand for Argentine wool. Thirdly, the internal consumption of beef in the United States had rapidly increased there by reducing her export surplusses considerably. And fourthly, there was a change in the composition of the demand in Great Britain that favoured beef.

Changes in the development of ranching can also be traced in the evolution of the estancia. Not only were breeds improved but enclosure of land, artificial pastures and investment in water supply were undertaken (9). "On the large well run estancia ... there are thousands of cattle with hardly a bad one among them and a levelness, of class has been attained which would be an eye-opener to the average English farmer and breeder. Considering the short time in which all this has been accomplished it speaks volumes for the far-sightness and capability of the Argentine land owner. The estancia owner in this country has very up-to date ideas" (Macnis describing the Argentine country side in 1899-1908)(10). H. Rivarola also mentions the emphasis on introducing new techniques prevailing among several estancieros (11), and E. Zeballos gives a long account on estancieros and their achievements in the improvements of their estancias (12). Martinez and Lewandowski carefully describe the transformation of the old estancia and conclude that "in all these establishments, thanks to the intelligent efforts of their owners there are many stallions, bulls and rams

of the purest blood and the general stock of the country has reached a very high quality of race, as all stock-breeders, even the smallest, are aware of the great advantages to be obtained by crossing selected animals with sires of pure blood". They give statistics of importation of stud animals to "show the importance which the Argentine breeder attaches to the improvement of the breed of his flocks and herds" (13).

Estancieros in the last decades have been blamed for not keeping pace with technological change, particularly during the Peronist government when agricultural production decreased. Whatever the judgement present day estancieros may deserve, it is unfair to extrapolate and blame the estancieros of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth. Criticism on other grounds may be valid, but, it cannot be forgotten that they played their entrepreneurial role with high efficiency, insofar as entrepreneurship expresses an attitude towards economic production: that of acting upon nature, reinvesting surplusses and improving production in order to achieve better quality goods as well as larger quantities.

The argument frequently used today against the estancieros of that period is that they were absentee landowners. The meaning of absentism is not clear. It may mean that landowners left all their land in the hands of tenants, or share-croppers, or that the estancia was run by an administrator with full power to make decisions, or finally that the owner did not live permanently on the land even though he was in charge of its administration. We cannot estimate how much of the total land under cultivation in different periods was under one system or the other.

The only information we have comes from the Agricultural Census of 1914. There, one can see that provinces where large holdings prevailed are those with a smaller proportion of tenants, and second, whereas large holdings performed ranching as their prime activity, small holdings specialized in farming (see table 21.1 (b), appendix I). This information is however only useful in that estancias (large holdings performing primarily ranching) were most unlikely to be given in tenancy, but it does not say how many were managed by their owners or by administrators with full power of decision. Let us see in what cases the entrepreneurial role could have been delegated.

If one owner rented all his land to tenants, that land did not constitute an estancia, neither was its owner an estanciero. This is the only clear cut case of an absentee landowner, who, once his land had been given in tenancy, had no say in its management. (See introduction on the definition of estancia.)

The second case were estancias which farmed under the system of share-cropping (we shall come to this point further on). In this case there is little doubt that the power of decision remained in the hands of the estanciero. This can be deduced from the system itself. The aim of the estanciero was to improve his ~~margin~~ virgin land with pastures, so usually the share-cropping contracts lasted three years at the end of which time the share-cropper had to sow alfalfa grass. The share-cropper received seeds and implements from the estancia and it was fixed beforehand the type of crops he had to sow every year. Moreover, it was estab-

lished in the contract how much land he could dedicate to his personal use and the number of cattle he was allowed to keep on the land. Not infrequently the share-cropper was obliged to sell even his share of crops to a dealer named by the estanciero. (The Grito de Alcorta was a reaction against this system.) Under this system of sharing-crops, which was the norm in the Province of Buenos Aires, the estanciero by no means delegated his entrepreneurial role.

The third case was that when the owner completely disregarded the business of the estancia and left them in the hands of an administrator with full power of decision, even investment decisions. How many landowners behaved like this we do not know, but it was certainly not the majority, otherwise the number of administrators (administrador de estancia) we obtained from a recent sample of the censuses of 1869 and 1895 would have been larger (14).

Finally, the last system was, and is, very frequently used in large estancias. The owner had no permanent residence on the land even though he was in charge of its administration. A mayordomo looked after the current operations of the estancia but it seems presumptuous to believe that decisions on investment or on how much land would be dedicated to crops or cattle-breeding were left in his hands. Tough mayordomos might have also acted as advisers, their role was to control the everyday life within the estancia and keep an eye on the work of peones (of course assisted by other people of lower rank).

To understand the entrepreneurial role of estancieros it is crucial

to take into consideration what the estancia was before and after the process of agricultural development. As already mentioned the main technological innovations introduced in the agricultural sector were: fencing, water supply (15) and improved breeds. These changes took place within the estancia and large estancieros were the first to take the lead and subsequently spread the information to smaller producers (16). First, the large estancieros had capital with which to invest, and secondly, they had more chances than anybody else to be in touch with sources of technological information, and to know the requirements of the demand market.

The technological transformation of the estancia was necessary in order to avoid failure in business. As we said before agricultural development in Argentina was possible because there existed an increasing international demand for agricultural products. The aim of estancieros was to gain the European market for which they had, necessarily to improve breeds, and these better breeds demanded a series of changes, both as regards investment and organization of the estancia.

The concern of estancieros with innovation and their understanding that only with improved breeds could they compete in the international market is shown in the activities of the Rural Society. At that time, this society was almost exclusively formed by large estancieros, particularly from the province of Buenos Aires.

As early as 1869 the Rural Society possessed an experimental field station in Rio Segun^o, Cordoba, and in 1875 founded an institute for farming research. When the "Frigorifique" sailed for Buenos Aires in 1876 the Rural Society partly financed the experiment with funds collected among its members. In 1888 they founded a new institute, this time for the study of

cattle diseases, And all these initiatives were undertaken when economic prosperity had not yet made itself felt in its fullest effects (17).

At the beginning of the process of agricultural development estancias were little concerned with farming. For whereas ranching could be performed on an extensive low-cost-production basis with a low level of labour, farming required both a higher initial capital investment and a higher proportion of labour per unit of land. For these reasons the Argentine Government engaged in the task of promoting farming; thereby organizing foreign immigration and, sometimes, eventually assuming part of the economic risks involved in farming colonization. Usually the Government granted land to Colonization Companies which organized colonies and were obliged to pay for the land at the end of the contract.

The immigrant farmers who first settled in newly established colonies received a plot of land and an initial capital mainly consisting of some building materials, seeds, some cattle and foodstuffs. The plot of land assigned to each family was small for the standards of that period but large enough to permit farming (approximately 50 Ha.). According to the contract of colonization the colonist was bound to repay both land and capital, but in most cases the Government gave up its claims to any compensation. For at the beginning most colonists had to overcome great difficulties partly due to climatic misfortunes and partly to their own ignorance of farming techniques as "very few of them were farmers in Europe; the majority had been recruited

among people without a definite profession" (18).

After the first successful colony (1856) many others were organized (19). In 1873 there were 53 colonies and two decades later more than seven hundred, most of them in the provinces of Santa Fe, Cordoba and Entre Rios. Besides State colonization, carried out under the system of concessions, some landowners also undertook colonization on their own land. It was an indirect way of improving the value of their remaining plots (20).

Due to farming colonization, for the first time in 1877 Argentina exported wheat (21). Though home production was protected, wheat had to be imported up to 1870 and flour up to 1876. And as far as corn was concerned exports had started earlier, because internal consumption was smaller and also because before 1888 the area sown with corn was larger than that with wheat.

Whereas in Santa Fe, Cordoba, and Entre Rios, colonies prospered, the situation in Buenos Aires was different. There in the 80's the expansion of farming took place where portions of large grazing holdings were let out to tenants and so converted into cereal farms. The betterment of sheep and cattle breeds required better pastures than those of virgin fields. Plots of land were given in tenancy to immigrants with no capital, who cultivated the land for short periods, usually three years. At the end of the tenancy period they had to leave the land sown with alfalfa grass and move to a new plot for another three years under the same conditions. This system of cultivation benefited both farming

and ranching, as well as tenants and estancieros. For the former, how ever unstable their situation was, could benefit from the use of land otherwise unobtainable for them; and estancieros profited both by the rents received from their land and better pastures for their cattle.

Under that system "during the first year flax was sown, followed by wheat during the second year, and the cycle ended with the land sown with alfalfa grass and flax. "Thus linseed was exported; what may be considered as a by-product of ranching development" because the estanciero ultimately aimed at having his land improved with better pastures (22). The growing and exportations of oats and rye had the same origin (though oat-fields were also used as pastures). Thus whereas in 1905/6 there were only 72 thousand hectares cultivated with oats , five years later there were more than a million. (23).

The area under cultivation grew steadily in spite of cyclical variations in prices. And the volume of exports depended rather on the chances of a good or a bad harvest than on changes in international prices (24). This was so because land had necessarily to be sown with cereals before alfalfa could be cultivated. And estancieros were interested in the improvement of their sheep and cattle. Tenants on their part, having no cattle of their own, had necessarily to grow cereals. And as far as proprietor-farmers were concerned their plot was too small except for farming (25). Moreover, low cost of production permitted the expansion of the supply even when prices were decreasing.

The expansion of farming over virgin fields ended during the second decade of this century; and new increases in cereal production were to occur at the expense of ranching and viceversa, as intensive cultivation did not fully replace extensive exploitation. As regards ranching its expansion continued for a few years after World War I and ended with the cattle crisis of 1924. The improvement of chilling procedures, largely developed in local Frigorificos (meat packing plants), had had twofold consequences. First, it had given preponderance to cattle over sheep, which then moved to marginal fields, particularly Patagonia ; and secondly , it was a decisive factor in the success of Argentine meat in the British market.

The World Crisis of 1929 marked a turning point in the evolution of the Argentine economy. Hitherto the whole economic structure had been based on the development of agriculture as a response to an external stimulus, so much so that the development of agriculture can easily be traced by the evolution of exports.

The demand for wool in the international market, was followed by all the most important changes in agricultural production: improvement of breeds, fencing and other investments. As long as the demand for wool increased and that for tasajo declined, sheep replaced cattle on the Pampean Region. The cycle of wool that had started in the 60's ended at the end of the century after the depression of 1890. Exports of cereals started in the 70's, increased steadily and by 1885 had a share of 13% of all exports, 30.9% in 1893 and 47.6% in 1903.

The first decade of this century was one of predominance of export of cereals over cattle by-products (66% in 1903) but in the next decade began the era of frozen and chilled beef (chilled beef overtook frozen meat in 1921/2). Then cereals and meat shared exports approximately equally, and farming and ranching shared the fields in a mixed system of exploitation. For in the twenties the rotation of crops with cattle breeding became the normal procedure of operation.

All these changes, replacement of crops and livestock, were undertaken without destroying the outstanding position of the estancia as a productive unit. This was so because the estancia was large enough to permit the simultaneous operation of different crops and breeds. When the demand for wool increased and sheep-breeding became a good source of income, estancias developed sheep-farms as well as continuing cattle-breeding (producers of hides and tasajo)(26). When improved breeds wanted better pastures and cereals became a prospective source of income large holdings could afford to divert some plots into farming(27). There were immigrants prepared to accept share-cropping contracts or who paid a rent in cash. For it was a good business for both estanciero and tenant. And eventually when cereals and meat successfully shared the export trade, farming and ranching could coexist side by side in the large estancia.

The large estancia, so much blamed in later decades, made up a good part of the success of agricultural development in Argentina. For, as a productive unit the estancia was able to operate on a low-

cost-production basis (28). And this low-cost -production could successfully compete in the international market . To such an extent that in the twenties Argentina became the chief world exporter of meat, linseed, quebracho extract (tanin), maize, oats and barley; the second of casein, wheat, rye and wool; and the third of lamb (29).

The failure of the present day estancia as a productive unit does not stem from its size, but from the fact that it has not kept up to a sufficient rate of investment to permit a growing productivity. E. C. L. A. experts think that "from the point of view of the economic advantage of the country there are no serious objections against large holdings provided that they are rationally administered, i. e. that they are adequately capitalized and technically operated". "Nevertheless there exists the impression that very few fulfil these requisites"(30). Fifty years ago these objections were not applicable because at that time the rate of investment in agriculture was reasonably high. Though "the main characteristic of the rural sector was an extensive use of the land" there was also "a high amount of capital per unit of labour" so that "per-capita productivity was high ... and the country could feed its population as well as generate large exportable-surplusses employing only a low proportion of its labour force". (31) In the twenties the number of horses decreased as a consequence of "a process of a constant mechanization of farming", "a process that had started long past" (32).

The advantage of the estancia performing simultaneously farming

and ranching was that allowing for scale economies it could yield a production at competitive international prices. Moreover large holdings had, and still have, a technical advantage over small ones: given the extensive system of exploitation the rotation of cultures and cattle-breeding helps to maintain the fertility of the soil. "Rotation with cattle-breeding is indispensable, though not sufficient, in order to allow the soil to recover those elements lost after continued farming. These rotations have been a traditional system of operation in Argentina, carried out lest the soil become exhausted... The system of land tenure, so objectionable from other points of view, favoured rotations because the landowner had great flexibility to dispose of his land for ranching whenever necessary" (34).

That system of operation in large holdings, based on temporary tenancy, besides its economic and technical advantages, permitted the survival of the estancia as a large productive unit. Though tenants also benefited from that system, the economic power of estancieros grew as much as the economy expanded (35). Nevertheless their power was not based on the mere possession of land but on the fact that land constituted the basis of the

of the economy of the country. For though along with agriculture other sectors developed, they developed as a consequence of a present or expected agricultural development. If foreign capital was invested in frigoríficos (meat packing plants) and railways it was because the Pampean Region could yield cereals and cattle which were very valuable in the international market.

The role of railways is too well known to need discussion here. It seems enough to point out that in 1857 there were only 10 kilometres of railway-tracks, 16,8 thousand in 1900 and 38,6 thousand in 1930. The building of railways aimed at serving the needs of an economy oriented towards the export market. To such an extent that more than 70% of all railtracks were located in the Pampean Region, where railway density (i.e. the relation between area covered by railways and length of track) in the twenties was higher than that of Britain herself (25 km. in the Pampean Region against 83 in Great Britain)(36). Moreover the orientation of railtracks was such that they tended to converge on harbours, particularly Buenos Aires (37).

Though the Argentine State engaged in building railways (with foreign financing), the development of this means of transportation remained almost entirely a matter of direct foreign investment. In the eighties the Government sold part of its railways and only engaged in non-profitable areas, particularly outside the Pampean Region.

Foreign capital not only controlled the most important and largest part of the railways, (at that time almost the only means of transportation). They also controlled most of the meat packing industry. Until 1902 when United States capital became interested in frigorificos, British capital had almost an hegemonic control over this industry, only shared by a small proportion of Argentine capital. The development of frigorificos in the Nineteenth Century was slow and gradual but it advanced at a high rate after 1900, when imports of livestock from the River Plate were forbidden in Great Britain. Thus the link between ranching and frigorificos became definitive and particularly closer when chilling procedures were improved.

Competition between Railway companies eventually led to the amalgamation of lines (railtracks) into a few very large firms. And as far as the meat packing industry was concerned the 'meat war' between Anglo-Argentine and United States frigorificos ended in several agreements dividing the British market into quotas (38).

Though all three groups, estancieros, railways and frigorificos were in competition and this competition was particularly strong between estancieros and frigorificos, there were also elements of cohesion

between them. For they shared ultimate interests, those of their mutual link with the Export Trade. Among these sectors existed what is called an 'implicit agreement' (39) that prevented them from destroying each other lest any one should itself be destroyed. Frigoríficos could not do without estancieros because they controlled the basic means of production and they themselves were strong within their own sector. Both railways and frigoríficos benefitted from a large agricultural production that would have been seriously affected by a drastic reduction in the income received by estancieros. Because estancias were large they could afford to survive a reduction in prices by retaliating with a reduction in production, (as came about in the forties). Estancieros had a power based on their economic strength, and however monopolistic the position of both frigoríficos and railways might have been, they had to face a group with power of retaliation and bargaining. Had estancias been small productive units the fate of estancieros would have been quite different (40), like 'chacareros' (small farmers) whose income was reduced by the intervention of big Corn-traders which at the same time were big exporters of cereals.

The rapid development of agriculture oriented towards the supply of the international market did not hinder the development of industries. On the contrary they developed largely as a secondary effect of that process of agricultural development, and of the intense growth in population. This first stage of industrialization started in the eighteen seventies and ended with the Crisis of 1929. A second

stage began in the thirties and continued until the beginning of the fifties when a period of relative economic stagnation started in Argentina (41).

Formerly we mentioned that during the Colony and well into the Nineteenth Century the want of an external sector kept many regions of the River Plate in a state of economic stagnation. The most prosperous regions were the Northwest and Central Provinces which supplied Upper Peru with artisan products. The economic decline of these provinces started with their loss of that market at the end of the Eighteenth Century and continued during the first half of the Nineteenth as a consequence of the Civil War (42). Besides, the economic policy of the Province of Buenos Aires was a fresh blow to provincial crafts which reduced their share in the supply of that market and subsequently of the rest of the Littoral. However, this latter event was less significant than the former, as most provinces were already producing mainly for self-consumption and to a lesser degree for inter-regional exchange. Besides distance and internal tariffs protected the provincial economies from alien competition (43). Two factors broke down that regional isolationism, the Free Trade Policy sponsored by the Central Government, and the development of means of communications.

The unification of Argentine territory took place under a federal system (1852). The Provinces retained their original rights to run their own economies and regulate their own taxing systems. But all issues regarding customs regulations were delegated to the Federal

Government and "Internal Douanes" abolished by Constitution. As part of its economic policy the Federal Government sponsored free-trade and foreign investment in railways. Imports, easily transported by railway destroyed many local crafts which could not survive competition (44). On the other hand regional specialization was favoured, as with sugar-cane, quebracho, and later on yerba and cotton in the North, and wine and fruit in Cuyo(45).

The decline of local crafts was not only a direct consequence of competition from foreign goods easily transported by railway, other factors also played an important part. First, as we said, local crafts had already declined during the Civil War, and were producing mainly for consumption within their own localities. Second, they were concentrated in the Northern provinces where the population was too small to constitute a market for expansive production(46). Third, imports were not only of a higher quality but were also more diversified, so that they competed efficiently with local crafts. Four, with the increase in income brought about by agricultural development higher income groups most likely preferred imports to their own local produce. Finally, in some trades, such as wool weaving, the increase in the cost of the raw material, now exported, affected negatively local crafts. Regional

crafts could have increased their production if the size of their market had expanded, and this could have happened only by gaining the Litoral market. There they had to compete with imports and in that market the cost of transportation was an additional burden. This seems to us the crucial point in the disappearance of local crafts. Their local market was small and they could not compete in the Litoral market, and as the quality of imports was better, higher income groups, in their own locality, very likely shifted to them. Moreover, if the price of imports was lower, then local produce would not be in demand by the lower income groups.(47).

The situation in Buenos Aires and to a lesser degree in other Litoral Provinces was different. Their internal market had always been largely supplied by alien goods, either foreign or regional. When both agricultural development and foreign immigration started, they mainly concentrated in the Litoral(48). The combined effect of

increase in income and population created favourable conditions for the development of industries.

Industries that developed during the second half of the Nineteenth Century were of a sort likely to appear as a consequence of a process of rapid economic growth. To start with there were a series of industrial activities connected with the adequate preparation of export-commodities. The best example was the meat packing industry. Other foodstuffs could also develop under competitive conditions. Though only perishable goods had a clear advantage over imports, the abundance and cheapness of raw material stimulated the internal production of a large variety of foodstuffs. The building up of infrastructure also gave rise to the development of 'subsidiary' industries' mostly connected with the supply of building materials (49). Metal works, carpentry and repairing industries developed as well. In fact many of them were not in direct competition with imports. For all goods of low specific value (large volume and low price) could be more economically produced at home.

Nevertheless home industries also developed in those branches more in direct competition with imports, such as textiles, cloth-making wine, leather and furniture. "Their aim was to supply the needs of the poorest classes"; as "foreign goods tended to be of superior quality" (50) low income groups had to consume home-made products. Unlike those local crafts so badly affected by competition with imports, the new home industries could start and grow because the size of their

market was considerably larger. For there was a close relationship between the concentration of population in urban areas (particularly Buenos Aires) and the development of native industries.

In the past, foreign immigrants had engaged in farming, supplied the labour force for railway construction, cared for services, as well as engaging in artisan production, building and commerce. Whereas at the turn of the century the proportion of immigrants who remained in urban areas increased, the number of those who continued to become farmers sensibly decreased. As long as exploitation of the land continued being extensive, agriculture could absorb only a decreasing number of either farmers, tenants, or workers, except in seasonal jobs (51). On the other hand urban areas offered good opportunities for economic improvement. The land tenure system and latifundia have been blamed for the low absorption of immigrants by the country-side. It is undeniable that had land property been more easily open to immigrants a larger number would have settled there. Nevertheless such an explanation assumes that foreign immigrants were attracted by agriculture and their failure to become proprietors turned them to industry and services. This explanation does not take into consideration that industry and services were in themselves good enough sources of income to attract foreign immigrants. What still holds true is that the total number of immigrant settlers/would have been larger, had the land property been more open (52).

As well as growth in population the rapid growth in income pro-

duced by agricultural development played an important role in the development of a native industry. Though income tended to be concentrated in the hands of estancieros and other groups connected with the Export trade, as long as the economy was expanding at a high rate part of that income had necessarily to spread downwards. The Pampean Region, where economic development most intensively occurred, was thinly populated. Large movements of native population from the North did not start until the third decade of the Twentieth Century (53). Agriculture, the building-up of railways and other infra-structure, as well as other indispensable activities demanded labour which was supplied by foreign immigrants. The role of shortage of native labour force and the need to attract foreign immigrants was of crucial importance. For it favoured a better distribution of income and indirectly fomented the development of native industries. Though there were great inequalities, these were not as large as they might have been in a densely populated country. Such was the case of the Northern Provinces (East and West) where the exploitation of native labourers was so well known. But however miserable their condition at home might have been, European immigrants had to be offered something better than a subsistence income.

"Before World War I wages in Argentina were higher than in Europe" (54) even though during periods of depression the level of wages was depressed and unemployment increased. But these periods of crisis were also those when the rate of return of immigrants increa-

/sed. The period after the War and before the Crisis was also one of high absorption of immigrants and of high wages. Comparing the series of cash wages, real wages and per-capita income between 1915 and 1930 "It is possible to verify that wages grew at a higher rate than the per-capita income which suggests that the share of labour in the national income was increasing. This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that unemployment fell from a War level of 10-19 % to almost nil in the last years of the twenties" (55).

Mechanization of agriculture was also a result of permanent shortage of labour. In the twenties when the level of European wages was higher than that prevalent in Argentina, seasonal immigration ceased and further steps in mechanization were undertaken. In the past an immigrant-worker could earn between £40 and £50 during the harvest season which made it worthwhile to journey to Argentina and return home once the harvest was over (56).

Therefore, unlike countries where the population is split up into two groups, one of very high income and the other living at a subsistence level, in Argentina a middle stratum developed. A stratum whose income was high enough to allow them the consumption of manufactures, either imports or home-produce, according to income. In other words, in Argentina before the Crisis there was a market for industry, which actually developed.

The fall in imports and the inflation that followed the Crisis of 1873-75 stimulated the emergence of workshops that benefitted

subsequently from the Tariff-Reform of 1876, when surcharge-taxes were raised in order to improve the financial position of the Federal Government. Between 1880-90 again many workshops developed. This was a decade of great prosperity, of large investment in railways and infrastructure as well as of large foreign immigration. Though imports per-capita nearly doubled "native industries also benefited from this fever of progress" (57).

In the eighteen - nineties a new tariff reform was carried out in order to balance the National Budget, badly affected by the crisis of 1890. Though by the end of the century most of these increases in surcharge-tax had been annulled, in this decade many branches of industry developed nonetheless. Thus in 1900 industry already accounted for 14.3% of the National Product, a share that increased to 16.7% in 1911. During this decade the volume of industrial production more than doubled though importation of non-durable goods also doubled and that of durable grew five times. This was again a period of great prosperity, with surpluses in the Export-Import Trade and great inflow of foreign capital (58). Even branches of industry such as textiles almost doubled their volume of production. And between 1903-08 "the largest proportion of imports were textiles and clothing" (59) (For this and the following analysis see Table II).

The development of the industrial sector depended on the more general economic conditions (growth in agriculture, exports and flow of capital) to such an extent that during World War I the volume of

industrial production declined, in spite of the natural protection of the War period (60). Subsectors such as metal works declined to a half and even textiles were affected though they recovered more quickly (61). The textile industry showed the biggest variations; after a deep contraction in 1916 it recovered and grew to hitherto unknown levels. Perhaps because it partly replaced some imports in the internal market and also because during the war period coarse textiles were exported as war supply. James Ferrer thinks that "much of the industrial increase that did occur during the war was characterized by its dependence upon foreign markets. Washed wool, wool cloth and blankets, cotton cloth, wine, cheese, minerals, butter, meat, tanning extract and flour were the most important items benefitting from the larger foreign demand"(62). This means that the contraction of industry would have been even worse if the reduction of its internal market had not been partly compensated by the expansion of industrial exports.

In the post war period, though importation of consumption goods increased the volume of industrial production doubled again. Textiles, the sector one may regard as the most affected by imports, followed an upward trend, even though with great annual variations.

With the exception of a few branches of industry, industrial concerns in 1914 were small. There manual procedures prevailed and usually production within the firm was diversified into a large variety of commodities. For the pioneer industrialist could not afford to specialize, so that the decline in the demand of one product could always

be compensated selling other ones (63). It was also common to dispense with retailers and sell directly to the public (64). Even in 1914 when the use of intermediaries had generalized, nearly 40% of all concerns still produced for retail-sale (65).

From the analysis of census data we found that in 1914 out of 115 different branches of industry there were only 22 with an average size of firm which could qualify either as large or medium. We considered an average size of firm as large when its average-investment was over six hundred thousand current pesos (see appendix I) This was a size equivalent to a ranch of five thousand hectares. And an average size of firm was considered medium when its investment was between one hundred and twenty thousand and six hundred thousand pesos.

Among the twenty-two top branches of industry there were only three where resources were really highly concentrated; these were meat packing plants, an oil distillery and sugar refineries. Other branches with high concentration were paper and pasteboard, ale, cloth-sacks, cigarettes, textile fibres and galvanized iron and aluminum. Branches with middle-sized concerns included foodstuffs, some chemicals, textiles, saw mills and shipyards. (see Table III).

Those 22 branches, where large and middle-sized undertakings prevailed, accounted for 19.8% of the total employment in industry and for 38.9% of the total capital invested in this sector; though only 2.8% of firms belonged to these branches.

In the remaining 93 branches either small or very small concerns prevailed. The proportion of undertakings in this group was 97.6% and they accounted for 80% of the total employment and 60% of the capital (Table 32.3, Appendix I).

The former figures only show averages by branch of industry. Very likely in some of the branches classified as small concerns either middle or even large firms must have existed. Nonetheless these figures indicate in what branches production was more concentrated in large firms.

However general the Census data may be, they show: first, that industry in 1914 was to a large extent diversified; secondly, that except in a few branches the degree of concentration of resources was low, as there were a large number of firms with low investment; and thirdly, that these firms worked at a low level of technology, utilizing labour rather than capital.

We shall try to find out some hypotheses which might explain the low degree of concentration of resources in industry. That is, what factors in the development of industry obstructed the formation of groups who controlled a high proportion of the resources of their own branches of activity. Here, we shall be concerned with the majority of branches, those where small firms prevailed. Though we are well aware that an accurate explanation would require an analysis of each branch in particular, we are now interested only in the most general factors which affected industry as a whole.

It is highly probable that industrial concerns grew adding very little fixed capital in relation to variable capital and man-power. The analysis of a series of branches classified by their average capital and average employment shows that the growth in capital is smaller than the growth in employment. Frigorificos, for example, had 400 times more capital than average concerns of the smallest branches; but only 200 times more employment, though frigorificos still counted on a great deal of man-power for the slaughtering and handling of cattle (Table 32.2, Appendix I).

It is also very likely that concerns grew adding new lines of production. The introduction to the Census of 1914 mentions the difficulty of classifying industrial concerns due to the coexistence of different lines of production in the same undertaking. It has been mentioned that this coexistence of lines of production within the same undertaking helped small firms to overcome contractions in their demand. The lack of a long-term coherent Tariff-Policy did not encourage specialization, except in large firms. Moreover, imports were very unstable, depending on short run variations in the Argentine peso rate of exchange.

The tariff system affected the native produce in one important aspect. Imports paid duty "on the basis of an ad-valorem tariff applied on types of articles disregarding their actual price or quality". Under this system "whereas low quality goods were overprotected, regular or high quality ones enjoyed great liberality, so that a native firm in

its beginning had no other range of production than the coarse article" (66). Besides, surcharge taxes did not weigh evenly on all products, as there were differential taxes by type of commodity, in such a way that the degree of protection varied from branch to branch.

Thus the tariff system explains the fact that periods when imports increased were also those when industrial production grew faster (Table II). For there must have been a division of the demand market between native produce and imports in terms of quality, as well as in terms of type of commodity. Though high quality imports paid a comparatively low surcharge tax, their price was still too high for low income groups (67). In other words even when producing the same type of article most native concerns did not suffer direct competition from imports because they were aiming at different types of demand. If this interpretation is correct it would explain the survival of small firms. And in fact they actually survived. As the Census shows the vast majority of firms belonged to branches of industry where the average capital was between one hundred and three hundred times smaller than the average in Frigoríficos (where large firms prevailed). Moreover, the Census data were collected in a year of economic contraction when many small firms had collapsed, as the introduction to the Census points out (68).

The structure of productive-units in the industrial sector was such that there was an overwhelming majority of small firms with a low level of fixed-capital and a low degree of specialization. This may

explain the fact that there were no abrupt annual variations either in the volume of industrial production or in that of its component subsectors, except for years of great depression in business. Even when depression in given subsectors was deep it soon recovered; such as textiles in 1916 when production fell to a half and in the following years overcame the crisis to reach a level higher than that of 1915. For very probably quick changes in the line of production must have helped to overcome the crisis. These changes must have existed within branches of the same sub-sector and between subsectors as well. As the evolution of volumes of industrial production shows, annual variations in the industrial sector were smoother than those in the component-subsectors (69).

The diversification of the industrial production was possible because there was a demand for a large variety of manufactures. And; that diversification (115 different branches in 1914) permitted the formation of a large number of firms that engaged in those ranges of production less vulnerable to foreign competition; either because of their perishability or weight, of their urgency, or because of their lower quality. In some cases, particularly foodstuffs, where large firms prevailed, they had a real advantage over imports; though sometimes they also enjoyed explicit tariff-protection, like sugar and flour.

As previously mentioned, population and income were growing at a high rate. Though groups of high income tended to consume imports, when available, there were always groups of lower income

who demanded native produce. The effect of growth in population and income on native industry could be summarized as follows. When the income of a family increased their demand for manufactures also increased. And this demand was very likely satisfied mainly by native produce. Further increases in the income of that family deviated their demand to imported goods. Nevertheless as long as immigration continued and population grew and furnished the lower strata there were potential consumers of native produce. The pressure of their demand, canalized to native manufactures, permitted the diversification of industrial production, even though part of that demand might eventually be transferred to imports.

Although by this mechanism industry was able to develop, the effect of the transfer of part of the demand to imports had negative effects on the rate of concentration in industry. A given industrialist could set up a workshop and produce a given commodity; there was a demand that could be satisfied by it. But unless he could change the technology of his workshop to produce quantity and quality sufficiently to compete with imports, he had to be content with supplying the demand of low income groups. That change of technology was too great a change for one who counted only on his own resources. Therefore if he had a surplus it was less risky to set up a new workshop or add a new line of production to his own. The negative effect of the tariff system was that it permitted the diversion of the demand from native produce to imports. Had there been a systematic protective policy,

increases in income would have served as a stimulus only to the native industry. In other words the tariff system put a brake on industry by diverting part of its potential demand towards imports. And not only for articles which were produced internally but also as regards types of goods which were totally imported.

The diversification of the industrial production that permitted the formation of a large number of firms had, in another sense, negative effects on the concentration of industry. Taking the industrial sector as a whole and its total profits it may be affirmed that the larger the number of firms that share these profits the lower is the proportion of these profits that are actually reinvested. This hypothesis assumes that the propensity to invest of a small productive unit is lower than that of a larger one. This assumption in a different context is equivalent to stating that the smaller the income of an individual or family, the higher is their propensity to consume. For example, suppose the total net profits of a given branch equals one thousand and the normal expenditure of a family is equal to ten; if there is just one owner he will be able to invest nine hundred and ninety out of a thousand (though he may invest less). But if there are a hundred owners, even if they were willing they would not be able, to invest, unless they decided to reduce their family expenditure. The single owner controlling a large surplus will be freed of personal considerations as his decisions on investment will not affect his position as consumer. Though we cannot say what the actual behaviour will be, in terms of probability a

large firm will have a greater chance to invest a larger proportion of its net profits. Moreover a large firm, with large profits, will be in a better position to finance its new investment, as well as having an easier access to credit. If our assumption is correct, then insofar as the industrial sector in Argentina was made up by a large number of small firms, the rate of investment must have been smaller than what it would have been, had industry been more concentrated. Obviously this assumption applies only to those branches where the vast majority of firms were small.

Unless a workshop had a comparative advantage (the first to start business, better location in relation to the market, more skill, etc.) the process of absorbing a higher share of the market must have been slow. In other words, even though each small firm had its own clientele which was large enough to continue in business and make a good profit the taking over of shares from other firms must have been difficult and slow.

To take a small firm where manual procedures prevailed. In terms of cost of production it did not have a clear advantage over other small firms also using manual procedures. Had it been able to introduce a technological change (better equipment) the reduction in cost would have permitted the absorption of a higher share of the market. But the introduction of better equipment assumed a previous accumulation of capital that was beyond the means of that small firm. Thus this firm could only grow by degrees. Under a protective system, in

the long run comparative advantages would have developed and a process of concentration would have taken place. Instability of customs regulations and the lack of a positive protective policy which put a brake on the full expansion of the demand for native produce made the process of concentration more difficult.

The situation of this vast majority of small industrial firms may be summarized as follows: On the one hand growth in population and income due to agricultural development created favourable conditions for the development of industrial production. There small firms were settled and made a good business out of it. On the other hand the lack of a positive protective policy impeded the process of concentration.

The relationship between the general prosperity created by agricultural development and the prosperity enjoyed by the small industrial concerns was clear. Though imports increased, the income of groups, consumers of native produce, also increased. And the small craftsman or industrialist benefited from it. Increases in imports did not affect him, in that his market was not made up by consumers of imports. The whole economic system worked so as to satisfy the majority, and in times of economic depression both native industry and imports were negatively affected.

This economic system was based on an agricultural sector that produced for the international market. Industry was secondary to agriculture and very much affected by its evolution. But when the

world crisis of 1929 destroyed the basis of the Argentine economy, the role of industry was to change.

As far as the Argentine economy was concerned, the most important consequence of the world crisis was the disruption of a world market based on regional specialization and Free-Trade. Advanced countries undertook a series of measures in order to protect their own economy from the effects of the crisis. This, added to the already decreased demand for raw materials and foodstuffs, worsened the position of primary producing countries like Argentina. The extent to which these countries were affected depended on their degree of connection with the international market and the degree of diversification of their economies. The degree of vulnerability of the Argentine economy to external factors was high because a quarter of her national product was exported (Table IV). But her economy was diversified enough as to be able to overcome the effects of the crisis in a fairly short time.

The impact of the fall in prices and demand for agricultural products on the balance of payments was very acute; moreover the interruption of the flow of foreign capital and the weight of the external debt aggravated the shortage of foreign exchange. Imports of non-essential goods had to be curtailed and a control over foreign exchange introduced. Thus an Exchange Control Bureau was created in order to supervise foreign exchange transactions as well as import priorities. Though these measures came to be protective to the native industry, they were not undertaken deliberately in order to promote industrial-

/ration (70). Whereas agriculture was helped to overcome the effects of the Crisis through a series of Governmental decisions, no specific policy of industrialization was carried out, except for the financial support given in the form of bank-loans to firms processing foodstuffs (71). Moreover a future release of import-controls was contemplated when the Roca-Runciman treaty was renewed in 1936; on the occasion of the first treaty the Argentine Government had already agreed that no further increases of surcharge tax would be applicable to British imports (72).

The natural protection of the war-period was followed, after 1943, by positive measures taken in order to promote industrialization (73). Industrialization in 1946 seemed unavoidable; either for ideological reasons or as a result of the realization of the high cost, economic as well as social, of a return to a more liberal policy. In the last decade industry had been absorbing a higher proportion than agriculture of increases in employment. However promising expectations of future exports might have been in 1946, a prompt reabsorption of labour force either by the primary sector or services was most unlikely (74). Moreover, Britain, the main customer of Argentine produce, could neither supply manufactures or pay all her debt in a convertible currency (75). When these obstacles were removed (in the late forties) the reverse in the trend of the trade-terms for agricultural products and renewed deficits in the balance of payments dissipated any doubt about the unavoidability of industrialization (76).

The policy of industrialization carried out after 1946 was based on imports control and bank-credit. Foreign currency was compulsorily extracted from exporters and sold to industrialists willing to import machinery, intermediate products, or fuel. As the rate of exchange was below its international price, through this mechanism income was transferred from agriculture to industry (77). Besides, bank loans to industrial concerns, either for investment in equipment or to finance current operations were to a large extent liberal and indiscriminatory (78).

Inflation played an important role as stimulus to industrialization and also accentuated the transfer of income from agriculture to industry. During this period increases in the level of agricultural prices were smaller than those of industrial prices (79). As much as inflation the higher participation of labour in the National Income increased the demand for industrial goods. The share of labour increased from 44.1% in 1943 to 56.7% in 1950 (80).

After the contraction of business of 1931-32 the industrial sector expanded steadily until 1948; followed by a slight decline in 1949 and the recovery of 1950-51. The year 1954, when the volume of industrial production had again reached its 1948 level, had been preceded by two years of contraction in business. The recovery and growth of the industrial sector during this period (1930-1954) was not evenly shared by all branches of industry. Those engaged in import-substitution benefited best. By 1934 all subsectors had recovered their

pre-crisis level except Timber and Building Materials, which delayed their recovery up to the middle forties. For building construction did not recover its pre-crisis level until 1945 (Table V).

The Crisis of 1937 which was felt in many subsectors did not affect the total level of the industrial production. Foodstuffs, textiles, machinery, metal works, rubber, oil and electrical appliances passed over the crisis unaffected. Subsequently World War II affected most of these subsectors (except foodstuffs, textiles and machinery) which depended on the importation of intermediate products.

Though, before the War, foreign investment was small compared with the pre-crisis level, new lines of production were undertaken by foreign companies. They invested in chemicals, rubber, electrical appliances, metal works, textiles and to a lesser degree in foodstuffs. Before the crisis foreign capital had already been flowing to these lines of production (81).

G. Di Tella thinks that with the exception of foreign owned concerns, investment in industry had its source in the accumulation originating in the same sector. "For there was hardly any flow of capital from agriculture. After the war there was a change of attitude on the part of estancieros and capital flowed more easily to industry" (82).

During this period industry overwhelmingly engaged in the production of durable and non-durable consumption goods; though the production of some machinery and tools of a low degree of technology

was also undertaken. First, shortages of foreign exchange, subsequently the natural protection of the war period, and finally a stubborn protective policy, stimulated the production of import substitutions. As imports declined steadily over this period, the pressure of the demand for native industrial produce was the main feature of this second stage of the process of industrialization. In the pre-crisis period the demand for manufactures had been reasonably high and diversified, and had been partly supplied by imports. When imports drastically shrunk, this demand shifted to home produce. Though during the thirties the level of wages was low, unemployment was also very low; this added to the transfer of labour from rural to urban areas, where wages were comparatively higher, increasing the pressure of the demand for manufactures (83). This demand grew still faster after 1946 because the transfer of labour continued and particularly because the share of labour in the national income improved.

The expansion of the demand and protection from foreign competition allowed many small firms to spring up and survive. During the war "industry became greatly diversified because it was forced to produce essential goods in substitution for imports. Many of the new industrial concerns were small and located in Great Buenos Aires. Their production of import substitutions let the economy carry on" (84).

In 1946 there were twice as many industrial concerns as in 1935 and the proportion of small firms (self employed and one to ten

workers) increased from 79% to 85%. Within this group self-employment grew even faster than small workshops (one to ten workers), as their number grew two and a half times between 1935 and 1946, whereas small workshops grew 0.9 times. On the other hand firms with more than 100 workers more than doubled their number (Table VI), and in 1946 made up 1.3% of all concerns. These firms supplied 47% of all native manufactures and absorbed 46% of the employed labour force. On the other hand small workshops supplied slightly less than 21% and employed 18% of the labour force (here the self-employed are excluded). (Table VII).

The analysis of the distribution of firms among different sizes of productive units (measured by their employment) in 1946 shows the coexistence in the same subsector of self-employed, small workshops and even factories of more than one thousand workers. The proportion of self-employed and small workshops varies from subsector to subsector (Table VII). In oil, rubber, pasteboard and paper, textiles and tobacco, the proportion is about 45-55% in electrical appliances, clothing, metal works, machinery (repairs included), foodstuffs, and building material, the proportion varies between 84-92%. In chemicals, timber and leather the proportion is between 74-80%.

The distribution of total production among different sizes of productive units indicates to what an extent industry depended on small firms. Except rubber, oil and tobacco where the share of small firms

in the total production of their sub-sector was very low, in other sub-sectors their share reached up to a third or more (such as machinery (28%), metal works (17%) clothing (45%), printing (21%), timber (28%), foodstuffs (22%) and electrical appliances (18%) (Table VIII).

The comparison of the proportion of firms with more than 100 workers in the total number of productive units (1.5%) and their share of the total industrial production (47%) may be misleading as far as the degree of concentration in industry is concerned. First, the share of subsectors in the total industrial production and in the total number of productive units varied from subsector to subsector. Secondly, the same can be stated of branches within a given subsector. Thirdly, large firms tended to be located more in certain branches than others. Fourthly, when all branches are summed up into a subsector the weight of branches with high concentration of production in large firms may give the impression that concentration was high in the whole subsector. The same happens when all subsectors are summed up. There foodstuffs had the higher share both in employment and production (22% and 32% of the total industrial employment and production) and in this subsector processing of exports was included (particularly meat) a branch where very large firms prevailed. Finally, the proportion of large firms (1.5%) was low because the total number of firms was particularly large (34,895) (Table IX).

Thus we are inclined to think that industrial production was concentrated in certain subsectors but not in the industrial sector as a

whole. Unfortunately the industrial census of 1946 does not record the distribution of productive units by size for every branch of industry. Data is available only by subsectors.

In order to establish in what subsectors industrial production was more concentrated, the following procedure was applied. For every subsector the distribution of firms (classified by size, measured in employment) was drawn (Table VII). To each interval-size of firms corresponded a given share of the total output of its own subsector. Both distributions size of firms and output, were cut into two halves, leaving 50% of the total production of the subsector on each side. Thus it was possible to know what top sizes of firm supplied 50% of the production of its own subsector. In other words at what size of firm the distribution of output was cut by a line drawn at the 50% of the distribution of output. In rubber, oil and tobacco 50% of the output was produced by units of more than 500 workers and the other 50% by units of less than 500 workers; in timber the fifty-fifty per cent distribution was divided at more, and less, than 25 workers, and in clothing at more, and less, than 10 workers. The meaning of this cutting point is for instance that in clothing 50% of the production was supplied by firms of less than 10 workers, whereas the remaining 50% corresponded to firms with more than 10 workers (up to firms with more than a thousand). In all other subsectors the line was drawn at more, and less, than 100 workers, except for printing, leather and machinery (cut at 50 workers). In the industrial sector as a whole the line was drawn

at 100 workers.

These figures show in most subsectors the importance of middle-sized and small firms; for only in three cases is it possible to say that 50% of the production was supplied by units of considerable size.

The only information the Census furnishes on branches of industry is that concerned with the total number of firms, total employment and total production of the branch. For every branch the average employment (arithmetic mean) was computed. This average gives only a rough idea of the sizes of firm predominant in each branch; i. e. in what branches large units had sufficient share of employment to compensate for the weight of small firms.

For each subsector a selection was made of those branches whose average employment was 40 to 100 workers, between 101 and 200 workers and finally higher than 200 workers (Table X). Branches with an average of more than 200 workers were sugar, meat packing, ale, cigarettes, matches, oil refining, tyres, rubber shoes, cement, and tramway and railway workshops. In our analysis of the census of 1954 we shall see that all the branches with an average higher than 100 in 1946 were also branches with a high degree of concentration in 1954. And with few exceptions branches with an average of 40 to 100 workers were also concentrated in 1954.

The late forties (1948-50) are considered as the end of the process of industrialization based on the development of light industry.

That date is also considered as the beginning of a period of economic stagnation of which the slowing down in the rate of industrial growth was one of the causes (85). Unfortunately the nearest Industrial Census to that date is that taken in 1954. The following analysis is based on unpublished data obtained from a special tabulation of the census of 1954. Just as in 1946, industrial firms were measured by their employment of workers (control over resources) and the total output of each branch was distributed by interval size of firm; that is, we could know for different interval sizes of firms their share of the total output of their own branch (control over the market).

Our aim was to find in what branches of industry output was concentrated in large firms. To start with, we classified branches by their total output; from those that produced more than a thousand million pesos of manufactures to the smallest branches with less than ten million pesos of output. Table XI indicates how many branches in each subsector belonged to each size of output. Secondly, for each branch we had the distribution of its output by interval-size of firm measured by number of workers. This distribution of output taking each branch separately, was divided into two halves leaving fifty per cent of the output on each side. Drawing a line which divided the two fifty per cents we could know what sizes of firm produced the upper fifty per cent of the output. We called upper fifty per cent that which started from the largest firms downwards, and lower fifty per cent beginning from the smallest upwards, following the scale of the

interval size of firms.

The location on the distribution of productive units by size of the dividing limit varied from branch to branch. All branches were made up by units of all sizes; what was important to know was how many of them on the upper side of the distribution were made up only by large concerns. Table XII shows the distribution of the upper fifty per cent of the output by size of branch and size of firm. This table is a summary of our original table where the same data were laid out for each branch separately. From there we could know for each branch what sizes of firm produced the upper fifty per cent of the output. The third step was to select only those branches where fifty per cent of the output was produced by firms of more than a hundred workers. Under this condition among 202 different branches only 59 were selected (Table XIII). The decision on the limit at which firms would be considered as being large was primarily based on practical reasons. As the data used in this analysis was classified by grouped intervals either 100 workers or 300 workers had to be chosen. It seemed more sensible to start with a lower interval, at least to begin with. In any case we kept apart branches with a lower limit of 300 and of 500 workers.

Tables XII and XIII illustrate what we say above in relation to the use of percentages to measure degree of concentration. On table XII we can see that 9.443 firms produced fifty per cent of the total industrial production. As there are nearly one hundred and fifty

thousand firms we deduce that in 1954 6% of the firms produced fifty per cent of the output. But within this 6% there are firms of quite different sizes, from one to five thousand workers. For this reason we decided to define concentration more concretely. Thus we thought that there would be concentration in a given branch only when a significant portion of its market was supplied by large firms. As above all we were interested in knowing in what branches firms had developed to a sufficient size to control resources and market within their own domain. As table XIII shows in 1954 there were fifty-nine branches which fitted our definition of concentration. This arose from our defining as large firms of a hundred workers; but if we choose instead 300 workers the number of branches is reduced to 31, and to 22 if 500 workers is chosen as the minimum size a firm must have to qualify as large (Table XIII).

Table XIII gives a list of the 59 branches of industry where fifty per cent of the output was produced by firms of more than a hundred workers, of more than 300 workers and of more than 500 workers. The meaning of these lower limits is that fifty per cent of the output was produced by firms of a hundred workers or more, up to several thousand; or from 300 workers or 500 workers upwards. Each cell on Table XIII shows how many firms produced the fifty per cent output and among firms of a given cell (which corresponds to a branch) there are some of the minimum size or larger. Our aim was to show the lower limit of size of firms in the upper fifty per cent of the distribution of

output, as it was this lower limit that characterized a branch. One may say that the degree of concentration in sugar refining was higher than that of flour mills because given similar size of branch the smallest sugar refinery was larger than the smallest flour mill. Besides, there were less sugar refineries than flour mills.

As far as we know there is no systematic study of foreign investment in industry. Nonetheless from the few sources at hand we could extract a list of branches of industry where foreign capital was directly invested in the past. Among the fifty-nine branches of industry with a high degree of concentration we found that there were forty-three where foreign firms were operating (Table XIV). We do not know whether the large firms recorded in the census were foreign, but we can affirm that there is a remarkable coincidence between branches with a high degree of concentration and branches where foreign capital has been invested. And it is highly probable that some of the large firms recorded in the census were foreign owned, even though there must have also been native firms in those branches (as in the case of sugar). Unfortunately our sources are scarce so we cannot know whether there was foreign investment in branches with a low degree of concentration.

In all except four of the twenty-two branches with the highest degree of concentration (firms of more than 500 workers) there has been foreign investment. For even in two of the branches where there were State owned firms these had begun as foreign owned (railway

and tramway workshops). Of those four branches, one was explosives (state owned firms) and the others were canvas-shoes, matches and wool spinning. In all these three branches there were firms which were founded in the last century or at the beginning of this. Table XIV also shows that among the second group of branches (more than 300 workers) there was one of native owned firms, and among the third group (more than 100 workers) there were another eight. In four of the latter branches there were firms founded long ago; these were flour mills, yerba, newspaper and biscuits. And in the two first (flour and yerba) there were firms which belonged to one of the most important financial concerns in the country, a very well known dealer in cereals.

As well as the size of firms it is important to know how many firms produced the fifty per cent of the output of a branch. So we prepared Table XV, where branches have been classified by size and number of firms. Table XV shows that there were fifteen branches of just one firm, another fifteen of two to four firms and finally twenty-nine branches of more than four firms. In order to show more clearly the coincidence between concentration and foreign investment Table XVI repeats the information given in Table XV, but only for branches of one to four firms, discriminated by the possible origin of their firms. Among the thirty branches with the highest degree of concentration, in twenty-two there has been foreign investment and in half of these twenty-two branches firms were of more than 500 workers. There

were only six branches that were very probably of native owned firms, three of old foundation and three probably new.

So far we have been dealing with branches where fifty per cent of the output was produced by firms of more than 100 workers. Now we shall disregard the size of firms and deal with branches where fifty per cent of the output was produced by a small number of firms. We shall except the fifty-nine more concentrated branches of industry and among the rest we shall consider only those branches where four or fewer firms produced fifty per cent of the output. Table XVII shows that there were seventeen branches which fulfilled this condition; five of them had a lower limit of 50 workers and in all there had been foreign investment. The remaining branches had a lower limit of 25 workers (ten branches) and 11 workers (two branches) and in all but one there were firms which most probably were native owned.

As far as degree of concentration is concerned the analysis of the lower side of the fifty-fifty per cent distribution of output is as revealing as that of the upper side. On Table XVIII we have included all those branches whose upper limit of the lower fifty per cent distribution of output is 100 workers or smaller.

To start with, there were twelve branches where that 50% was produced by productive units belonging to self-employed people; another sixty-one branches by workshops of less than 10 workers (self-employed included); thirty-eight branches by units of less than 25 workers; thirty-two branches by units of less than 50 workers and twenty-eight

by units of less than 100 workers. And most of them included self-employed. We also include Table XIX which shows the distribution of firms by size, of the lower fifty per cent of the distribution of output. Among nearly one hundred and forty thousand firms less than five hundred were of more than 100 workers and they belonged to the thirty-one branches whose lower limit of the upper side of the distribution of output was either 300 or 500 workers.

Leaving aside the division into two 50% halves and considering instead the 100% of the production, there were sixty branches where the total production was produced by productive units of less than 100 workers (down to self-employed)(Table XVIII, last column). On the other extreme only in one branch was 100% of the production produced by firms larger than 100 workers (man-made fibres, where there was foreign investment); and another branch where it was produced by firms larger than 50 workers (matches). The remaining at most did not include workshops of less than 10 workers either (86).

What is crucial to emphasize here is that after twenty years of protection against import competition and ten years of decisive State support, industry in 1954 remained as dependent on small firms as half a century ago. There was a difference in degree, there were more and larger concerns, but the industrial sector as a whole was still made up by thousands of small workshops and factories, sharing a good proportion of the production of their branches. What is perhaps a most important difference is that the Argentine economy in 1914 did not

depend so much on industry for its expansion.

In 1914 there were many small firms; twenty years later there were many more and after another twenty years still many more. Whether they were the same or different firms is irrelevant. What counts is that they were small and shared a proportion of the industrial production large enough as to be indispensable. Why then after twenty years of relative security (ten of them under open protection) did the process of concentration not go further ? Though twenty years is a relatively short period the overwhelming survival of very small workshops is amazing. For they existed even in branches where concentration was comparatively high:

There are two possible explanations as to why small firms in 1954 had not been at least partially absorbed by middle-sized or large concerns. First, the fact that the industrial sector was constantly pressed by an expanding demand; here urgency was a crucial factor. And secondly, there was a failure in the process of investment of industrial profits.

When the second stage of industrialization began there was already a demand for manufactures, which in the past had been satisfied partly by imports. The pressure of that demand, now shifted to home-produce, permitted the formation and growth of firms making use of an inadequate capital equipment. Whereas equipment had to be imported, labour force was cheap and less risky. That type of growth certainly took place during World War II when "the lack of newly imported

equipment reduced investment in industry. The survival and even growth of industrial production was therefore more the result of an intensification in the use of equipment than of its expansion (in equipment)" (37).

During and after the War the pressure of the demand was even intensified. Transfer of labour from rural to urban areas and their higher share of the latter in the national income, as well as inflation, expanded the demand for manufactures. Though equipment was imported, particularly between 1947-48, the pressure of the demand on the supply of manufactures still left room for even the most unproductive firms. For "difficulties of the war period and of balance of payments as well as inflation permitted the existence of a market without competitors, resulting in a decline of the level of technology and of the whole economy" (38).

The fact is that the expansion of industrial production took place as a result of an increase in the number of productive units without a concomitant process of capitalization. The rate of investment in industry was not high enough to eliminate the less productive units from the market; these could continue in business in spite of their low level of technology and consequent high cost of production (39).

The failure in the process of investment may be attributed to two factors; on the one hand the decline in the late forties of the capacity to import and on the other hand the diverting of profits to non-industrial investments.

The capacity to import decreased in the late forties as a result of the reduction of agricultural surpluses and a reversal of the trend of the terms of trade. Then importation of equipment was severely cut down and only permitted in exceptional cases (90), as most import-facilities had to be used for essential raw materials and intermediate products (91). In the same period capital started flowing to building construction and speculation. How much had its origin in industrial profits is difficult to ascertain, but surely a good proportion. In the fifties that process became intensified, particularly the flight of capital through the mechanism of the black market of foreign exchange (92).

Under the pressure of the demand small and middle-sized concerns sprang up spurred on by a market that was not very competitive. These firms formed the basic stratum on which industry rested. Some grew bigger but not enough to destroy the basic structure of productive units in industry. When the expansion of the demand slowed down, simultaneously, the capacity to import decreased. As inflation continued at an even higher rate, industrial firms defended themselves as best they could. For a given industrialist there were two alternatives, either to reinvest in his own firm and try to gain a higher share of the existing market or to divert his profits into speculation with foreign exchange, consumption of durable goods or housing. The first alternative involved a higher risk; the growth in scale had to be such as to obtain a reduction in cost and be able to supply at lower prices.

Very probably to many an industrialist the second alternative seemed more sensible. Moreover for the great majority of small and middle-sized firms the change in scale was too big a jump to be undertaken. As they had not enough accumulation to change the scale of their business, whatever profits they made had to be diverted to other sources of investment or consumption.

Though our evidence is extremely weak we shall attempt to draw some hypotheses on the possible patterns of growth of industrial firms after the World Crisis. Let us divide firms into those which started off large and those which started as workshops. During the two decades of this period both types of firms worked under the pressure of an expansive demand and within the framework of a non-competitive market. Firms which started off large had the chance to choose in what activity they would settle regardless of whether there were already firms supplying that market; here we assume that whenever they entered a fully supplied market they disposed of a level of technology higher than that of firms already in the market and could therefore produce at a lower cost. On the other hand small firms would have engaged in the production of those items which had an unsatisfied demand in which case there was no need to become involved in a struggle for a market already fully supplied by native produce. To all firms the potential competitor was imports; but as long as the need of import-substitution continued, either because of shortages of foreign exchange or open protective policies, the full pressure of the demand

would be aimed at native sources of supply. That interplay between the pressure of an expansive demand shortages of foreign exchange and industrial protection moulded the peculiar conditions under which industrial firms developed. This is shown by the fact that industrial production increased as a consequence of diversification, instead of specialization and intense development of a few branches. It is well known, and E. C. L. A. 's report insists on the fact, that in 1955 the Argentine industry supplied a large proportion of final goods with the exception of many intermediate products and more advanced capital equipment (93).

Now, in what way could firms have grown in size? Small firms could add units of machinery and labour by easy stages as a response to their demand. This on the assumption that entrepreneurs decided to reinvest all their profits, or part of them, in the expansion of their firms instead of diverting them to other sources of investment, to the satisfaction of their own needs of consumption or to increase their liquidity. In cases where they decided to expand their plants they could obtain their equipment either in the internal market or abroad, when there was no native produce and import-permits were available. On this pattern firms could grow to a certain point, at which a substantial change in technology had to be introduced. Then they could not resort to the native supply, and depended exclusively on the importation of new equipment. It was then that shortages of foreign exchange operated fully. If we survey the state of the equipment industry during this

period we may conclude that with few exceptions native produce could only supply items of medium or low level technology (94).

Our hypothesis is that there must have been two limiting factors to the expansion of industrial concerns. The first limit operated among small firms and it was determined by their incapability to accumulate large surplusses and therefore limited access to financing facilities. The second limit affected middle and large firms when they reached the point where any change of scale had to be accompanied by the introduction of a more advanced technology which depended on imports (95). We should mention a third factor which affected foreign owned firms. During the Peronist Government the remittance of profits was under severe control; only a fixed proportion of the capital of origin could be sent abroad. As inflation ran faster the actual profits they were able to remit intensively decreased. The mechanism of the law did not stimulate the expansion of foreign owned concerns, so that they must have increased their variable capital proportionally more than their fixed-investment (96).

When the agricultural sector developed, estancias suffered a process of internal transformation, such as changes in breeds and cultures, but estancieros remained in control; for they controlled the land. So that agriculture could grow without destroying the basic productive units: the estancia.

Before 1943 estancieros enjoyed either direct control of political power or the acquiescence of Governmental elites. Their role as

an economic force was unquestioned. When Peron came to power a series of measures were taken against the interests of farmers and estancieros. Particularly the last ones, because the low prices tenant farmers received were at least partly compensated by the low rents they paid to their landlords (97). The answer of agriculture to the economic policy of the Government was a reduction of production, particularly of cereals whose prices were comparatively lower than those of meat. As agriculture was (and still is) the main source of foreign exchange (98), as early as 1943 the Government had to recognize this fact and start changing its policy of agricultural prices.

The economic power of estancieros stemmed from the size of their holdings, their capacity to change breeds and cultures according to variations in the demand and above all from their capacity to overcome reductions in income without being forced to a land sell-out (see Appendix IV). And their power was also based on the fact that agriculture was the main source of foreign exchange. Before the Crisis the economy grew along with the expansion in agricultural production; after the Crisis industry could not survive without imports of equipment, fuel, and intermediate products. So the link and dependence of the Argentine economy on agriculture could not be broken down.

Though in the past Railways and Frigorificos were very powerful groups they could not, even if they wanted, do away with estancieros. For they depended on estancieros as much as estancieros depended on frigorificos and railways. However oligopsonic the position of frigorifi-

ficos might have been they had to face a group that had bargaining power based on its capacity to take losses, if necessary, during stalemates (99). Neither frigorificos nor estancieros could underestimate the power of the other and this had necessarily to lead to compromising positions. If frigorificos had on their part the control of the external market and the political support of their governments, estancieros controlled the raw material and in the last resort could count on the political backing of their own government. And not only for political links but also for economic reasons.

The deterioration of the bargaining power of estancieros started after the Crisis, and it was the result of the new conditions prevailing in the world market. Argentina was mainly tied up to the British market with no real chances of gaining new ones. It was then that Britain improved her power of negotiation which showed in the clauses of the Roca-Rurciman treaty. James Ferrer gives a detailed account of Argentina failure to obtain a relaxation of the American policy towards importation of Argentine meat. After the Crisis hopes definitely faded (100).

During the Peronist Government the economic position of estancieros worsened but it was never broken down. Unless the Government decided to expropriate land and organize agricultural production on new bases sooner or later it had to recognize that its very policy of industrialization rested on the good working of the agricultural sector, closely controlled by big estancieros.

Our main hypothesis here is that on its part industry very rarely gave rise to the formation of strong economic groups. Except for a minority located in a few branches, the great majority of native industrialists controlled small or medium firms. As in the past they had some reason to be contented. They had started up a business and made a good profit out of it. But they were basically weak: if the process of industrial development had continued, smaller firms would eventually have had to disappear. Their survival was rooted in the very situation of economic stagnation; in the reversal in the terms of trade that obstructed the process of concentration; in fear of unemployment and its political consequences and finally in the unwillingness of foreign capital to invest in Argentina. The industrial bourgeoisie that was born out of the process of industrial development survived because after all they were still indispensable. There was nobody to replace them and Argentina could not afford to import foreign goods.

The basic question in the preceding analysis is why industry, unlike agriculture, has failed to give birth to many more powerful economic groups. That is, what factors in industrial development have obstructed the process of concentration. As a conclusion to this chapter we shall summarize those factors which could explain the survival of small firms in the industrial sector.

During the first stage of industrialization industry developed a considerable degree of diversification. Though the whole of the Argentine economy was geared to agricultural production, the growth of population,

due to foreign immigration, and the high rate of growth in income created favourable conditions for the development of industry. Besides those activities dependent on exports (such as meat packing) and the manufacturing of foodstuffs, other industries developed as well. Among these were many which were, at least potentially, in competition with imports.

Though there was no explicit protective policy (in a country so dependant on exports such a policy would have been unworkable), the tariff system in fact protected many industrial activities; but, with one important characteristic: it favoured those specializing in the manufacture of low quality goods. Our hypothesis is that there must have existed a division of the demand market based on quality. Whereas high income groups could afford to consume imported goods, of better quality but higher price, low income ones most likely had to be content with the native article, of lower quality but also of a lower price.

The working of the tariff, on the one hand favoured the development of industry, though on the other limited its market, diverting part of the demand towards imports. A market that was already unstable due to the fact that industrial growth depended greatly on the general conditions of prosperity or depression prevailing in the agricultural sector. According to our findings periods when there were large exports, inflow of foreign capital and large immigration, coincided with high rates of industrial growth, even though the level of imports increased considerably.

Scarcity of capital was an important characteristic of this sector in its early period of development. As census figures show, in 1914

the amount of capital per unit in the vast majority of industrial activities was very small. This may be understood if one remembers that in the beginning the overwhelming majority of industrialists were foreigners, who did not possess capital at the time of their immigration. As there was no flow of capital from agriculture to industry and the banking and financial system was not devised to promote long term investment in industry, the amount of capital likely to be devoted to investment in industry depended exclusively on the accumulation of profits generated within the sector (101). Moreover, as we explained before, the diversification of activities, the dispersion of resources in a large number of small firms working at a low level of technology, and the undertaking of several lines of production within the same concern, all tended to disperse profits and therefore hinder the possibility of growth in scale.

After the World Crisis of 1929 the Argentine government undertook a series of measures which were devised to overcome the effects of the fall in international prices and demand for agricultural products. The two most important measures were the creation of exchange control, and the monetary policy which maintained the internal level of income reasonably stable (102). Both measures created favourable conditions for the development of industry. This period was followed by one when the government applied an open policy of industrial protectionism.

Under the new conditions a large number of firms sprang up, many grew in scale (some were born large firms), but many more remained small, making use of a low level of technology. Diversification of

industrial activities increased to the extent that at the end of the period under study, as far as final consumption goods were concerned, Argentina was highly self-sufficient. Moreover, the manufacturing of equipment, though not of an advanced technological nature, had already started.

However, diversification was accompanied by a low degree of concentration of resources in the majority of branches. And even in those branches where large firms prevailed there was still room for the smaller one. This is not an unusual phenomenon (103); what is unusual was its magnitude in the Argentine of 1955, as it indicated the failure in the process of capitalization.

The apparent paradox is that under protectionism the process of concentration did not advance more. The analysis of the Argentine case would indicate that protectionism is not a sufficient condition, though it may be a necessary one, to produce growth in scale. Other conditions must exist as well: appropriate size of the market, access to capital and availability of technology.

Protectionism only guaranteed the internal market, which in itself was small due to the limited size of the population. After 1943, capital was supplied through the banking system, but with three important characteristics: it favoured import-substituting activities, and not necessarily those with greater comparative advantages; current operations comparatively more than long run investment; and the small or medium sized firm against the large. As regards availability of tech-

nology, beyond certain stages any further step in the growth in scale had to count on the importation of foreign technology. Shortages of foreign exchange and, during the Peronist government, restrictions on foreign investment as well, made the incorporation of new technology difficult. Moreover, exchange priorities after 1946 favoured the importation of inputs for firms producing final consumption goods, while machinery and intermediate metal products were given a second rank privilege.

Finally, we should like to point out that in our thesis we have not discussed whether or not Argentine industrialists were positively motivated towards re-investing their profits in their own firms. We have omitted this subject mainly because there is no empirical evidence (104), but also because we distrust theories which try to explain the Argentine economic stagnation in psychological terms. Moreover, there is plenty of evidence on the existence of structural limitations to growth in scale which, though they do not explain fully the failure in the process of capitalization in the industrial sector, at least account for the key elements.

That Argentine industrialists lack entrepreneurial attitudes because they orient their behaviour towards the status that comes with conspicuous consumption, has not been empirically proved, instead the evidence shows the existence of structural obstacles. This is not to affirm that industrialists today actually possess the appropriate attitudes, we only affirm that there is no empirical evidence.

If Argentine industrialists today lack entrepreneurial attitudes, we shall have to believe in the quick transformation of attitudes.

The first industrialist in Argentina, and to a large extent in a later period, were foreigners or their descendants. As we shall discuss in chapter IV, most immigrants shared at least one characteristic: their orientation towards money-making. Under conditions that demanded a great deal of fortitude and sacrifice they created crafts and industries, engaged in commerce and services. With scarce capital and little education they showed a great imagination in the setting up of their businesses. In a later period, during world war II, no less imagination was needed to make use of inappropriate equipment. Perhaps, after a few decades very little of this type of behaviour remains.

Whatever the correct answer is to the question whether industrialists do or do not possess the appropriate entrepreneurial attitudes we strongly believe that this subject should be carefully studied before any statement can be seriously considered.

NOTES

- (1) For an analysis on Colonial economics see A.Ferrer, "La Economía Argentina", México, F.C.E., 1963, Chapter 1.
- (2) Ferrer, *ibid.*, p.41. Cf. Tulio Halperin Donghi, "The Pampean Region remained unpopulated for a long time, except those tracts of land which served as corridors of communication with the Interior and Paraguay. "El Río de la Plata al comenzar el Siglo XIX", Facultad Filosofía y Letras, Buenos Aires, 1961. p.8.

- (3) Puigeros, R. "Historia Económica del Río de la Plata", Buenos Aires, Ed. Futuro, 1945, p.29.
- (4) Alvares, J., "Las Guerras Civiles Argentinas", Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1966, p.68.
- (5) Halperin Donghi, T., "La expansión ganadera en la campaña de Buenos Aires. 1810-1852". Revista de Desarrollo Económico, Vol.3. No.1-2, April-September 1963.
- (6) Cárcano, M.A., "Evolución histórica del régimen de la tierra pública en la Argentina (1810-1916)", Buenos Aires, 1917; here there is a detailed account of the distribution of public land.
- (7) The Pampean Region covers 56 million hectares of natural pastures.
- (8) Gilberti, H.C.E., "Historia económica de la ganadería argentina", Buenos Aires, Raigal, 1954, pp.144-146.
- (9) Sbarra, N.H., "Historia del alambrado en la Argentina", Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1964.
- (10) Macnie, J., "Work and Play in the Argentine". London, T. Werner Laurie Ltd., p125; pp.9-10.
- (11) Rivarola, H.C., "Las transformaciones de la sociedad argentina", Buenos Aires, Imprenta de Coni Hnos., 1911.
- (12) Zeballos, E. "Descripción amena de la República Argentina", Buenos Aires, Peuser, 1881-88, Vol.III.
- (13) Martinez, A.B. & M. Lewandowski, "The Argentine in the XXth. Century", London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1915, p.168.

- (14) The schedules of the censuses give information on the name of the respondent, his profession and whether he was a proprietor or not.
- (15) Investment in water supply even changed the shape of the estancia. Old surveys show how estancias were divided up in plots perpendicular to courses of water. With the introduction of windmills and water tanks, plots became squares.
- (16) Diaz Alejandro, C., "The Rural Sector in Argentina", Instituto Di Tella, Buenos Aires. 1965 (Internal circulation), pp.28 and 32-33.
- (17) Gondra, R., "Historia económica de la República Argentina", Buenos Aires, 1943, Chapter 17.

- (18) Wilcken, G., "Las Colonias", Bs. As., Sociedad Anónima, 1873, p. 21.
- (19) There had been a previous attempt that failed.
- (20) See Beyhaut G., Gorostegui H. et. Alt. "Inmigración y desarrollo económico", Instituto de Sociología, 1961.
- (21) Dr. Eduardo Zalduendo has drawn our attention to the fact that small quantities of wheat were occasionally exported before that date. (Centro de Investigaciones Económicas, Di Tella Institute).
- (22) Giberti, H. "El desarrollo agropecuario", Bs. As., Instituto de Sociología, 1961, p. 28.
- (23) Giberti, H. "El desarrollo agropecuario", *ibid.*, p. 44.
- (24) Di Tella & Zymelman, no title, Pd. D. thesis (mimeograph). p. 41 & 128.
- (25) Even now 50-100 hs. are too small except for farming.
- (26) Zeballos, *ibid.*, Vol. III.
- (27) Giberti, H., "El desarrollo agropecuario", *ibid.*, p. 38.
- (28) Taylor, C. "Rural Life in Argentina", Baton Rouge, Louisiana, State University Press, 1948.
- (29) Giberti, H., "El desarrollo agropecuario", *ibid.*, p. 40.
- (30) E. C. L. A. "El desarrollo económico de la Argentina", Part. II, section A, 1956, p. 279 (Mimeograph edition).
- (31) Ferrer, A., *ibid.*, 141.
- (32) Giberti, H., "El desarrollo agropecuario", *ibid.*, p. 44.

- (34) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Part. II. Section A, pp. 142-143.
- (35) See further on the role of shortage of labour force, immigration and the process of redistribution of income in Argentina.
- (36) Ortiz, R. "Historia económica de la Argentina", Bs. As., Raigal, 1955, Vol. I., p. 244.
- (37) For a thorough analysis of railways in Argentina see R. Scalabrini Ortiz, "Historia de los ferrocarriles", Bs. As., Devenir, 1958.
- (38) There were three agreements. After each agreement U. S. A. plants increased their share.
- (39) Fellner, W., "Competition among the few", N. York, A. Kelley, 1965.
- (40) Ferns attempts to show that the rate of return in agriculture was higher than in either Railways or Frigoríficos. In this way he explains the lack of interest of ranchers in investing in activities other than their own. "Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century", Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1960, p. 490.
- (41) See E. C. L. A. report on Argentina. First Part.
- (42) The importance of the Upper Peru market declined as a consequence of the exhaustion of the mines in Potosi and also of the decrease in the world demand for silver.
- (43) Ferrer, A., *ibid.*, pp. 82-83.
- (44) The main negative effect of railways was on inter-regional exchange. Goods going from Buenos Aires paid a lower fare than those transported from and between interior localities, though the distance was shorter. On the discriminatory tariff system of Railways

see Scalabrini Ortiz, *ibid.*

- (45) Ferrer, A., *ibid.*, p. 150.
- (46) The three first national censuses (1869, 1895 and 1914) show that the majority of craftsmen were concentrated in the North.
- (47) In the case of wool weaving, pottery and tobacco it seems likely that imports were more expensive than local produce. Local craftsmen were among the poorest people (see Bialek Masse, "Informe sobre el estado de las clases obreras en el interior de la Republica, Buenos Aires, Grw, 1904) and produced low quality goods (with the exception of vicuña ponchos). If they produced a low quality article and had a low income they must have supplied low income groups. It seems improbable that people of low income would consume a more expensive product. Another question is the price of local crafts (i.e. those produced in the Interior) in the Litoral market which could have been higher than that of imports because of transportation costs.
- (48) Germani, G., "Politica y Sociedad en una época de transición", Bs.As., Paidós, 1966, p. 188.
- (49) Concept developed by Gans; quoted by Di Tella, *ibid.*, p. 222.
- (50) Ortiz, R., *ibid.*, vol. II, p. 202. See also Di Tella, 156 and A. Ferrer, p. 142.
- (51) This was so because the expansion over virgin fields was decreasing.
- (52) Germani, G., "Politica y sociedad", *ibid.*, pp. 189-197.
- (53) Though there were internal migrations during the XIXth Century

and beginning of the XXth, large movements of population started later on in the thirties.

- (54) Di Tella, *ibid.*, 277. See also Frazer "The Amazing Argentina" London, Carsell & Co., 1914 p. 35 and Darbyshire "My life in the Argentina Republic", London, F. Warne & Co., 1917, p. 102.
- (55) Di Tella, *ibid.*, 182
- (56) Darbyshire, *ibid.*, p. 102.
- (57) Third National Census, Vol. VII, p. 18.
- (58) Except 1907 and 1911.
- (59) Di Tella, *ibid.*, 152.
- (60) E. C. L. A. data shows that there was a decline in the volume of industrial production during the War. Di Tella argues that whereas small firms disappeared large ones benefited from the temporary protection of the War period.
- (61) Metal works were more affected because it was difficult to import intermediate products and also because investment in railways ceased during the war. Di Tella, *ibid.*, p. 217.
- (62) Ferrer, James, "United States-Argentine Economic Relations, 1900-1930" Ph.D. Dissertation, Berkeley, California, 1964. p. 87.
- (63) Ortiz, *ibid.*, p. 198 & 207; Dorfman "Evolución industrial Argentina", Bs. As., Losada, 1942. p. 67; Census 1914, vol. VII, p. 7.
- (64) Dorfman, *ibid.*, p. 67.
- (65) These firms are defined in the Census as 'non-manufacturing', vol. VII, p. 35.

- (66) Census 1914, *ibid.*, p. 23. Cf. Juan B. González "El encarecimiento de la vida en la República Argentina", Bs. As., Las Ciencias, 1908.
- (67) Koebel, W. in 1890 complains of British industrialists who stuck to high quality manufactures which could not compete in the supply of low income groups.
- (68) Cf. Di Tella, *ibid.*, 217.
- (69) Unfortunately there are no data on the evolution of branches of industry.
- (70) Ferrer, A., *ibid.*, p. 182 quotes Beveraggi Allende "El servicio del capital extranjero y el control de cambios".
- (71) Dorfman, *ibid.*, 310.
- (72) On a detailed analysis of the Roca-Runciman Treaties see Di Tella, *ibid.*, p. 394.
- (73) In 1943 a Military Government took over; followed by the Government of Peron in 1946.
- (74) It is doubtful that any government however reactionary could afford to bear the pressure of unemployment after the War.
- (75) Cole, G.D.H., "Presente y Futuro del dinero", Mexico, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947, p. 363.
- (76) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, part. I, p. 67 (table on trend of trade-terms).
- (77) The Exchange Bureau controlled all transactions with foreign exchange, supervised import priorities and fixed preferential rates of exchange. Besides I. A. P. I. (State Agency) had a monopoly on transactions with cereals.

- (78) Juan C. Marin in his research on owners and executives of big industrial concerns has found that between 1945-55 a large proportion of the bank-credit was used to finance current operations. There is only a partial report on this research published by ILPES, United Nations, "El empresario industrial argentino", Santiago - Chile, 1966, (mimeograph, internal circulation).
- (79) Giberti, H., "El desarrollo agropecuario", *ibid.*, p. 61.
- (80) Ministerio de Asuntos Técnicos, "Producto e ingreso en la Argentina" (1935-1954), Bs. As., 1955, p. 120.
- (81) Dorfman, *ibid.*, p. 297.
- (82) Di Tella, *ibid.*, p. 344.
- (83) E. C. L. A. part I, p. 21 on the relationship between increases in the level of wages and growth of the demand for manufactures.
- (84) Di Tella, *ibid.*, 403.
- (85) E. C. L. A., part I and part II section B.
- (86) This information was directly obtained from the original tabulation.
- (87) Di Tella, *ibid.*, p. 421.
- (88) Ministerio de Economía, "Informe sobre la industria argentina", Bs. As. 1963, p. 19.
- (89) "Informe sobre la industria argentina", *ibid.*, several pages.
- (90) Before World War II the native production of capital goods supplied half of the internal final demand for new investment (all sectors). This proportion increased to ninety per cent during the war because

imports almost disappeared. In the immediate post-war period imports increased, until 1949 when they were severely cut down. E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Second Part, B., "Las industrias dinámicas y la sustitución de importaciones", p. xxiv, table 3.

- (91) Importation of industrial equipment in the immediate post war was to a large extent unselective; old machinery and new of old - fashioned design were imported. In mid 1949 imports were suspended and permits were granted only in very special cases to given firms and when the "national interest was involved". E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Second Part, B., p. 75.
- (92) Ministerio de Economía, "Informe sobre". Several ex-Ministers of Economics and the most important industrial associations answered a questionnaire on the state of the Argentine industry. Here speculation and flight of capital are mentioned very frequently as having occurred in the past twenty years.
- (93) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, First Part. p. 177 and Second Part, B., several chapters deal with the import needs of the dynamic branches of industry.
- (94) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Second Part, B., there is a detailed account on what types of equipment were locally produced, and what had to be necessarily imported.
- (95) See above note 94.
- (96) Tandy, A. H., "Argentina. Economic and Commercial Conditions", Overseas Economic Survey, The Board of Trade, Commercial

Relations and Exports Department, London H. M. S. O., 1956, pp. 16-17. There is a report on the problem of blocked profits and their remittance during the Peronist Government.

- (97) Land rents were frozen during the Peronist Regime.
- (98) Ninety per cent of exports are agricultural products.
- (99) See Fallner, *ibid.*, on the quasi-agreement and bilateral monopoly (and oligopoly).
- (100) Javier Villanueva (Centro de Economía, Di Tella Institute) has an interesting hypothesis as to why Britain started shifting her demand for raw materials to countries within the Commonwealth. From the beginning of this century, or even before, American manufactures started gaining ground in the Argentine market. As Britain was the main customer of Argentine products there must have been a constant outflow of exchange towards the United States. So that Britain may have tried to improve her payments position by reducing her purchases from Argentina and diverting it to the sterling area. When the Crisis came Argentina found herself tied up to a market which had granted import priorities to the Commonwealth and it was then when she partly lost her power of bargaining. Villanueva supports his hypothesis with evidence given by James Ferrer who tells of the British diplomatic efforts to obtain import privileges from the Argentine Government during the two first decades of this century.

- (101) Some industrialists, like T. Di Tella founder of SIAM, had access to bank loans, but the system as such, devoted to short term sound operations, was not devised to promote large scale industrialization. The first bank which gave credit exclusively to industrialists was the Banco Industrial de la Republica Argentina, founded in 1943. On the scarcity of capital see G. Di Tella, *ibid*, p344.
- (102) During the thirties the government applied an anti-cyclical policy, sustaining internal agricultural prices lest they fell following international prices. The government also created additional means of payment and engaged in public investment. These measures maintained the internal level of income, and the Argentine economy recovered in two years from the impact of the World Crisis.
- (103) There are activities which, due to the type of goods they produced, are the domain of small enterprises. In others it is normal to find the coexistence of large and small firms, as the process of concentration is accompanied by a mushrooming of small subsidiary and satellite enterprises. But, it is one thing when the few large oligopolistic firms control the largest share of the market, another quite different situation when the small and medium sized firms prevail not only in number but also in their share of the market.
- (104) Prof. J.L. de Imaz in "Los que mandan" (Buenos Aires, EUDEBA,

1966, pp. 158-166) affirms that industrialists were orientated towards status as defined by the aristocracy and for this reason bought land and forgot to defend their own interests. As Prof. de Imaz does not offer empirical evidence to support his statements, we deduce that they express his personal opinion.

TABLE: I

Volume of Exports: 1876 - 1914 (°)

| Year | Tanale | Wool | Cattle on the hook | Cereals | Frozen lamb | Frozen beef | Chilled beef |
|------|--------|-------|--------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1876 | 29,7 | 89,2 | | 29,0 | | | |
| 1877 | 38,7 | 97,3 | | 11,8 | | | |
| 1878 | 33,6 | 81,7 | | 19,7 | | | |
| 1879 | 32,3 | 91,9 | | 55,9 | | | |
| 1880 | 26,1 | 97,1 | | 17,2 | | | |
| 1881 | 22,4 | 103,9 | | 31,6 | | | |
| 1882 | 27,0 | 111,0 | | 132,1 | | | |
| 1883 | 21,5 | 118,4 | | 102,5 | | | |
| 1884 | 18,9 | 114,3 | | 256,3 | | | |
| 1885 | 32,0 | 128,4 | 138,4 | 345,9 | 2,9 | 0,084 | |
| 1886 | 37,4 | 136,1 | 155,1 | 357,3 | 7,3 | 0,5 | |
| 1887 | 24,0 | 109,2 | 100,1 | 680,9 | 12,0 | | |
| 1888 | 26,4 | 131,7 | 117,3 | 381,1 | 18,2 | 0,042 | |
| 1889 | 41,8 | 141,8 | 159,1 | 483,6 | 16,5 | 0,7 | |
| 1890 | 43,5 | 118,4 | 200,0 | 1029,2 | 20,4 | 0,7 | |
| 1891 | 39,6 | 138,6 | 285,6 | 473,6 | 23,3 | 0,07 | |
| 1892 | 44,7 | 154,6 | 165,6 | 959,0 | 25,4 | 0,3 | |
| 1893 | 41,2 | 123,2 | 272,8 | 1164,9 | 25,0 | 2,8 | |
| 1894 | 42,8 | 161,9 | 342,7 | 1767,5 | 36,5 | 0,3 | |
| 1895 | 55,1 | 201,4 | 838,0 | 2069,0 | 41,9 | 1,6 | |
| 1896 | 45,9 | 187,6 | 894,7 | 2332,2 | 45,5 | 3,0 | |
| 1897 | 36,2 | 205,6 | 742,2 | 639,2 | 50,9 | 4,2 | |
| 1898 | 22,2 | 221,3 | 937,1 | 1521,2 | 59,8 | 5,9 | |
| 1899 | 19,2 | 237,1 | 855,6 | 3047,4 | 56,6 | 9,1 | |
| 1900 | 16,4 | 101,1 | 348,6 | 2866,2 | 56,4 | 24,6 | |
| 1901 | 24,3 | 228,4 | 144,9 | 2355,4 | 63,0 | 44,9 | |
| 1902 | 22,3 | 197,9 | 240,8 | 2178,6 | 80,1 | 70,0 | |
| 1903 | 13,0 | 193,0 | | 4379,3 | 78,1 | 81,5 | |
| 1904 | 11,7 | 158,6 | | 5654,7 | 88,6 | 97,7 | |
| 1905 | | | | 5745,4 | 78,4 | 152,9 | |
| 1906 | | | | 5480,2 | 67,4 | 153,8 | |

TABLE I (2)

| Year | Tanajo | Wool | Cattle on the hook | Cereals | Frozen lamb | Frozen beef | Chilled beef |
|------|--------|------|--------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1907 | | | | 4721,2 | 69,8 | 138,2 | |
| 1908 | | | | 6403,7 | 78,8 | 174,6 | 6,3 |
| 1909 | | | | 5674,7 | 66,5 | 209,4 | 1,2 |
| 1910 | | | | 5148,6 | 75,1 | 245,3 | 8,4 |
| 1911 | | | | 2826,9 | 85,9 | 297,7 | 15,1 |
| 1912 | | | | 7979,7 | 70,2 | 317,6 | 25,2 |
| 1913 | | | | 8635,8 | 45,9 | 332,1 | 34,2 |
| 1914 | | | | 5364,4 | 58,7 | 328,3 | 40,7 |

(*) In thousand Tons. Note, the end of the series for wool and

cattle on the hook is arbitrary; exports continued though considerably smaller in the case of the latter.

SOURCE: M. Tella & Zymelman "Etapas del desarrollo económico argentino", mimeograph.

TABLE II

Home Economic Indices, 1900-1932

Base: 1900 = 100

| Year | Gross Domestic Product | Volume of Imports | | Industry Gross Domestic Product | Branches of Industry | | | Residual Balance of Trade (Gold pesos) (°) | Residual Balance of Payments (Gold pesos) (°) | Foreign Investment (1930 pesos) |
|------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | Durable | Non Durable | | Foodstuffs | Metal Works | Textiles | | | |
| 1900 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | -71 | | 1.260 |
| 01 | 106,7 | 100,0 | 103,6 | 100,0 | 105,9 | 66,7 | 100,0 | 21 | | 1.260 |
| 02 | 106,7 | 61,5 | 80,2 | 111,1 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 52 | | 1.260 |
| 03 | 119,9 | 92,3 | 97,3 | 122,2 | 105,9 | 100,0 | 100,0 | 53 | | 2.583 |
| 04 | 133,3 | 230,8 | 138,3 | 133,3 | 105,9 | 133,3 | 133,3 | 0,5 | | " |
| 05 | 153,3 | 234,6 | 134,7 | 155,6 | 111,8 | 166,7 | 133,3 | 64 | | " |
| 06 | 160,0 | 365,4 | 159,9 | 166,7 | 111,8 | 200,0 | 133,3 | -20 | | 2.583 |
| 07 | 166,7 | 303,8 | 140,1 | 177,8 | 129,4 | 200,0 | 133,3 | -20 | | 3.276 |
| 08 | 180,0 | 280,8 | 144,6 | 188,9 | 141,2 | 200,0 | 133,3 | 93 | | 3.276 |
| 09 | 193,3 | 396,2 | 167,1 | 188,9 | 135,3 | 233,3 | 133,3 | 92 | | 4.662 |
| 10 | 206,7 | 480,8 | 193,7 | 233,3 | 164,7 | 333,3 | 166,7 | 10 | | 4.662 |
| 11 | 206,7 | 600,0 | 201,8 | 244,4 | 200,0 | 366,7 | 166,7 | -60 | | 4.725 |
| 12 | 226,7 | 626,9 | 184,7 | 233,3 | 182,4 | 366,7 | 166,7 | 53 | | 4.725 |
| 13 | 226,7 | 730,8 | 214,8 | 244,4 | 182,4 | 400,0 | 233,3 | 23 | | 1.910 |
| 14 | 206,7 | 284,6 | 128,4 | 222,2 | 188,2 | 333,3 | 233,3 | 12 | -165 | 1.695 |
| 15 | 206,7 | 173,1 | 113,1 | 200,0 | 164,7 | 233,3 | 266,7 | 288 | 115 | 813 |
| 16 | 200,0 | 546,2 | 170,7 | 211,1 | 176,5 | 266,7 | 100,0 | 142 | -21 | 63 |
| 17 | 180,0 | 442,3 | 155,4 | 211,1 | 194,1 | 266,7 | 366,7 | 254 | 93 | 69 |
| 18 | 213,3 | 223,1 | 153,6 | 244,4 | 229,4 | 200,0 | 466,7 | 284 | 117 | |

TABLE IX (2)

| Year | Gross Domestic Product | Volume of Imports | | Industry Gross Domestic Product | Branches of Industry | | | Residual Balance of Trade (Gold pesos) | Residual Balance of Payments (Gold pesos) | Foreign Investment (1950 pesos) |
|------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | Durable | Non Durable | | Foodstuffs | Metal Works | Fertilizers | | | |
| 1919 | 226,7 | 376,9 | 159,0 | 255,6 | 229,4 | 300,0 | 433,3 | 302 | 87 | 617 |
| 20 | 240,0 | 707,8 | 177,9 | 266,7 | 217,6 | 400,0 | 333,3 | 327 | 117 | 88 |
| 21 | 246,7 | 580,8 | 154,9 | 277,8 | 247,1 | 333,3 | 400,0 | 5 | -197 | 1216 |
| 22 | 266,7 | 700,0 | 168,9 | 311,1 | 264,7 | 400,0 | 400,0 | 109 | -51 | 1688 |
| 23 | 293,3 | 1192,3 | 217,1 | 366,7 | 311,8 | 533,3 | 366,7 | 6 | -195 | 561 |
| 24 | 320,0 | 1284,6 | 186,9 | 377,8 | 329,4 | 766,7 | 500,0 | 125 | -93 | 976 |
| 25 | 320,0 | 1707,7 | 221,6 | 411,1 | 370,6 | 866,7 | 400,0 | 53 | -150 | 1039 |
| 26 | 333,3 | 1688,5 | 212,1 | 411,1 | 347,1 | 966,7 | 500,0 | 48 | -143 | 1688 |
| 27 | 353,3 | 1546,2 | 204,0 | 433,3 | 353,0 | 1233,2 | 433,3 | 144 | -92 | 1934 |
| 28 | 380,0 | 1673,1 | 241,4 | 477,8 | 341,2 | 1400,0 | 566,7 | 205 | -36 | 1606 |
| 29 | 393,3 | 2046,2 | 226,6 | 511,1 | 347,1 | 1433,3 | 433,3 | 113 | -128 | 1760 |
| 30 | 380,0 | 1288,5 | 203,1 | 500,0 | 347,1 | 1166,7 | 733,3 | -117 | -340 | 1755 |
| 31 | 353,3 | 596,2 | 163,5 | 444,4 | 323,5 | 800,0 | 600,0 | 123 | -120 | - |
| 32 | 340,0 | 296,1 | 150,0 | 422,2 | 311,8 | 466,7 | 566,7 | 224 | -60 | - |

(*) These figures were taken from Di Tella & Zymalski, "Etapas del desarrollo económico argentino",

various chapters. There, it is not clear whether they are using dollars or Argentine gold pe-

ses.

SOURCE: INLA "Desarrollo económico de la Argentina", 1956.

TABLE: III

Industrial Concentrations 1914

| Branches of industry where large or medium concerns prevailed | | | | |
|---|------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Branch number | Rank | | Average investment | Average employment |
| 2902 | 500 | Oil Distillery | 7.500.00 | 220 |
| 2108 | 400 | Meat Packing Plants | 5.515.689 | 822 |
| 2104 | 200 | Sugar Refineries | 2.730.233 | 334 |
| 2604 | 80 | Paper-Pasteboard | 1.053.036 | 173 |
| 2109 | " | Ale Factories | 1.111.795 | 90 |
| 2401 | 60 | Cloth-Sacks | 879.458 | 75 |
| 2201 | 40 | Cigarettes | 579.781 | 78 |
| 3404-3418 | " | Galvanized Iron, Aluminum | 463.973 | 98 |
| 2305 | " | Vegetable fibres | 546.667 | 22 |
| 2128 | 16 | Paraguayan Tea(Yerba) | 238.161 | 34 |
| 3417 | " | Iron and Steel Mills | 231.190 | 20 |
| 2115 | 15 | Flour Mills | 216.394 | 12 |
| 2805 | 14 | Paints, Polishers | 203.100 | 20 |
| 2313 | " | Dyeing of Textiles | 200.000 | 45 |
| 2103 | 13 | Rice | 193.667 | 25 |
| 2101 | " | Cooking oils | 188.172 | 21 |
| 2803 | 12 | Alcohol Distilleries | 178.500 | 10 |
| 2509 | 11 | Obrajes (Saw Mills) | 158.512 | 40 |
| 2307 | " | Wool (Washing) | 158.525 | 26 |
| 2808 | 10 | Matches | 143.406 | 193.4 |
| 2802-2901 | 9 | Non cooking oil & Mining ral Grease | 120.750 | 22.3 |
| 3501 | " | Shipyards | 126.626 | 35.5 |

TABLE: IV

Proportion of Exports over Gross Domestic Product

| PERIOD | |
|----------|------|
| 1905 - 9 | 25.4 |
| 10 -14 | 22.5 |
| 15 -19 | 24.0 |
| 20 -24 | 25.1 |
| 25 -29 | 23.8 |
| 30 -34 | 21.9 |
| 35 -39 | 19.1 |
| 40 -44 | 13 |
| 45 -49 | 10.3 |
| 50 -54 | 7.4 |
| 55 -59 | 6.3 |

SOURCE: CFI - CGR "Programa Conjunto para el desarrollo agropecuario e industrial". First Report, Vol. I. Bs.As., Nov. 1962.

TABLE V

Effect of the World Crisis on the Industrial Sector

| Subsector | Depression | Recovery to pre-crisis level | Decline | Recovery |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|---------|------------|
| Industry | 1931-32 | 1933-34 | - | - |
| Foodstuffs | 1931-32 | 1934 | - | - |
| Tobacco | 1932-33 | 1934 | 1937 | 1946 |
| Textiles | 1931-32 | 1933 | - | - |
| Clothing | 1930-31 | 1932-33 | 1937 | 1944-45 |
| Timber | 1931-33 | - | - | 1943-44(*) |
| Paper-Pasteboard | 1930-34 | 1934 | 1937 | 1950(*) |
| Printing | 1931-33 | 1934 | 1937 | 1948-50 |
| Chemicals | 1930-31 | 1933 | 1937 | 1941 |
| Oil Refining | Not affected | - | 1944-45 | 1946 |
| Rubber | " | - | 1943-45 | 1947 |
| Leather | 1930 | 1931 | 1937 | 1939 |
| Glass-Stone-Pottery | 1930 | - | - | 1946-47(*) |
| Metal Works | 1930-32 | 1937 | 1941-43 | 1944 |
| Machinery | 1931-32 | 1937 | - | - |
| Electrical Appliances | Not affected | - | 1943-45 | 1946 |

(*) at Pre World Crisis level

SOURCE: Based on Index Numbers. ECLA, *ibid.*, Anexo, Table 9.

TABLE VI

Distribution of Industrial Firms by Size: 1935

| Subsector | Total N° of firms | Small concerns | | | More than 100 workers |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|
| | | Unipersonal | Up to 10 workers | Total | |
| Foodstuffs | 14.440 | 2.121 | 8.101 | 10.222 | 107 |
| Tobacco | 152 | 17 | 67 | 84 | 17 |
| Textiles | 781 | 75 | 293 | 368 | 95 |
| Clothing | 4.039 | 584 | 3.056 | 3.640 | 42 |
| Timber | 3.976 | 741 | 2.585 | 3.326 | 28 |
| Paper- Pasteboard | 214 | 5 | 86 | 91 | 10 |
| Printing | 2.194 | 611 | 1.292 | 1.903 | 24 |
| Chemicals | 931 | 117 | 595 | 712 | 24 |
| Oil Refining | 50 | 3 | 25 | 28 | 8 |
| Rubber | 46 | 1 | 20 | 21 | 9 |
| Leather | 1.087 | 122 | 658 | 780 | 39 |
| Glass, Stone, Pottery | 2.259 | 304 | 1.742 | 2.046 | 18 |
| Metal Works | 3.742 | 637 | 2.496 | 3.133 | 66 |
| Machinery | 4.663 | 806 | 3.390 | 4.196 | 48 |
| Electrical Appliances | 386 | 65 | 267 | 332 | 9 |
| Various | 1.501 | 205 | 1.056 | 1.261 | 25 |
| TOTAL | 40.461 | 6.414 | 25.729 | 32.143 | 569 |
| Total N° of firms 1946 | 84.895 | 23.865 | 48.482 | 72.347 | 1.278 |
| GROWTH 1935- 46 | 110 % | 250% | 90% | 116% | 130% |

SOURCE: Industrial Censuses, 1935 & 1946.

TABLE VII

Industrial Subsectors: Distribution of Firms, Employment (workers) and Output by Size of Firms: 1946

| Size Workers | FOODSTUFFS | | | TEXTILES | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| Self employed | 27.6 | - | 3.3 | 12.5 | - | 0.5 |
| 1-10 workers | 61. | 21.1 | 18.4 | 33. | 2. | 0.4 |
| 11-25 | 6.6 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 17. | 3.3 | 0.9 |
| 26-50 | 2.3 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 10.7 | 4.5 | 0.5 |
| 51-100 | (*) 1.4 | 9.2 | 11.9 | 7.1 | 5.9 | 1.4 |
| 101-300 | 0.8 | 12.6 | 16. | 10.7 | 21.4 | 26.3 |
| 301-500 | .2 | 6.1 | 6.5 | (*) 1.5 | 20.0 | 21.2 |
| 501-1000 | .08 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 30.1 | 25.1 |
| 1001 & over | .08 | 27.2 | 20.6 | 0.9 | 12.7 | 21.9 |
| N | 18,294 | 189,084 | 4,665,525 | 112 | 9,304 | 325,600 |
| Size Workers | TIMBER | | | PAPER & PAPERBOARD | | |
| | Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| Self employed | 25.6 | - | 3.7 | 9 | - | 3.1 |
| 1-10 workers | 54.2 | 21.1 | 24.9 | 36.1 | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| 11-25 | (*) 11.7 | 19.7 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 12. | 7.4 |
| 26-50 | 5.2 | 19.3 | 19. | 13.4 | 15. | 12.1 |
| 51-100 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 15. | (*) 10.3 | 20.1 | 19. |
| 101-300 | .9 | 14.2 | 11.5 | 7.3 | 32.5 | 30.9 |
| 301-500 | .08 | 2.8 | 1.5 | .38 | 4.4 | 6.3 |
| 501-1000 | .06 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 0.19 | 4.9 | 7.3 |
| 1001 & over | 0... | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.19 | 5.9 | 9.7 |
| N | 18,079 | 98,114 | 735,313 | 524 | 17,901 | 209,764 |

(*) The 50-50 per-cent distribution of output
Output in thousand pesos

SOURCE: Industrial census 1946

| TEXTILES | | | CLOTHING | | |
|---------------------|---------|-----------|----------------------|---------|-----------|
| Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| 11.1 | - | 5.6 | 30.5 | - | 12.5 |
| 37.6 | 3.1 | 6.5 | (361.5) | 36.4 | 32.9 |
| 19.7 | 5.9 | 7. | 5.2 | 17. | 13.6 |
| 11.5 | 7.4 | 8. | 1.6 | 11.1 | 9.7 |
| (10.) | 13.5 | 14.7 | .8 | 10.3 | 8.1 |
| 8.2 | 30. | 30.8 | .4 | 14. | 13.7 |
| 1. | 6.4 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 6. | 5.9 |
| 1.5 | 10.7 | 12.8 | 0... | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| .5 | 15 | 10. | 0... | 3.8 | 2.9 |
| 2.061 | 117.110 | 1.838.970 | 10.409 | 51.112 | 1.161.200 |
| PRINTING | | | CHEMICALS | | |
| 23.7 | - | 6.5 | 26. | - | 1.2 |
| 58.2 | 19.2 | 14.6 | 48.2 | 9.9 | 10.5 |
| 11.1 | 15.7 | 13.7 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 11.2 |
| (13.7) | 11.3 | 10.5 | 6.4 | 12.9 | 14.5 |
| 1.6 | 10.5 | 8.9 | (14.4) | 17.9 | 29. |
| 1.3 | 18.5 | 16.4 | 3.04 | 28.8 | 26.1 |
| 0.098 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 0.42 | 8.5 | 7.1 |
| 0.16 | 9.7 | 13.4 | 0.14 | 5.9 | 5.2 |
| 0.098 | 11.9 | 13.3 | 0.047 | 5.3 | 4.1 |
| 3.056 | 34.632 | 439.207 | 2103 | 38.052 | 1.060.858 |

TABLE VII (2)

Industrial Subsectors: Distribution of Firms, Employment (workers) and Output by Size of Firms: 1946

| (°) Scale Workers | OIL REFINING | | | RUBBER | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| | Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| Self employed | 6.4 | - | 0.03 | 17.6 | - | 0.3 |
| 1-10 workers | 38.3 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 39.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 |
| 11-25 | 10.6 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 16. | 5.4 | 5.5 |
| 26-50 | 8.5 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 9.9 | 6.4 | 4.8 |
| 51-100 | 10.6 | 7.1 | 2 | 6.1 | 8.5 | 3.9 |
| 101-300 | 19.2 | 36.8 | 34.8 | 3.8 | 12.1 | 7. |
| 301-500 | (°) 2.12 | 11.3 | 8.2 | (°) 4.6 | 31.5 | 26.3 |
| 501-1000 | 2.12 | 15.2 | 13.3 | 2.3 | 32.8 | 49.8 |
| 1001 & over | 2.12 | 23.1 | 36.3 | - | - | - |
| N | 47 | 4388 | 465682 | 131 | 7252 | 131946 |
| | METAL WORKS | | | MACHINERY | | |
| | Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| Self employed | 32.5 | - | 2.3 | 33.2 | - | 7.6 |
| 1-10 workers | 52.9 | 15.9 | 14.2 | 57.4 | 22.4 | 20.8 |
| 11-25 | 8.5 | 13.8 | 13.1 | 5.7 | 12.5 | 11.8 |
| 26-50 | 3.6 | 12.6 | 11.9 | (°) 1.9 | 8.9 | 8.8 |
| 51-100 | (°) 1.8 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 1.06 | 10.3 | 10.4 |
| 101-300 | 1.3 | 21.5 | 23. | 0.55 | 11.9 | 10.7 |
| 301-500 | 0.18 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 5.8 | 3.7 |
| 501-1000 | 0.12 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 0.09 | 8. | 11.5 |
| 1001 & over | 0.07 | 9.6 | 10.7 | 0.07 | 20.1 | 14.7 |
| N | 8971 | 91146 | 1079894 | 12.286 | 89.201 | 815.278 |

(°) The 50-50 per-cent distribution of output

Output in thousand pesos

SOURCE: Industrial census 1946

| LEATHER | | | GLASS, STONES, POTTERY | | |
|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Firms | Workers | Output | Firms | Workers | Output |
| 27.3 | - | 1.9 | 20.8 | - | 3.2 |
| 53. | 16.6 | 16.2 | 66.3 | 28.4 | 19.4 |
| 10.8 | 16.7 | 17.8 | 8.4 | 14.5 | 10.8 |
| (c) 5.1 | 17. | 14.2 | 2.4 | 9.1 | 8.6 |
| 2.3 | 14.6 | 12.6 | (c) .8 | 5.8 | 5.2 |
| 1.2 | 17.4 | 18.1 | 1. | 17.6 | 17.6 |
| 0.2 | 7.1 | 7.9 | .2 | 9.5 | 14. |
| 0.09 | 5.4 | 7.4 | .08 | 5.7 | 10.4 |
| 0.045 | 5. | 3.9 | .05 | 9.3 | 10.9 |
| 4364 | 46.027 | 776.121 | 6380 | 58946 | 532.892 |

| ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES | | | VARIOUS | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| 42.3 | - | 4.3 | 28.2 | - | 5.8 |
| 47.2 | 14.7 | 13.6 | 57.9 | 27. | 31.4 |
| 5.2 | 9.6 | 9.4 | (c) 8. | 17.7 | 15.6 |
| 2.6 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 3. | 14.7 | 11.2 |
| (c) 1.5 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 1.9 | 18.6 | 15.2 |
| .9 | 15.9 | 16.6 | 0.9 | 18.6 | 13.9 |
| .2 | 10.3 | 12.2 | 0.07 | 3.5 | 6.9 |
| .06 | 3.2 | 2.9 | - | - | - |
| 0.1 | 25.6 | 20.8 | - | - | - |
| 1.763 | 15801 | 194162 | 4315 | 31.282 | 279,946 |

TABLA VII (3)

Industrial Subsectors: Distribution of Firms, Employment(workers) and Output by Size of Firms: 1946

| (•) Scale Workers | ALL SUB-SECTORS | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Firms | Workers | Output |
| Self employed | 28.1 | - | 4.2 |
| 1-10 workers | 57.1 | 18.3 | 16.3 |
| 11-25 | 8.2 | 12.6 | 10.4 |
| 26-50 | 3.3 | 11.1 | 10.3 |
| 51-100 | (•) 1.8 | 12. | 11.9 |
| 101-300 | 1.1 | 18.3 | 19.6 |
| 301-500 | 0.17 | 6.4 | 6.8 |
| 501-1000 | 0.12 | 7.9 | 7.7 |
| 1001 & over | 0.06 | 13.5 | 12.9 |
| N | 84.895 | 899.032 | 14.793.358 |

(•) The 50-50 per-cent distribution of output
Output in thousand pesos

SOURCE: Industrial census 1946

TABLE: VIII

Distribution of Output by Size of Industrial Concern: 1946

| Subsector | (*) Small Workshops | Large(**) Firms |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| INDUSTRY | 20.5 | 47.0 |
| Foodstuffs | 21.7 | 48.5 |
| Tobacco | 0.9 | 96.5 |
| Textiles | 12.1 | 58.4 |
| Clothing | 45.4 | 23.1 |
| Timber | 28.6 | 15.3 |
| Paper & Pasteboard | 7.3 | 54.2 |
| Printing | 21.1 | 45.7 |
| Chemicals | 11.7 | 42.5 |
| Oil Refining | 0.53 | 92.6 |
| Rubber | 2.7 | 83.1 |
| Leather | 18.1 | 37.3 |
| Glass, Stones, Pottery | 22.6 | 52.9 |
| Metal Works | 16.5 | 46.8 |
| Machinery | 28.4 | 40.6 |
| Electrical Appliances | 17.9 | 52.5 |

(*) Self employed and firms with less than 10 workers

(**) Firms with 100 workers and over

SOURCE: Table VII

TABLE IX

**Distribution of Firms, Employment and Output by Industrial
Subsector : 1946**

| Subsector | Firms | Employment | Output |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Foodstuffs | 21.5 | 22.3 | 31.5 |
| Tobacco | .1 | 1. | 2.2 |
| Textiles | 2.4 | 12. | 12.4 |
| Clothing | 12.3 | 6.4 | 7.8 |
| Wood | 11.9 | 10.1 | 5. |
| Paper & pasteboard | .6 | 1.8 | 2. |
| Printing | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3. |
| Chemicals | 2.3 | 4.9 | 7.2 |
| Oil Refining | .06 | .5 | 3.1 |
| Rubber | .2 | .8 | .9 |
| Leather | 5.1 | 4.9 | 5.2 |
| Glass, Stones, Pottery | 7.5 | 6.1 | 3.6 |
| Metal Works | 10.6 | 9.8 | 7.3 |
| Machinery | 14.5 | 9.8 | 5.5 |
| Electrical Appliances | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| Various | 5.1 | 3.6 | 1.9 |
| T | 84.895 | 899.032 | 14.793.358 (*) |

(*) Thousand pesos

SOURCE: Industrial Census 1946

TABLE X

Industrial Concentration: 1946

Branches of industry with an average employment higher than forty workers.

| BRANCH NUMBER | Total No of firms | Total Output (million Pesos) | Average Employment (workers) | | |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 201 & over | 101-200 | 40-100 |
| 2100 <u>Feedstuffs</u> | 18,294 | 4,665,5 | - | - | - |
| 2101 <u>Cooking Oil</u> | 90 | 352,4 | | 96 | |
| 2104 <u>Sugar</u> | 40 | 266,8 | 283 | | |
| 2108 <u>Frigerificos</u> | 20 | 934,1 | 2658 | | |
| 2109 <u>Ale</u> | 17 | 136,5 | 434 | | |
| 2110 <u>Chocolate</u> | 221 | 118,0 | | | 43 |
| 2114 <u>Biscuits</u> | 86 | 47,2 | | | 62 |
| 2115 <u>Flour</u> | 215 | 396,9 | | 158 | 41 |
| 2119 <u>Malt</u> | 6 | 40,2 | | | |
| 2125 <u>Older</u> | 24 | 18,6 | | | 47 |
| 2128 <u>"Yerba Mate"</u> | 67 | 94,0 | | | 40 |
| 2200 <u>Tobacco</u> | 112 | 325,6 | - | - | - |
| 2201 <u>Cigarettes</u> | 17 | 283,7 | 282 | | 60 |
| 2202 <u>Cigars</u> | 95 | 41,9 | | | |
| 2300 <u>Textiles</u> | 2061 | 1839,0 | - | - | - |
| 2305 <u>Textiles Threads</u> | 32 | 7,1 | | | 51 |
| 2306 <u>Wool Spinning & Weaving Mills</u> | 781 | 1935,4 | | | 99 |
| 2307 <u>Wool (washing)</u> | 46 | 104,4 | | | 79 |
| 2308 <u>Hosiery</u> | 171 | 108,1 | | | 59 |

TABLE X (2)

| BRANCH NUMBER | Total No of firms | Total Output (million Pesos) | Average Employment (workers) | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|--------|
| | | | 201 & over | 101-200 | 40-100 |
| 2309 Katchair | 9 | 8,3 | | | 39 |
| 2313 Wring of textiles | 114 | 58,0 | | | 51 |
| 2314 Cordage | 26 | 33,7 | | | 67 |
| 2400 Clothing | 10409 | 1161,2 | - | - | - |
| 2401 Cloth Sacks | 17 | 76,1 | | 132 | |
| 2415 Department Stores | 12 | 42,0 | | 116 | |
| 2500 Timber | 10079 | 736,3 | - | - | - |
| 2507 Wood-Planks | 21 | 13,0 | | | 78 |
| 2600 Paper & Pasteboard | 524 | 289,8 | - | - | - |
| 2603 Copy-Books | 14 | 6,6 | | | 41 |
| 2604 Paper | 50 | 148,1 | | 130 | |
| 2800 Chemicals | 2103 | 1060,9 | - | - | - |
| 2802 Vegetal Oil | 73 | 140,7 | | | 50 |
| 2806 Tanning | 25 | 101,2 | | 177 | |
| 2808 Matches | 9 | 30,0 | 224 | | 61 |
| 2819 Explosives | 19 | 7,3 | | | |
| 2900 Oil | 47 | 465,7 | | | |
| 2902 Oil Refinery | 18 | 449,3 | 259 | | |
| 3100 Rubber | 131 | 131,9 | | | |
| 3101 Rubber Shoes | 10 | 20,9 | 211 | | |
| 3102 Tyres | 5 | 76,8 | 546 | | |

TABLE X (3)

| BRANCH NUMBER | Total No of Firms | Total Output (million Pesos) | Average Employment (workers) | |
|--|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | 201 & over | 101-200 40-100 |
| <u>3200 Leather</u> | 4364 | 776,1 | | |
| <u>3300 Stone, Glass & Pottery</u> | 6380 | 532,9 | | |
| <u>3305 Cement & Plaster</u> | 13 | 100,4 | 375 | |
| <u>3314 Glass</u> | 152 | 126,4 | | 103 |
| <u>3309 Machines Bricks & Others</u> | 43 | 13,6 | | 41 |
| <u>3400 Metals</u> | 8972 | 1079,9 | | |
| <u>3417 Iron Foundries</u> | 271 | 239,4 | | 79 |
| <u>3423 Lead, Tin & Others (Foundries)</u> | 9 | 31,0 | | 80 |
| <u>3500 Machinery</u> | 12,286 | 815,3 | | |
| <u>3501 Shipyards</u> | 198 | 77,4 | | 48 |
| <u>3507 Railway, Wash-Shops</u> | 74 | 143,9 | 341 | |
| <u>3508 Tramways Workshops</u> | 9 | 26,3 | 459 | |
| <u>3600 Electrical Appliances</u> | 1,763 | 194,2 | | |
| <u>3604 Electric Bulbs</u> | 14 | 10,5 | | 40 |
| <u>3700 Versions</u> | 4315 | 279,9 | | |
| <u>3711 Optic</u> | 22 | 14,6 | | 70 |

TABLE XI

Branches of Industry in each sub-sector Distributed by Size, Measured in Output: 1954

| Total Output | NUMBER OF BRANCHES | | | | | | | | | Million pieces |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------|----------|----------|--------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|-----|-------------------|
| | Foodstuffs | Tobacco | Textiles | Clothing | Timber | Paper & pasteboard | Printing | Chemicals | Oil | |
| over 1001 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | |
| 501-1000 | 3 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| 301-500 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| 101-300 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | |
| 301-400 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | |
| 101-200 | 6 | | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | 4 | | |
| 91-100 | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | |
| 81-90 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71-80 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| 61-70 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | | | |
| 51-60 | 1 | | | 4 | 2 | | 1 | | | |
| 41-50 | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | | |
| 31-40 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| 21-30 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 3 | | |
| 11-20 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | 4 | | |
| 0-10 | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 29 | 2 | 15 | 25 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 24 | 2 | |

(Source: Industrial Census 1954 (unpublished))

TABLE XI (2)

| NUMBER OF BRANCHES | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|-------|
| Rubber | Leather | Stone, Glass & Pottery | Metal Works | Machinery | Electrical Appliances | Various | Total |
| | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 16 |
| | | | 1 | | | | 4 |
| | | | | | | | 4 |
| | | | | | | | 4 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 4 |
| | | 1 | 1 | | | | 10 |
| 1 | | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 17 |
| 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | 8 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | 18 |
| | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 36 |
| | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 7 |
| | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 10 |
| | | | 2 | | | 1 | 5 |
| | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 10 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 8 |
| | | | 1 | | | 1 | 8 |
| | | | 1 | | | 1 | 11 |
| | | | 1 | | | 3 | 15 |
| | 1 | 2 | | | | | 4 |
| 3 | 9 | 15 | 25 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 202 |

SOURCE: Industrial Census 1954 (unpublished)

TABLE XII

Distribution of Output by Size of Firms. 1954

| Size of Branches Million Pesos | Total N° Firms | Number of firms | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Size of firms | | |
| | | Total | 2001-5000 | 1001-2000 |
| Over 1001 | 41.150 | 1.814 | 20 | 44 |
| 901-1000 | 4.424 | 153 | - | 1 |
| 801-900 | 8.971 | 689 | - | - |
| 701-800 | 2.650 | 181 | - | 3 |
| 601-700 | 718 | 52 | 1 | - |
| 501-600 | 19.765 | 657 | 1 | 2 |
| 401-500 | 10.934 | 259 | 12 | 6 |
| 301-400 | 4.579 | 507 | | 2 |
| 201-300 | 21.693 | 807 | | 2 |
| 101-200 | 15.004 | 1.799 | - | 2 |
| 91-100 | 2.261 | 157 | | |
| 81-90 | 260 | 15 | | |
| 71-80 | 4.392 | 322 | | |
| 61-70 | 658 | 63 | | |
| 51-60 | 2.443 | 465 | | |
| 41-50 | 3.636 | 484 | | |
| 31-40 | 1.318 | 168 | | |
| 21-30 | 1.796 | 374 | | |
| 11-20 | 1.447 | 392 | | |
| -10 | 282 | 94 | | |
| TOTAL | 148.381 | 9.443 | 24 | 62 |

(*) The asterisco on the right indicates that some firms from the next category should be included in this one. And on the left, it means that some firms of this category should be included in the next one.

SOURCE: Industrial Census 1954 (Unpublished).

is in the upper 50% of the distribution of output

measured in number of workers

| | 501-1000 | 301-500 | 101-300 | 51-100 | 26-50 | 11-25 | 1 - 10 |
|--|----------|---------|---------|--------|-------|--------|-----------|
| | 41 | 27 | 140 | 173 | 294 | 936(°) | |
| | 4 | 11 | 35 | 44 | (°)58 | | |
| | 6 | 9 | 45 | 87 | 159 | (°)383 | |
| | 1 | 5 | 17 | 27 | 29 | 99(°) | |
| | 4 | 2 | 19 | 26(°) | | | |
| | 8 | 8 | 49 | 56 | 156 | 377(°) | |
| | 12 | 34 | 49 | 63 | (°)84 | | |
| | 6 | 55 | 102 | 230 | 46 | (°)66 | |
| | 4 | 6 | 66 | 89 | 187 | 453(°) | |
| | 10 | 6 | 71 | 104 | 185 | 364 | (°) 1.057 |
| | 1 | 3 | 2 | 19 | 48 | (°)84 | |
| | | | 7 | 8 | | | |
| | | 5 | 9 | 15 | 35 | 91 | 167 |
| | | | 4 | 6 | 2 | 51(°) | |
| | | | 4 | 12 | 28 | 88 | (°)333 |
| | | | 1 | 8 | 25 | 55 | 395(°) |
| | | | 2 | 9 | 21 | 51 | (°)85 |
| | | | 3 | 7 | 11 | 60 | (°)293 |
| | | | 4 | 5 | 15 | 37 | 331(°) |
| | | | | | 3 | 6 | (°)85 |
| | 97 | 171 | 629 | 988 | 1.386 | 3.201 | 2.746 |

next lower category should be included to complete a 50% output.
 should be subtracted.

TABLE XIII

Industrial Concentrations 1954

| Size of branch million pesos | Code No | Branches | Total number firms in the branch | Sixty branches of industry where 50% output was produced by firms of more than: | | | | Foreign Investment |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------|
| | | | | Total | 500 m. | 300 m. | 100 m. | |
| Over 1001 | 2104 2103 2115 | Sugar Refineries Meat Packing Flour Mills | 39 191 | 8 10 | 8 9 | | 10 | H 68-76 Various ref. |
| | 2201 | Cigarettes | 28 | 3 | 3 | | | H 76 |
| | 2306 | Wool Spinning & Weaving Mills | 2568 | 48 | 48 | | | |
| | 2615 | Pharmaceutical | 345 | 30 | | | 30 | D 163 |
| | 2902 | Oil Refineries | 18 | 1 | 1 | | | F 169 |
| 901-1000 | 3417 | Iron-Steel Foundries | 682 | 10 | 10 | | | H 69-70/183 |
| | 3507 | Railway Workshop | 106 | 8 | 8 | | | (*) |
| | 3602 | Electrical Appliances | 1422 | 7 | 7 | | | D.165 |
| | 2101 | Cooking Oil | 173 | 5 | | 5 | | F.211 |
| | 2118 | Liquors | 190 | 6 | | | 6 | D.162 |
| 601-900 | 2620 | Chemicals (Various) | 549 | 14 | | | 14 | D.163-64 |
| | 2604 | Paper-Pasteboard | 73 | 3 | | 3 | | A 60 |
| | 2701 | Printing-Newspaper | 528 | 10 | | | 10 | |
| | 2109 | Breweries | 16 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 3305 | Cement | 14 | 3 | 3 | | | H-75-76 |
| 501-600 | 2313 | Dying of Textiles | 241 | 19 | | | 19 | F.97-171/205 |
| | 2401 | Cloth-Becks | 24 | 9 | | | 9 | D.164 A.(1) |
| | | | | | | | | (1) |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

TABLE: XLII (2)
Industrial Concentration: 1954

| Size of branch million pesos | Code No | Branches | Total number firms in the branch | Sixty branches of industry where 50% output was produced by firms of more than: | | | | Foreign investment |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|-----------------------|
| | | | | Total | 500 w. | 300 w. | 100 w. | |
| 401-500 | 2805 | Paints & Polishes | 225 | 6 | | | 6 | B.164 |
| | 3314 | Glass | 247 | 5 | 5 | | | P.208 |
| | 3414 | Cockers(except el.) | 639 | 13 | | | 13 | (1) |
| | | | | | | 4 | | B.162 |
| | 2110 | Chocolate | 303 | 4 | | | | |
| | 2128 | Tea(Mills) | 71 | 4 | | | 4 | |
| | 2308 | Hosiery | 465 | 14 | | | 14 | P.171 |
| | 2812 | Man-made Fibres | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | A.58 |
| | 2813 | Canna Soap | 239 | 3 | | 3 | | P.171 |
| | 3102 | Tyres | 7 | 2 | 2 | | | B.164 |
| 301-400 | 3405 | Tin | 894 | 17 | | | 17 | (1) |
| | 3413 | Cooper-Brass | 428 | 6 | | | 6 | P.208 |
| | 3503 | Cars-Trucks | 354 | 4 | | 4 | | P.209 |
| | 3606 | Radios | 1169 | 2 | 2 | | | B.163 |
| | 2806 | Tanning | 18 | 2 | | 2 | | P.43-97 |
| | 3101 | Rubber-Shoes | 135 | 2 | 2 | | | B.164 |
| | 3501 | Shipyards | 270 | 10 | | 10 | | (*) |
| | 2404 | Canvas Shoes | 95 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 3103 | Vs Rubber | 383 | 7 | | | 7 | B.164 |
| | 3301 | Pottery | 428 | 16 | | | 16 | |
| 201-300 | 3411 | Iron, Steel Pipes | 96 | 7 | | | 7 | P.96 |
| | 3423 | Lead, Tin Foundries | 11 | 4 | | | 4 | P.96 |

TABLE XIII (3)

Industrial Concentration: 1954

| Size of branch million pesos | Code No. | Branches | Total number firms in the branch | Sixty branches of industry where 50% output was produced by firms of more than | | | | Foreign investment |
|------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | Total | 500 w. | 300 w. | 100 w. | |
| 101-200 | 2114 | Biscuits | 139 | 5 | | | 5 | M 382 (1) D 165 |
| | 2117 | Vegetable Flour | 207 | 1 | | | | |
| | 2119 | Malt | 20 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 2314 | Cordage | 31 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 2425 | Vs. Clothing | 214 | 1 | | 1 | | H 64-68 |
| | 2507 | Wooden Planks | 51 | 6 | | | 6 | |
| | 2602 | Cellulose | 9 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | 2808 | Matches | 10 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | 3309 | Bricks | 127 | 6 | | | 6 | A-58 (1) (*) (*) |
| | 3408 | Screws, Nails | 266 | 6 | | | 6 | |
| | 3508 | Trolley workshop | 24 | 4 | 4 | | | |
| | 2819 | Explosives | 9 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| 91-100 | 2603 | Copy-books | 59 | 4 | | | 4 | D.165 A.52 H.76 D.163 |
| 81-90 | 2202 | Tobacco | 84 | 6 | | | 6 | |
| 71-80 | 3604 | Electric Bulbs | 14 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| 61-70 | 2415 | Department stores | 8 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| 51-60 | 2816 | Cleaning Powder, etc. | 38 | 1 | | | 1 | A 62 |
| 41-50 | 2124 | Metetics | 3 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| 31-40 | 2821 | Ink | 21 | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | TOTAL FIRMS | 17,444 | 384 | 120 | 53 | 234 | |

TABLE: XIII (4)

References:

(*) State owned

Foreign investment:

- F:** Ferrer, J., "United States-Argentine Economic Relations 1900-1930", Ph. D. Dissertation, Berkeley, California, 1964.
- H:** Halsey, F., "Investments in Latin America: Argentina", U.S. Department of Commerce, 1925.
- M:** M Tella & Zynelmen, "Etapas de Desarrollo Económico de la Argentina".
- A:** Cámara de Comercio de los Estados Unidos, "La Argentina y las firmas Norteamericanas", Buenos Aires, 1958.

(1): There is no certainty about foreign investment in these branches but some references from other sources suggest that it is highly probable.

Note: When there is more than one reference, only one is given as a reference.

TABLE: XIV

Branches of industry where there has been
direct foreign investment: 1954

| Type of firms within the branch | Sixty branches of industry where fifty per cent. output was produced by firms of more than: | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 500 workers | 300 workers | 100 workers | Total |
| Foreign owned | 16(*) | 7 | 20 | 43 |
| State owned | 3 | 1 | - | 4 |
| Others: | | | | |
| i- old | 3 | - | 4 | 7 |
| ii-new | - | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 22 | 9 | 28 | 59 |

(*) Oil Refineries have been included here, though I.P.F. (the
largest single firm) is state owned.

SOURCE: Table XIII

TABLE XV

Industrial Concentration: 1954

The sixty more concentrated branches of industry

| Fifty per-cent output produced by branches of: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| N° of firms | Size of firms: More than | | | |
| | 500 workers | 300 workers | 100 workers | Total |
| 1 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | - | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 5 to 10 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 21 |
| 11 & over | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Total number of branches | 22 | 9 | 28 | 59 |

SOURCE: Table XIII

TABLE: XVI

Industrial Concentration: 1954

Branches of industry where a small number of firms produced fifty per-cent of the output

| N ^o of firms | Number of branches where there are firms: | | | | | | | | | | | | | T O T A L |
|-------------------------|---|---------------|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|---------------|----|----|-----------|
| | Foreign investment | | | | State owned | | | | Others | | | | | |
| | 500 W. & over | 300 W. & over | 100 W. & over | T. | 500 W. & over | 300 W. & over | 100 W. & over | T. | 500 W. & over | 300 W. & over | 100 W. & over | T. | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | |
| 4 | - | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | 2 | 6 | |
| TOTAL | 11 | 6 | 5 | 22 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 30 | |

SOURCE: Table XIII

TABLE: XVII

Branches of industry where fifty per-cent output was produced by a small number of firms: 1954 (*)

| Size of Branch Million Pesos | Branch Number | | Firms of more than: | | | | Foreign investment |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| | | | Total | 50 w. | 26 w. | 11.w. | |
| 101-200 | 3401 | Wire | 4 | 4 | - | - | F 118 |
| 91-100 | 2818 | Tallow, Grease, Bones | 2 | 2 | - | - | F 43 |
| 71-90 | 2901 | Mineral Oil | 2 | 2 | - | - | Vs. referen ces |
| 51-70 | 2424 | Awings, Tents | 2 | - | 2 | - | |
| 41-50 | 2822 | Printing Ink | 3 | - | 3 | - | |
| 31-40 | 3313 | Glass, Stone, Pottery | 3 | - | 3 | - | |
| 21-30 | 2309 | Hats Hair | 4 | - | 4 | - | |
| 21-30 | 2804 | Wax (Polishing) | 2 | - | - | 2 | D.163 |
| 21-30 | 3418 | Galvanised iron | 4 | 4 | - | - | D.164 |
| 11-20 | 2304 | Tow | 3 | - | 3 | - | |
| 11-20 | 2305 | Vegetable fibres | 3 | 3 | - | - | D.165 |
| 11-20 | 2421 | Straw Hats | 3 | - | 3 | - | |
| 11-20 | 2809 | Pirotechny | 3 | - | 3 | - | |
| 11-20 | 2817 | Salt mills | 2 | - | 2 | - | |
| 11-20 | 2824 | Candles, Stearin, Parafin | 2 | - | 2 | - | |
| Under 10 | 3204 | Transitions, Straps | 4 | - | - | 4 | |
| Under 10 | 3315 | Vitranx d'art | 1 | - | 1 | - | |
| TOTAL | | | 47 | 15 | 26 | 6 | |

(*) The more concentrated branches excluded

SOURCE: Census of 1954 (Unpublished Data)

TABLE XVIII

Industrial Dispersions: 1954

| Size of Branch | Branches of industry where fifty percent output was produced by firms of less than (*) | | | | | The 100 percent by firms of less than 100 workers |
|----------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|-------------|---|
| | Self-employed | 10 workers | 25 workers | 50 workers | 100 workers | Total |
| 1000 & over | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 901-1000 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 801-900 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 701-800 | | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 601-700 | | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 501-600 | | 4 | 1 | | 4 | 9 |
| 401-500 | | | 5 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| 301-400 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| 201-300 | | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 17 |
| 101-200 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 30 |
| 91-100 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 6 |
| 81-90 | | | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 71-80 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 61-70 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 51-60 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | 10 |
| 41-50 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | | 8 |
| 31-40 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | | 8 |
| 21-30 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 11-20 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 15 |
| Under 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | 4 |
| Total No of branches | 12 | 61 | 38 | 32 | 28 | 171 |
| | | | | | | 60 |

(*) Note: This is the lower side of the fifty-fifty distribution of output.

TABLE: XIX

Distribution of Output by Size of Firms: 1954

| Size of branches Million Pesos | Total N° of firms | Number of firms in the lower 50% of the distribution of output | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|-------------|---------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|------------------|
| | | Size of firms measured in number of workers | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total | Over 500 | 301/500 | 101/300 | 51/100 | 26/50 | 11/25 | 1/10 | Self Employed |
| Over 1001 | 41.150 | 39.336 | 37 | 63 | 166 | 188 | 514 | 1.206 | 19.824 | 17.336 |
| 901-1000 | 4.424 | 4.271 | | | 11 | 36 | 53 | 288 | 2.004 | 1.879 |
| 801-900 | 8.971 | 8.282 | | | | 10 | 78 | 352 | 3.628 | 4.214 |
| 701-800 | 2.650 | 2.469 | | | 15 | 22 | 70 | 114 | 1.105 | 1.143 |
| 601-700 | 718 | 666 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 1 | 75 | 93 | 281 | 194 |
| 501-600 | 19.765 | 19.108 | | 4 | 13 | 60 | 78 | 244 | 7.709 | 11.000 |
| 401-500 | 10.934 | 10.684 | 4 | 3 | 34 | 76 | 171 | 602 | 3.470 | 6.326 |
| 301-400 | 4.579 | 4.072 | | 2 | 29 | 28 | 40 | 497 | 2.048 | 1.428 |
| 201-300 | 21.693 | 20.886 | | 1 | 1 | 32 | 80 | 452 | 10.803 | 9.517 |
| 101-200 | 15.004 | 13.205 | | 1 | 25 | 54 | 129 | 449 | 4.785 | 7.762 |
| 91-100 | 2.261 | 2.104 | | | 2 | 2 | 5 | 45 | 989 | 1.061 |
| 81-90 | 260 | 245 | | | | 4 | 16 | 41 | 122 | 62 |
| 71-80 | 4.392 | 4.070 | | | 3 | 9 | 16 | 20 | 1.471 | 2.551 |
| 61-70 | 658 | 595 | | | | 2 | 3 | 5 | 314 | 271 |
| 51-60 | 2.443 | 1.978 | | | | | 4 | 40 | 605 | 1.329 |
| 41-50 | 3.636 | 3.152 | | | | | | 12 | 450 | 2.690 |
| 31-40 | 1.318 | 1.150 | | | | | | 8 | 341 | 801 |
| 21-30 | 1.796 | 1.422 | | | | | 1 | 9 | 350 | 1.062 |
| 11-20 | 1.447 | 1.055 | | | | | 7 | 24 | 205 | 819 |
| Under 10 | 282 | 188 | | | | | | | 15 | 173 |
| TOTAL | 148.381 | 138.938 | 43 | 81 | 312 | 524 | 1.340 | 4.501 | 60.519 | 71.618 |

4 JUN 69

Vol 2
A 2 vols



R

X 35,799

30-9-69

3 . - OCCUPATIONAL ORDER OF STRATIFICATION

In the XVIII Century and before, silver from the Upper Perú had made up a substantial part of the exports of the River Plate; and "very likely a large proportion of that silver was owned by entrepreneurs of the Northwest and Cordoba who had received it in payment of their sales in Potosi"(1). The decline of this market as a source of income for the Interior (provinces other than the Littoral ones) and the subsequent Free-Trade Reforms depressed the Interior economies; most frequently to a subsistence level even though they remained self-sufficient. Besides, the interregional trade also deteriorated as a consequence of the Civil War which profoundly affected the means of communication.

On the other hand the economy of the Littoral was stimulated by the Trade Reforms of 1778 and subsequently by the economic policy of the Revolution of 1810. "The sectors of the economy of the viceroyalty which benefited most were the grazing industry, overseas commerce and that portion of the inter-regional trade which emanated from or passed through Buenos Aires"... "the fact that the country was now able to obtain better prices for its exports and that it was free to buy in the cheapest markets, increased the volume of trade and on terms more advantageous than hitherto" (2). "The interior provinces presented a different picture. In these regions grazing, although important, was not the only source of subsistence. Backward as these provinces were, they yet succeeded in developing certain industries which, in

addition to supplying local needs, produced surplusses for exports" to other provinces (3). As a result of the trade reforms those provinces which had already lost their Upper Peru market (4) "were forced to withdraw from the Buenos Aires market" (5) now more easily and cheaply supplied from abroad.

Thus whereas the Littoral entered upon a period of economic expansion based on ranching production oriented to the overseas trade, the economy of the Interior gradually began to deteriorate. So that in mid-Nineteenth Century the sectorial division of the Argentine economy almost completely corresponded to a geographical division. And though the big expansion of ranching and overseas trade was yet to come, the external sector had already become the only important source of income (6).

Though labour force was scarce its share in the income of the external sector was very low. So much so that a system of military service and local justice was implemented in the Province of Buenos Aires under Rosas in order to keep control over rural workers. For in this province labour scarcity was even more acute than anywhere else in the Argentine (7). Thus there was a two way concentration of income; the one based on geographical as well as sectorial grounds, the other based upon the control of the means of production. So that a small group of ranchers and merchants controlled the largest portion of the total income.

Although when the First National Census was recorded (1869) the process of agricultural development had already started, very few

changes had yet taken place. Hence the occupational distribution obtained from the census data can fairly be considered as a picture of a former stage of development (as far as it is possible to outline stages of development). At that date farming and improvements in cattle-breeding were in their infancy; railway construction and other investments in infrastructure had not yet attained great impetus; foreign immigration was comparatively very small and above all, exports were just beginning to expand. Regional insolationism had not yet been broken down by modern means of communication so that the affects of the Free Trade Policy of the National Government had not begun to operate fully either.

The occupational distribution in 1869 shows both the existence of a small group connected with the external market, and the survival of local crafts and trade oriented towards the production for their local markets.

Thus the upper stratum, the one with the highest income, was only made up by cattle-breeders (see Tables I & II) a very small number of saladeristas (producers of dried-salted meat) and merchants in "frutos del pais" (hides, wool and other agricultural produce).

The census does not distinguish between different types of cattle-breeders. It includes landowners as well as ranchers, owners of cattle who were de-facto occupants of public land and breeders who worked under a system of product-sharing with owners of land and cattle. (8).

The second largest group in this stratum, though considerably

smaller than the latter, was that of traders in "frutos del pais". They controlled the commercialization of land produce and were also intermediaries in the import-export trade. As high income groups tended to spend a large proportion of their income on imported goods, usually beyond the level of exports, deficits in the trade-balance were very frequent. These deficits were usually financed by overseas traders with connections abroad, who thus performed roles in commerce and finance as well (9).

Below this a second stratum was made up mostly by university-graduate professionals. Lawyers, doctors, public notaries, land surveyors, engineers, etc., who very likely earned their livings with varying degrees of success (10). Differences in income within this group must have been very large. The Introduction to the Census points out to "the negative consequences" of the excessive number of university graduates, philosophers and literary men; for "it is a mistake to stimulate aspirations when society cannot satisfy them" (11).

There were also located in this stratum a small group of consignees, surveyors, agents and some manufactures. The former very likely worked on transactions over land and land produce and the latter, recorded as such with no other specification, must have been the very few who employed labour in the production of manufactures (12).

Though farming was still little developed, compared with what it was to become, there were nearly nine thousand farmers who were included in the third stratum. Unlike ranchers, farmers surely did

not enjoy a high income; difficulties of transportation and labour scarcity weighed heavily on costs so that imports could compete successfully in Buenos Aires and other main Littoral cities leaving local producers as suppliers of their small neighbourhood markets (13).

In this stratum, other professionals of lower qualification were included together with teachers, journalists and artists.

The following stratum is almost exclusively that of craftsmen and small traders. The variety of occupations included here shows to what an extent local economies were diversified. Foodstuffs producers (particularly bakers), carpenters, leather and metal workers and pottery makers supplied their own local markets and exceptionally other more distant ones. These groups were those that suffered more deeply from the deterioration of the interregional trade in the past and were yet to undergo a period of even greater decline.

Within the group of traders and shopkeepers of all sorts there must have been some who enjoyed a better income than the majority (14). Unfortunately it is not possible to assess how large this group of traders of better income was. The number of shop-assistants indicates that there were almost a thousand traders who employed labour (15).

The lower strata of the occupational distribution were made up of miscellaneous occupations: starting from the top with masons, self-employed in services and transportation, low rank employees, some skilled workers, going down through weavers and seamstresses,

and peasants, and ending with unskilled workers and domestic servants.

With the exception of rural workers most of the occupations included in the lower strata were bound to disappear as a result of the process of agricultural development. The small craftsman survived as long as his local market remained isolated through lack of communication with the rest. In the past interregional exchange had been more active but soon after Independence three decades of Civil War had helped to deteriorate old links. So long as railways did not develop, the local market could remain unaffected by the competition of imports and however low their income was small craftsmen could survive (though at a mere subsistence level).

These lower strata as much as the upper represented the economic structure as well as the distribution of income prevailing in Mid-Nineteenth Century Argentina. At the top, a small group of cattle-breeders, merchants and "saladeristas" who appropriated the largest share of the only expansive sector of the economy (Table III). At the bottom, a vast majority of producers for their local market whose income hardly reached a subsistence level and a large number of rural workers with a very low share in the income of their own sector. There was no proper middle stratum; there were only some small groups located somewhere in between high income and subsistence. There was no opportunity for the formation of a middle stratum because the whole economy worked at a low level of technology. The raising of cattle and the commercialization of its product did not

create other opportunities of work outside the same sector. That is, the demand on local produce and services for the working of the external sector was very small. Besides, the flow of income from the upper stratum hardly took the form of expenditure on local produce because a large proportion of its consumption was satisfied by imports.

The most important effect of the agricultural development was to fill the gap between the upper and the lower strata with a stratum of neither rich nor poor occupational groups. For the big expansion of agriculture and the investment in infrastructure together with the growth of the population brought about occupational opportunities unknown in the past.

Though in the agricultural sector income still remained highly concentrated, the development of other sectors occurred in such a way that a fairly even distribution of income tended to prevail. Unlike agriculture where property was highly concentrated, we find that in industry, services and commerce small and middle-sized firms prevailed, resulting in a more even distribution of property and hence of income. And as long as the latter developed and increased their share in the total income the final result was one of a more even distribution of income than hitherto. Moreover within the agricultural sector the development of farming also opened the way to the formation of a stratum of small and medium farmers.

Considering the total distribution there was very likely a redistribution of income among strata between 1869 and 1914 (dates of the

National Censuses). Though there are no data on income for this period, some indirect evidence can be used to support this hypothesis. Just as in 1869 the upper stratum was mostly made up by big ranchers and overseas merchants. Though their income probably grew more than that of any other group it is probable that in 1914 their share in the Total Income had decreased. For the number of members of this stratum grew at a lower rate than the number of members of all other strata. That is even if the rich were richer than ever before, as their size comparatively decreased while the total income of the country increased, their share in this total decreased. This would not necessarily have been so had the level of income of all other strata remained very low. But in a country where foreign immigration had to be attracted a reasonably high level of income had to exist. To start with, during the Nineteenth Century a high level of wages prevailed in the Pampean Region. Colonist and tenants settled in the country because farming offered a good rate of return, and in the cities good opportunities for making money existed as well. The rate of growth of the economy during this period was high enough (16) to permit a great accumulation of wealth in the upper stratum and yet allow for an improvement in the standard of living of the remaining strata.

Moreover, between 1869 and 1914 Agriculture's share in the Economically Active Population decreased, as did its share in the National Income (17) even though it remained the largest single sector of the economy. That is, there was a transfer of labour and income

from a sector with a high concentration of income to sectors with more even distributions. It can be thus inferred that the distribution of income of the whole economy was more equitably distributed than hitherto.

The composition of the upper stratum varied slightly during this period (Table IV & V). Big ranchers and farmers, overseas merchants, dealers in cereals and other land produce, and bankers were still an overwhelming majority. But unlike 1869 there was now a group, albeit small, of big industrialists. The second and third strata, from the top, continued to be mainly agricultural but the number of industrialists and wholesale traders increased. In the third stratum there was also an important group of intermediaries and agents engaged in transactions concerning land and land produce. Though it is difficult to assess how large their income was, university trained professionals were also considered as forming part of the third stratum.

The proportion of agricultural groups started to decrease in the fourth stratum though their number was still larger than that of any other single group. Unlike the former strata there were here a considerable number of white collar workers (teachers, journalists, qualified employees of transportation and professionals) as well as industrialists, owners of medium and small workshops. In the following stratum Civil Servants outnumbered any other single group (18). Craftsmen and traders completed the rest of the stratum.

The sixth stratum was definitely urban. With the exception of a

small number of farmers the rest of the stratum was made up by self-employed craftsmen and traders as well as shop-assistants, small agents and self-employed individuals in services.

From the seventh stratum downwards wage-earners exceeded the number of self-employed. In this stratum there were included self-employed in services and building construction, very small traders, low rank employees and skilled workers.

Though the limit between the eighth and ninth strata is difficult to outline with accuracy there is evidence to believe that great regional variations in the level of wages existed. In the Pampean Region a rural worker earned as much as six times the wage of a worker of Northwest and Northeast (19). So that in the 1890's fifty thousand seasonal workers immigrated from Europe every year to work in the harvest (20) and that number doubled during the first decade of the XXth. Century (21). With the exception of periods of acute crisis the demand for labour in the Pampean Region always exceeded its supply. And this shortage of labour was a permanent feature of the economy of the region, in both rural and urban areas (22).

The transformation of the occupational structure between 1869 and 1914 was as deep as the changes the economic structure had undergone during this period (Table VI). New occupational groups formed and grew and many old ones declined or even completely vanished.

Though the distance between the upper stratum of big ranchers and the newly formed middle strata was still large the economic

achievement of the latter was considerable. "Few reached great wealth but here the majority enjoyed a standard of living higher than in their own home-countries" (23). Even in the countryside where the access to land ownership was frequently closed to newcomers a middle stratum of farmers and tenant-farmers emerged in spite of insecurity; for "a series of good harvests could change their future" so easily "that dreams of wealth and prosperity never shone so brightly in the River Plate" (24). In fact there were many farmers "who began by humbly labouring under the conditions of tenancy-contracts and subsequently became rich land-owners, possessing enormous tracts of land" (25).

Opportunities for making money were even larger in industry, commerce and services. The expansion of the economy opened the road to economic achievement to many members of the lower strata and foreign immigrants as well; the latter particularly took advantage of these opportunities (26).

Thus a middle stratum of farmers, industrialists, craftsmen and traders came to fill the gap between the very rich and the very poor. They enjoyed varying degrees of economic success but on the whole most achieved a good standard of living in the course of their lifetime. "In the middle stratum most foreigners were self-made men" (27).

Nevertheless economic prosperity did not reach large sections of the native population. In the timber forest of the Northeast, Indians

suffered extreme exploitation, as Biale Masse pointed out in his report on the state of workers in the Interior. "Just for that reason only, because he is an Indian he earns less than a Christian" (28). In farming colonies as well, and even in public-works companies, Indians were paid less than Christians and received no cash but "vales de la proveeduría" (payment-orders that could only be exchanged for goods in the plantation grocery, naturally with a significant reduction on its written value) (29). In sugar plantations of Tucuman "the cane worker leaves 40% of his already humble wage in the grocery" (30).

And the same happened in La Rioja and Corrientes; here the poor "worker receives a tiny plot of land and for this he has to work free for his landlord", his monthly income being only six pesos and miserable food" (in Santa Fe it was five times as high) (31).

According to the same report the state of other occupational groups in the interior was also deplorable. Washer-women, weavers, seamstresses and amasadores (bakers) seldom reached a subsistence income, and very frequently had not even opportunities of employment (32). In the following period with industrialization, opportunities of better employment were to be opened to a large proportion of that submerged population.

During the process of industrialization that followed the Crisis of 1929 several factors worked in favour of a more even distribution of income. Firstly, except for the few years after the Crisis, unemployment

diminished, absorbed by the expansion of industry and the tertiary sector. Secondly, there was a transfer of population from low income areas to others of higher income. Thirdly, whereas agriculture's share in the National Product decreased, other sectors increased theirs and the latter were sectors with a lower degree of concentration of income than the former. And finally, after World War II the wage-level improved so that labour's share in the National Income improved as well.

Though the wage-level decreased immediately after the Crisis the position of labour began to improve in 1933. This improvement was not so much the consequence of an increase in wages as of the absorption of unemployment, which was more intense during the War period when full employment was finally achieved (33).

While industrialization accelerated, large sections of the population emigrated from rural areas and small towns, attracted by the new occupational opportunities (34).

Interregional movements of population very likely existed in the XIXth. Century and first decades of the XXth. These were movements from the Interior to rural areas of the Littoral, particularly during the harvest season (35). However it was in the thirties and forties that internal migration became intensified; Great Buenos Aires then constituted the main focus of attraction.

There are only partial studies on the regional origin of internal immigrants, but the few available indicate that a substantial proportion

of that population came from the Northwest and Northeast (36), that is, from provinces where the lowest standards of living prevailed. Germani, in his study on urbanization in the Argentine, points out that the majority of internal immigrants in Great Buenos Aires came from areas with a high rate of underemployment as well as unemployment (37).

The transfer of labour that accompanied the process of industrialization can be fully appreciated in the composition of the economically active population. Whereas in the pre-Crisis period (1925-29) Agriculture employed 35.9% of the active population thirty years later this proportion had fallen to 26.1%. On the other hand the share of industry increased from 26.9% to 30% during the same period. During the first three decades of this century Agriculture had absorbed 33% of all increments in the economically active population and in the period 1940-44 to 1955 it could only absorb 4.3% of those increments (38).

To these changes in the economically active population corresponded similar changes in the sectorial distribution of income. Agriculture's share in the Gross National Product decreased from 24% in 1929 to 19.3% in 1946 and 17.1% in 1955 (39). For the rate of growth of the Agricultural sector slowed down compared with pre-Crisis standards and also with the rate of growth in other sectors (40). Besides, the Peronist Government still further fomented the transfer of income from agriculture to other sectors through the mechanism of

prices. Whereas agricultural prices (in real terms) decreased by 20% between 1937 and 1949, industrial prices increased by 42%(41). Thus the Government's policy of industrialization was partly financed with income which originated in the rural sector. (42).

The wage-level, particularly the urban, increased after 1946 and in spite of the increasing cost of living real wages improved (43). So that Labour's share in the National Income increased from 46.8% in 1946 to 59.6 %in 1954 (44).

As far the distribution of income is concerned the consequence of transfers of labour and product among sectors has to be evaluated within the context of their respective structures of economic units. Agriculture was a sector where the main factor of production, land, was highly concentrated in a few large holdings. Besides, the level of employment was low due to the extensive system of exploitation. On the other hand industry developed into a large number of small and middle sized firms. Though there were many large concerns a substantial proportion (41.2%) of the total product of the sector was produced by firms with less than 100 workers (see Chapter II). And the level of employment in this sector was higher than in the former. (In 1947 there were 1.438 thousand wage-carriers against 999 thousand in agriculture).

A transfer of income from a sector (agriculture) with a high degree of concentration to a sector where income is more evenly distributed necessarily leads to a more equitable distribution when both

sectors are added together. Similarly a transfer of labour to activities where higher wages prevailed produces an increase in the share of labour in the total income (45). In Argentina not only were there more wage-earners but also their income improved with the process of industrialization.

Though this study covers a longer period (until 1952-55) the analysis of the occupational distribution has necessarily to be based on the National Census of 1947 because the following census was taken in 1960.

Germani in his book on the social structure of Argentina analyses the occupational distribution in 1947. What now follows is a summary of his study; therefore in order to avoid continual footnotes, quotations are omitted as well as details on computation and sources (46).

Big ranchers and farmers still made up a large proportion of the upper stratum though considerably smaller than in the past (Table VII). They were exceeded only by top executives and entrepreneurs in commerce, finances and services. Here in this group top civil servants and the most successful University trained professionals were included as well. At the other extreme big industrialists and executives were the smallest group in this stratum.

The degree of interlocking among members of the upper stratum has yet to be established. Germani considers the few studies on this subject as inadequate and partial though accepts that many members of this stratum must have held simultaneously top occupational

positions in different types of activities (47). A more recent study by J. de Imaz arrives at a similar conclusion; though he does not measure the degree of interlocking among members of the power elite he finds that several members of his sample were big *estancieros* as well as executives of industrial and commercial firms (48).

Urban occupational groups overwhelmingly prevailed in the upper middle stratum. The importance of higher education as a channel of occupational mobility is shown by the composition of this stratum. Considering together all professionals, technicians and administrators (both self-employed and salary-earners) they constituted nearly half the size of this stratum (49). The rest was made up by medium entrepreneurs in commerce and services, and industry and a small proportion of medium farmers and ranchers.

Unlike the upper and upper middle strata the number of salary-earners increases considerably in the lower middle stratum. A large variety of white-collar workers as well as low-rank civil servants constituted 52% of the stratum whereas the rest was made up by a *petit-bourgeoisie* of small industrialists, shop-keepers, craftsmen, farmers and entrepreneurs in services.

Workers, both skilled and unskilled, and a small number of self-employed (8.3%) constituted the lower stratum. Among urban workers a quarter were employed in big concerns, that is firms with 100 workers or more. The geographical concentration of workers employed in big concerns was also very high; 75% of them worked in Great Buenos

Aires. At the other extreme 50% of all urban workers belonged to firms with less than 10 workers.

Only 25% of the lower stratum were rural workers. As in Agriculture the density of labour has always been very low (50) adding together all workers (rural and urban) a large majority (66%) of them belonged to concerns with a low degree of concentration of labour. Nevertheless from the point of view of the organization of labour their degree of concentration is misleading; for the great majority of them lived in large urban areas, above all Buenos Aires.

The formation of a white-collar stratum and the growth in the number of urban workers are the two main features of the occupational distribution in 1947. Whereas in the past the main channel of occupational mobility had been entrepreneurship, in the second stage of economic development mobility along a given career became more frequent. Nevertheless opportunities for entrepreneurship also persisted, as in fact happened; industrialization gave birth to a large number of small entrepreneurs and self-employed in industry, commerce and services.

What was new in this second stage was that salary earners as well as workers began to differentiate into several occupational sub-categories. Between a top group of highly trained administrators, civil servants and technicians, and the lowest rank of employees there were differences in qualification as much as in income. Similarly manual workers differentiated into supervision and different types of

skilled and unskilled labour. These changes were a consequence of the higher degree of complexity of the economic structure; hence training became a precondition to entering given careers. This was particularly so for top positions in the occupational hierarchy.

In this chapter we have been dealing exclusively with changes in the occupational distribution, insofar as these changes were the result of the process of economic development.

The first important feature of this process of change was the diversification of occupational groups that accompanied the underlying diversification of the economy. During the first stage there was as well the disappearance of many old groups of craftsmen, traders and other selfemployed in services, who barely reached a subsistence income (See Table VIII for the decreased proportion of self-employed in the lower strata between 1869 and 1914). On the other hand, new groups appeared in all sectors, particularly secondary and tertiary, located between the top of the few wealthy and the vast majority of groups of low income. As tables IX to XII show, the trend was towards a widening of the occupational pyramid.

Secondly, economic conditions favoured a more even distribution of income, though the process was more intense in secondary and tertiary activities due to their lower degree of concentration of wealth as well as to the fact that the level of wages in these sectors was higher than in agriculture.

Thirdly, all more important changes were accompanied by processes of immigration, foreign during the first stage and internal during

the second, the Littoral, in both periods, being the main focus of attraction. This indicates that with different degrees and forms occupational changes affected large sections of the Argentine population.

Fourthly, the whole period was characterized by a high rate of occupational mobility which, as we have said, affected large sections of the population. Due to the great economic expansion, opportunities in entrepreneurship were wide open over the whole period though comparatively higher during the first stage. During the second stage mobility along a given career also became an important channel, appropriate training being a condition to it. It cannot be affirmed that members of the lower strata easily reached top managerial or technical positions, but it probably occurred with a certain frequency, as access to higher education was relatively easy (51). Chances of upward mobility were not equally distributed. They were higher among the foreign population and their descendants as they settled in the Littoral, the most economically expansive region (52), and engaged in those activities that offered them opportunities of economic improvement, to such an extent that in 1914 there was an overwhelming majority of foreigners among self-employed and employers in industry and commerce (53). Whereas two thirds of industrialists and three quarters of merchants and traders were foreigners, the native population prevailed in artisan production (of the old type), public bureaucracy and domestic service (see Appendix V). However, in the second stage, members of the lower stratum, of native origin, also experien-

ced upward mobility. For many of them mobilized from regions and occupations of low income to others of higher income. This was a consequence of the process of industrialization in the thirties and fourties by which internal immigrants were absorbed into secondary and tertiary activities (54).

NOTES

- (1) Ferrer, A.: "La Economía Argentina", F.C.E., Mexico 1963, p. 80, Cf. T. Halperin Donghi, "El Río de la Plata al comenzar el siglo XIX", Bs.As., Facultad de Filosofía, 1961.
- (2) Burgin, M., "The Economic Aspects of Argentine Federalism 1820-1852", p. 14.
- (3) Burgin, M., *ibid.*, p. 15.
- (4) The loss of the Upper Peru market was a consequence of the decline of silver production in this region and therefore of its demand for goods hitherto imported from Northwest and Central Provinces.
- (5) Burgin, M., *ibid.*, p. 16.
- (6) Ferrer, A., estimates that between 1850 and 1900 exports increased from 35 million to 460 million dollars (1950 dollars). That is an accumulative annual rate of growth of 5% and he thinks that the rate of growth of the whole economy must have been very similar to that of exports., *ibid.*, p. 143.

- (7) Halperin Donghi thinks that at the beginning of the XIXth. Century appropriation of land beyond real economic needs aimed at controlling the scant labour-force of each region.
- (8) Daireaux, G. "Tipos y paisajes criollos", Bs. As., Agro Ed., 1945. Several stories.
- (9) Merchants also invested in saladeros and land. T. Halperin Donghi, "La expansión ganadera en la campaña de Buenos Aires. 1810-1852", Revista de Desarrollo, vol. 3 N° 1-2, April-September 1963, p. 73.
- (10) E. Wilde narrates in several stories the difference between a successful and a well trained doctor. See "Tini y otros relatos," Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1960.
- (11) National Census of 1869, p. XLIV.
- (12) In novels and short stories there are references to rich owners of industry.
- (13) See Introduction to the National Census of 1869.
- (14) Lopez, Lucio V. "La Gran Aldea", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964. One of the characters was a rich tendero (a trader in fabrics) and on p. 47 and the following there is a description of this type of shop. Cf. Halperin Donghi, "El Río de la Plata"... "on rich local traders.
- (15) There were three thousand employes in 1869, at least half must have been civil servants, of the remaining one and a half thousand only a part were shop-assistants; that is even if there was an employer per assitant this group could not exceed a thousand.

- (16) Ferrer, A. *ibid.* Chapter III. Most studies on Argentine economic history agree that the rate of growth in the XIXth. Century was very high.
- (17) E. C. L. A. "Desarrollo Económico de la Argentina" 1956, Data on National Product starts in 1900. See Anexo I.
- (18) Most of the literature of that time refers to characters who were civil servants, as people with a standard of living higher than that of small craftsmen and traders, though considerably lower than that of members of the upper stratum or upper middle.
- (19) Biale Massé, J., "Informe sobre el estado de las clases obreras en el interior de la República, Bs. As. 1904, Graw. On Santa Fe; vol. I p. 153; on Cordoba: vol I p. 134 and on Parana: vol. I p. 406.
- (20) Fares from Europe were so cheap that a seasonal worker could pay the passage with two weeks' wages. J. Scobie, "Una revolución agrícola en la Argentina", *Desarrollo Económico*, vol. 3 N° 1-2 April-September 1963, p. 135.
- (21) Scobie, J. *ibid.*, p. 122.
- (22) Ayarragaray, L., "Cuestiones y problemas argentinas" Lajouane Ed., Bs. As. 1926, p. 32 Cf. Scobie, *ibid.* p. 136.
- (23) Scobie, J., *ibid.*, p. 138. References to fortunes made in industry and commerce are very frequent in the literature. See Paterson, R., "Cien años, 1810-1910", Perroti, 1927; L. Pozzo Ardizzi, "Hombres del surco", Raigal, 1955; J. M. Pintos, "Así fue Buenos Aires", Coni, 1954; and others.

- (24) Scobie, J., *ibid.*, 121.
- (25) Martínez & Lewandowsky, "The Argentine in the XXth Century", Fisher Unwin, London. 1915, p. 132. Cf. E. Zeballos, "Descripción amana de la República Argentina", Bs. As. 1881-88, Peuser; R. Gaignard, "Origen y evolución de la pequeña propiedad campesina en la pampa seca argentina", *Desarrollo Económico*, vol. 6 N° 20. January-March 1966.
- (26) Germani, G. "Movilidad social en la Argentina", Instituto de Sociología, Bs. As. p. 8-9.
- (27) Germani, G., *ibid.*, p. 8.
- (28) Bialek Masse, J., *ibid.* vol. I, p. 41.
- (29) Bialek Masse, J., *ibid.* vol. I, p. 39.
- (30) Bialek Masse, J. *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 187-88.
- (31) Bialek Masse, J., *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 379.
- (32) The most dramatic case was that of wagon-drivers; Daireux, *ibid.*, tells the story of one of them and shows his hostile reaction to fencing. Cf. A. Junque, "La Literatura Social en la Argentina", Bs. As., Claridad, 1941, on the effect of railways on the old system of transportation.
- (33) Di Tella & Zymelman "Etapas del Desarrollo Económico", mimeograph edition, p. 422.
- (34) Germani, G. "Efectos Sociales de la Urbanización en un área obrera del Gran Buenos Aires", Bs. As., Instituto de Sociología, 1958. On economic motivation for migration.

- (35) In the literature there are frequent references to "provincianos" working in Santa Fe and Buenos Aires. Nevertheless there are no estimates of the number of internal immigrants during the first decades of this century. Lattes & Rechini are now working on this subject at the Di Tella Institute, Bs. As.
- (36) Germani, G. "Urbanización en la Argentina", Bs. As., Instituto de Sociología p. 40.
- (37) Germani, G. "Urbanización", p. 35.
- (38) E. C. L. A., first part, p. 119.
- (39) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Anexo p. 5
- (40) E. C. L. A., *ibid.*, Anexo, Index Numbers on p. 392 (table 20)
- (41) Ferrer, A. *ibid.*, p. 198.
- (42) See chapter II on the mechanism of prices, the exchange control and the transfer of income from agriculture to industry.
- (43) Real wages improved until 1949 when they started to worsen. Di Tella & Zymelman, *ibid.*, p. 464.
- (44) "Producto e Ingreso en la Argentina" Ministerio de Asuntos Técnicos, 1955, p. 121. The share of labour decreased between 1950 and 1954 from 60.9 to 59.6%.
- (45) Ferrer, A. *ibid.*, uses this concept in relation to labour.
- (46) Germani, G. "Estructura social de la Argentina", Raigal, Bs. As. 1955.
- (47) Germani, G. "Estructura social", p. 200.
- (48) Imaz, J. L. "Los que mandan", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1965.

- (49) Cf. Germani "La movilidad social", p. 15.
- (50) Ciberti, A. "El Desarrollo Agrario Argentino", Bs.As., EUDEBA, 1964, p. 42-50.
- (51) In 1950 there were 756 University Students per hundred thousand inhabitants; Argentina was the third country on a ranking prepared by Yale Political Data Program. See Germani, G., "Origen social de los estudiantes universitarios", Bs.As. Instituto de Sociologia, 1965.
- (52) In 1914 in the city of Buenos Aires nearly three quarters of the adult population were foreigners and in most of the Littoral provinces the proportion was around 50 to 60 per-cent (Germani's *Politica y Sociedad en una epoca de transicion*, Bs.As., Paidós, p. 188). On the other hand, in the poorest regions the proportion of foreigners was around 10 per-cent (Germani's *Estructura Social*, p. 88. Here the proportion refers to the whole population).
- (53) Germani, in *Novilidad Social*, estimates that two thirds of the middle strata in 1914 were made up by people of lower extraction; and taking into consideration only the foreign population that proportion amounted to 75 per-cent. p. 8. Similar estimates cannot be worked out for later periods as censuses do not give information on parents' nationality of the economically active population.
- (54) A.H.Feldman analyses the case of mobility within the lower stratum itself, as a result of changes in the economic activity. See "Economic Development and Social Mobility" in *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. VIII, No 3, April 1960.

TABLE: I

Occupational Strata. 1869

| | Employers and self-employed | Salary and wage-earners |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| I Estancieros, cattle-breeders | 46.545 | |
| Overseas merchants, dealers in land produce | 159 | |
| Bankers | 7 | 2 |
| 'Saladeristas' (meat-producers) | 68 | |
| Members of Parliament | | 17 |
| | 46.779 | 19 |
| II Intermediaries in land-produce | 251 | |
| Industrialists | 373 | |
| University trained professionals | 1.831 | |
| Entrepreneurs in services | 205 | |
| | 2.660 | |
| III Farmers | 8.667 | |
| 'Mayordomos' (ranch administrators) | | 543 |
| Professionals | 354 | |
| Artists | 1.871 | |
| Entrepreneurs in transport | 714 | |
| Building constructors | 6 | |
| Teachers and journalists | | 2.367 |
| Military men | | 9.113 |
| Qualified employees: transport | | 194 |
| | 11.612 | 12.217 |
| IV Craftsmen | 41.145 | |
| Agents | 924 | |
| Employees: civil service and commerce | | 3.345 |
| Entrepreneurs: Transport | 75 | |
| Employees: Transport | | 3.068 |
| | 42.145 | 6.413 |
| V Small farmers and tenant-farmers | 3.823 | |
| Miners | 1.261 | |
| Small entrepreneurs: services | 2.045 | |
| Traders and shop-keepers | 37.927 | |
| | 85.056 | |

TABLE I (2)
Occupational Strata. 1869

| | Employers and self-employed | Salary and wage-earners |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| VI Professionals | 1.620 | |
| Artists | 240 | |
| Vegetable-gardeners | 581 | |
| Masons, painters | 10.358 | |
| Small entrepreneurs: Transport | 5.032 | |
| Employees: transport | | 9.371 |
| Employees: services | | 10.114 |
| Skilled workers: industry | | 4.435 |
| | 17.831 | 23.920 |
| VII Peasants and shepherds | 115.155 | |
| Labour supervisors in estancias | | 4.267 |
| Skilled rural workers | | 2.941 |
| Small craftsman | 115.048 | |
| Workers: transport | | 9.148 |
| | 230.203 | 16.392 |
| VIII Hunters and fishermen; miners | 701 | 142 |
| Self-employed in artesanias | 100.004 | |
| Self-employed in construction, and workers | 201 | 245 |
| Peddlers | 1.158 | |
| Self-employed in services | 246 | |
| Workers: transport | | 1.823 |
| Domestic servants | | 24.362 |
| | 102.350 | 26.572 |
| IX Rural workers | | 164.316 |
| Industrial workers | | 16 |
| Self-employed in services | 37 | |
| Shop-assistants | | 156 |
| Workers: services | | 53 |
| Domestic servants | 36.580 | 58.703 |
| | 36.617 | 223.244 |

TABLE II

Occupational Strata by Economic Sector. 1869

| | Strata | Other Primary | Agriculture | Industry | Construct. | Commerce | Servi ces | Transp. | Total N |
|--------------|--------|------------------|-------------|----------|------------|----------|--------------|---------|------------|
| Upper | 1 | | 99.4 | 0.2 | | 0.3 | 0.1 | | 46.798 |
| | 2 | | | 14 | | | 86. | | 2.660 |
| | 3 | | 38.7 | | (0.03) | | 57.5 | 3.8 | 23.829 |
| Upper Middle | | | 34.8 | 1.4 | (0.02) | | 60.4 | 3.4 | 26.489 |
| Middle | 4 | | | 84.7 | | 6.9 | 1.9 | 6.5 | 48.558 |
| Lower Middle | 5 | 2.8 | 8.5 | | | 84.2 | 4.5 | | 45.056 |
| | 6 | - | 1.4 | 10.6 | 24.8 | | 28.7 | 34.5 | 41.751 |
| | 7 | | 49.6 | 46.7 | | | | 3.7 | 246.595 |
| | 8 | 0.6 | | 77.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 19.1 | 1.4 | 128.922 |
| | 9 | | 63.2 | (0.006) | | 0.1 | 36.7 | | 259.861 |
| Lower | | 0.1 | 42.4 | 32.4 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 19.5 | 3.8 | 677.129 |
| All Strata | | 0.2 | 41.1 | 30.9 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 17.9 | 3.5 | 844.030 |

TABLE III

Occupational Strata in Each Economic Sector. 1869

| | Strata | Other Primary | Agriculture | Industry | Construct. | Commerce | Servi ce | Transp. | All Sectors |
|--------------|--------|------------------|-------------|----------|------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------------|
| Upper | 1 | | 13.4 | (0.026) | | 0.4 | (0.017) | | 5.5 |
| | 2 | | | 0.1 | | - | 1.5 | | 0.3 |
| | 3 | | 2.6 | | (0) | - | 9.1 | 3.1 | 2.8 |
| Upper Middle | | | 2.6 | 0.1 | - | - | 10.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| Middle | 4 | | | 15.8 | | 7.8 | 0.6 | 10.6 | 5.8 |
| Lower Middle | 5 | | 1.10 | | | 88.7 | 1.4 | | 5.3 |
| | 6 | | 0.2 | 1.7 | 95.9 | | 7.9 | 48.9 | 5 |
| | 7 | | 35.3 | 44.1 | | | | 31.2 | 29.2 |
| | 8 | | | 38.3 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 16.3 | 6.2 | 15.3 |
| | 9 | | 47.4 | (0.01) | | 0.4 | 63.2 | | 30.8 |
| Lower | | | 82.9 | 84.1 | 100 | 3.1 | 87.4 | 86.3 | 80.3 |
| Total | N | | 364.838 | 261.130 | 10.810 | 42.750 | 150.937 | 29.461 | 844.030 |

TABLE IV
Occupational Strata 1914

| Strata | Employers and self-employed | Salary and wage-earners |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| I Estancieros: more than 12 thousand Hes. in ranching or 5 thousand in farming: | 2.444 | |
| Industrialists: more than 500 thou- sand pesos of investment | 246 | |
| Road builders: more than 750 thou- sand pesos of investment | 20 | |
| Overseas Merchants: more than 350 thousand pesos of investment | 1.000 | |
| Bankers: Entrepreneurs in services (more than 450 thousand pesos of investment) | 79 | |
| | <u>3.789</u> | |
| II Estancieros: Between one and 12 thou- sand Hes. in ranching and 300 and 5 thousand in farming | 58.536 | |
| Industrialists: Between 125 thousand and 500 thousand pesos investment | 1.163 | |
| Building constructors: more than 135 thousand pesos investment | 276 | |
| Merchants: between 165 thousand and 300 thousand pesos investment | 4.096 | |
| | <u>64.071</u> | |
| III Farmers: between 75 and 300 Hes. | 98.205 | |
| Industrialist: less than 125 thousand pe- sos investment | 8.597 | |
| 'Contratistas' (Intermediaries) | 35 | |
| Traders: between 45 and 300 thousand pesos investment | 11.716 | |
| Entrepreneurs in services: between 75 and 300 thousand pesos investment | 7.831 | |
| Top administrators in commerce | | 1.298 |
| University trained professionals | 19.945 | |
| | <u>146.329</u> | <u>1.298</u> |

TABLE IV (2)
Occupational Strata: 1914

| Strata | | Employers and self-employed | Salary and wage-earners |
|---------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| IV | Farmers and colonists: less than 75 Hs. | 191.766 | |
| | 'Mayordomos' (ranch administrators) | | 2.298 |
| | Craftsmen: between 45 and 125 thousand pesos investment | 36.975 | |
| | Building constructors | 7.349 | |
| | Entrepreneurs in services, Agents, between 15 and 75 thousand pesos investment | 5.652 | |
| | Entrepreneurs in transport | 355 | |
| | Qualified clerks in services | | 346 |
| | Employees: railways and other transportation | | 33.760 |
| | Professionals | 5.437 | |
| | Teachers, journalists, artists | 3.852 | 49.434 |
| | | 251.386 | 85.838 |
| V | Craftsmen: between 15 and 45 thousand pesos investment | 54.774 | |
| | Employees: industry | | 12.569 |
| | Traders: between 15 and 45 thousand pesos investment | 19.754 | |
| | Agents | 1.231 | |
| | Civil Servants | | 113.809 |
| | | 75.759 | 126.378 |
| VI | Small farmers, vegetable gardeners, etc. | 33.255 | |
| | Craftsmen: less than 15 thousand pesos investment | 257.140 | 5.072 |
| | Shopkeepers: less than 15 thousand pesos investment | 139.723 | |
| | Shop-assistants and employees | | 147.563 |
| | Agents | 2.753 | |
| | Employees in services | | 362 |
| | Self-employed in transportation | 594 | |
| | Professionals | 2.561 | |
| | | 436.026 | 152.997 |

TABLE IV (3)
Occupational Strata: 1914

| Strata | | Employers and self-employed | Salary and wage-earners |
|--------|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| VII | Labour supervisors in 'estancias' | | 1.231 |
| | Skilled artisans | 15.831 | |
| | Skilled industrial workers | | 40.682 |
| | Self-employed in building construction | 86.940 | |
| | Small shop-keepers | 9.470 | |
| | Self-employed in services | 33.988 | |
| | Un-qualified employees in services | | 17.592 |
| | Un-qualified employees in transport | | 45.292 |
| | Skilled transport workers | | 10.986 |
| | Domestic servants | | 2.013 |
| | | <u>146.229</u> | <u>117.706</u> |
| VIII | Shepherds and peasants | 107.470 | |
| | Rural workers | | 25.185 |
| | Seamstresses | 142.748 | |
| | Hunters and miners | 590 | 1.825 |
| | Shop-assistants | | 18.083 |
| | Self-employed in services | 4.817 | |
| | Self-employed in transportation | 26.210 | |
| | Unskilled workers in transportation | | 6.671 |
| | Domestic servants | | 117.626 |
| | | <u>281.835</u> | <u>169.390</u> |
| IX | Rural day-labourers | | 300.626 |
| | Industrial workers | | 327.637 |
| | Workers in building construction | | 12.333 |
| | Workers in energy | | 8.100 |
| | Workers in commerce | | 64.589 |
| | Workers in services | | 64.392 |
| | Workers in transport | | 54.526 |
| | Peddlers | 18.770 | |
| | Domestic servants | | 199.700 |
| | Workers, unknown sector | | 1.388 |
| | | <u>18.770</u> | <u>1.033.291</u> |

TABLE V

Occupational Strata by Economic Sectors 1914

| Strata | Mining | Agriculture | Indus- try | Construc- tion | Energy | Commerce | Servi- ces | Transport | All Sectors |
|--------------|--------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | | 64.6 | 6.4 | 0.5 | | 26.4 | 2.1 | | 3.789 |
| 2 | | 91.4 | 1.8 | 0.4 | | 6.4 | | | 64.071 |
| Upper | | 89.9 | 2.1 | 0.4 | | 7.5 | 0.1 | | 67.860 |
| Upper Middle | | 66.6 | 5.8 | (0.02) | | 8.6 | 18.8 | | 147.627 |
| 4 | | 57.5 | 11. | 2.2 | | | 19.2 | 10.1 | 337.224 |
| 5 | | | 35.3 | | | 9.8 | 56.9 | | 202.137 |
| Middle | | 56. | 19.3 | 1.4 | | 3.7 | 33.3 | 6.3 | 539.361 |
| Lower Middle | | 5.6 | 44.5 | | | 48.5 | 1. | 0.1 | 589.023 |
| 7 | | 0.5 | 21.4 | 32.9 | | 3.6 | 20.3 | 21.3 | 263.935 |
| 8 | 0.5 | 29.4 | 31.7 | | | 4. | 27.1 | 7.3 | 451.225 |
| 9 | | 28.6 | 31.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 7.9 | 25.1 | 5.2 | 1.052.061 |
| Lower | 0.1 | 24.6 | 29.8 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 6.3 | 24.9 | 8.1 | 1.767.221 |
| All Strata | 0.1 | 26.4 | 29.1 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 14. | 21. | 5.7 | 3.111.092 |

TABLE VI

Occupational Strata in Each Economic Sector: 1914

| Strata | Mining | Agriculture | Indus- try | Construc- tion | Energy | Commerce | Servi- ces | Transport | All Sectors |
|--------------|--------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | | 0.3 | (0.03) | 0.02 | | 0.23 | (0.01) | | 0.1 |
| 2 | | 7.1 | 0.13 | 0.26 | | 0.94 | | | 2.1 |
| Upper | | 7.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | | 1.2 | | | 2.2 |
| Upper Middle | 3 | 12. | 0.9 | (0.03) | | 3. | 4.3 | | 4.8 |
| 4 | | 23.6 | 4.1 | 6.9 | | | 9.9 | 19.1 | 10.8 |
| 5 | | | 7.4 | | | 4.5 | 17.6 | | 6.5 |
| Middle | | 23.6 | 11.5 | 6.9 | | 4.5 | 27.5 | 19.1 | 17.3 |
| Lower Middle | 6 | 4. | 29. | | | 65.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 18.9 |
| 7 | | 0.2 | 6.3 | 81.3 | | 2.2 | 8.2 | 31.5 | 8.5 |
| 8 | | 16.2 | 15.8 | | | 4.1 | 18.7 | 18.5 | 14.5 |
| 9 | | 36.6 | 36.3 | 11.5 | | 19.1 | 40.4 | 30.6 | 33.8 |
| Lower | | 53. | 58.7 | 92.8 | | 25.4 | 67.3 | 80.6 | 56.8 |
| N | 2.415 | 821.016 | 903.434 | 106.953 | 8.100 | 436.062 | 653.420 | 178.304 | 3.111.092 |
| | | | | | | | | | n.k. 2.248 |
| | | | | | | | | | 3.113.340 |

TABLE: VII
Occupational Strata: 1947

| Strata | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| UPPER - Estancieros: more than 2 or 3 thousand Hs. | 40 | | 40 |
| Big industrialists, owners of firms with an average employment of 200 workers | 10 | | |
| Top executives of industrial firms | | 7 | 17 |
| Big merchants and entrepreneurs in services | 21 | | |
| Administrators, Top Civil Servants, University trained professionals | | 22 | 43 |
| | 71 | 29 | 100% |
| UPPER MIDDLE - Estancieros and farmers: between 200 and 2,000 Hs. | 16 | | |
| Administrators of Agricultural concerns | | 1 | 17 |
| Industrialists: owners of firms with average employment of 11/12 workers | 14 | | |
| Technicians, executives, profe- ssionals in industry | | 7 | 21 |

TABLE VII (2)
Occupational Strata: 1947

| Strata | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Whole-sale merchants: owners of concerns with an average employment of 7 shop-assistants; entrepreneurs in transport (employment of 65 workers) and services (employment of 8), traders (4-5 employees) | 21 | | |
| Professionals | 18 | | |
| Technicians, administrators, professionals, and Civil Servants | | 19 | 58 |
| Rentiers | 4 | | 4 |
| | 73 | 27 | 100% |
| MIDDLE - Small farmers and tenant-farmers, share-croppers: less than 200 Hs. | 23.9 | | |
| Employees in farms and ranches | | 1.2 | 25.1 |
| Small industrialists: less than 10 workers (average 1 or 2 workers); craftsmen | 7.1 | | |
| White-collars in industry | | 6 | 13.1 |
| Shop-keepers, small entrepreneurs (1 or 2 employers) | 14.3 | | |
| Shop-assistants, white-collars Civil-servants | | 37.2 | 51.5 |
| Small rentiers, pensioners | 3.1 | 7.2 | 10.3 |
| | 48.4 | 51.6 | 100% |

TABLE VII (3)
Occupational Strata: 1947

| Strata | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| LOWER - Rural Workers | | 25 | |
| Self-employed in Agriculture | 1.7 | | 26.7 |
| Industrial Workers of concerns with an employment of: 100 wor- kers or more | | 11.4 | |
| between 10 and 99 workers | | 8.5 | |
| between 2 and 9 workers | | 4.3 | |
| with one worker | | 8.8 | |
| self-employed in industry | 3.7 | | 36.7 |
| Workers of the Tertiary Sector Em- ployed in concerns with an employ- ment of 100 workers or more | | 7.4 | |
| between 10 and 99 workers | | 3.5 | |
| between 2 and 9 workers | | 3.3 | |
| with one worker | | 16. | |
| Self-employed in Tertiary activities | 2.7 | | 32.9 |
| Workers, unknown sector | | 3.8 | |
| Self-employed, unknown sector | 0.2 | | 4 |
| | 8.3 | 91.7 | 100% |

TABLE VIII

Proportion of Employers and Self-Employed in each Stratum

| | 1869 | 1914 | 1947 |
|--------------|------|------|------|
| UPPER | 100 | 100 | 71 |
| UPPER MIDDLE | 53.9 | 99.1 | 73 |
| MIDDLE | 86.6 | 60.7 | 48.4 |
| LOWER MIDDLE | 100 | 74 | |
| LOWER | 57.2 | 24.4 | 8.3 |
| ALL STRATA | 63.4 | 43.3 | 26.1 |

TABLE IX

Occupational Strata

| | 1869 | 1914 | 1947 |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| UPPER | 5.5 | 2.2 | 0.7 |
| UPPER MIDDLE | 3.1 | 4.8 | 6.6 |
| MIDDLE | 5.8 | 17.3 | 32.9 |
| LOWER MIDDLE | 5.3 | 18.9 | |
| LOWER | 80.3 | 56.8 | 59.8 |
| N | 844.030 | 3.111.092 | 6.449.000 |

TABLE: X

Occupational Strata
Agriculture

| | 1869 | 1914 | 1947 |
|--------------|---------|---------|-----------|
| UPPER | | 7.4 | 1 |
| | 13.4 | | |
| UPPER MIDDLE | | 12 | 4.5 |
| MIDDLE | 2.6 | 23.6 | 32.2 |
| LOWER MIDDLE | 1.1 | 4 | |
| | | | 62.3 |
| LOWER | 82.9 | 53 | |
| N | 346.838 | 821.016 | 1.677.393 |

TABLE: XI

Occupational Strata
Secondary Sector

| STRATA | 1869 | 1914 | 1947 |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| UPPER | (0.03) | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| UPPER MIDDLE | 0.2 | 0.8 | 5.1 |
| MIDDLE | 15.1 | 11 | 15.5 |
| LOWER MIDDLE | - | 25.7 | 79 |
| LOWER | 84.7 | 62.3 | |
| N | 271.940 | 1.018.487 | 1.792.822 |

TABLE: XII

Occupational Strata
Tertiary Sector

| STRATA | 1869 | 1914 | 1947 |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| UPPER | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| UPPER MIDDLE | 7.6 | 3.1 | 9.6 |
| MIDDLE | 3.3 | 18.3 | 41.7 |
| LOWER MIDDLE | 17.9 | 23.1 | 48 |
| LOWER | 71.1 | 55.2 | |
| N | 223.148 | 1.267.786 | 2.624.743 |

4. SOCIAL ORDER OF STRATIFICATION

The social order of the River Plate can be described as a period of status groups that to a large extent corresponded to an ethnic segregation of the population. On the one hand, Spaniards and their descendants made up the 'Gente Principal' or 'Gente Decente' (Fine People), whereas, on the other, Indians and Mestizos constituted the 'Gente Inferior' (Inferiors) (1). The Conquest permitted this ethnic differentiation, which was guaranteed by convention and law. Besides this system acquired stability by the legal monopolization of economic opportunities by members of the upper stratum.

However, status distinctions were not equally sharp everywhere in the River Plate; neither were they always accompanied by extreme economic inequalities. By far the most important factor here was the existence, or otherwise, of an Indian population(2). In the North West and Center, Indians were abundant and incorporated into the socio-economic framework set up by the Spaniards. There the ethnic distinction served as the foundation of the legal monopolization of economic privileges as well as of the exercise of government. Such was the case in Salta, where "a population of Indians and Mestizos was governed by an arrogant wealthy aristocracy, owners of estancias who also controlled commerce so much that they enjoyed an economic power without parallel in the River Plate" (3).

This hierarchical division between "Gente Principal" and "Gente Inferior" based on status of birth existed in the Littoral as well. But

there, it lacked the type of stability achieved through a stable distribution of economic power. In the Pampa the system of "encomienda" failed because there were no Indians to be exploited. Descendants of the first settlers enjoyed by birthright the legal monopoly of cattle-hunting (4), but any attempt to enforce that monopoly by law failed in practice through the impossibility of exercising actual control (5). Another important difference was the fact that the "Gente Inferior" did not necessarily maintain economic links with the Fine People. This was particularly so in the "campesía" (country-side) where "gauchos" hunted cattle, lived off their carcasses, made furniture of their bones for their houses and their miserable huts, fashioned clothing from their hides, and by selling hides, provided Buenos Aires with an export staple and themselves with their few wants: cloth, iron, and steel implements, mate, and tobacco." So "the gaucho did not depend upon a money wage for his existence, nor upon the possession of a piece of land, nor was he obliged to engage in sustained labour for a master" (6).

Both in the Interior and Littoral, status ascription recognized no economic qualification, for among the Fine People money did not introduce status differences. However, on the whole, the latter was a much more fluid society than the former. As we have seen, a clear economic monopolization based on birthright was impossible; besides, the flow of people between country and city was more intense and therefore any control over birth-status difficult. The first "accioneros" and those who obtained grants of land (suertes de estancia) were city people

who eventually moved definitely to the country and became estancieros, though they never severed their links with Buenos Aires. Furthermore they were a group always open to new proprietors or wealthy city-people (7).

The first important impact of agricultural development on this social order was the transformation of the social elite itself. This was the result of the differential economic success their members achieved during that process. An aristocracy with a European style of life developed, leaving in the background some of the old fine families. The second important change was the definitive incorporation of 'gauchos' into the new economic life of the Pampa. And thirdly, there was the coming into existence of a foreign population, who led a different style of life and were felt to be alien by the rest of society.

Whereas the former phenomena may be associated with agricultural development, more recently industrialization brought to the fore a section of the native population known as "cabecitas negras" (black little heads). Most of them were inhabitants of shanty-towns in big cities who had migrated in the thirties and forties from rural and semi-rural areas. As their name denotes, they were as a rule darker than the majority of the population of their new area of residence.

By no means was the "Gente Principal" of the River Plate comparable in social or economic standing to the aristocracy of either Lima or Mexico. The River Plate was a minor colony where members

of the Spanish nobility were occasionally sent as Crown Officials. Neither were economic opportunities tempting enough to attract the settlement of a large number of selected Spaniards (8). This was more so in the Littoral where the material well-being remained low even throughout the first half of XIX th. Century (9).

At this stage, disposition over income did not affect the access of a family into the upper circle. Jose A. Wilde remembers that the 'tertulias' (parties) in the houses of the most notable families were open to any 'decent person' introduced by one of the 'tertulianos' (guests). And he remarks that "tertulias were not given only by the wealthier, as they also took place in the houses of decent families of medium resources"(10). And another witness, Lucio Mansilla, in his memoirs refers to the exclusion of 'guarangos platudos' (ill-bred rich) because of their 'plebeian' condition . (11).

The pronounced increase in income of the second half of the century introduced an element of differentiation among those families. This occurred as a consequence of different economic achievement reflected in differential chances to maintain the new style of life. Changes in the style of life of the upper social circle were truly remarkable. (Here we shall refer to it as high class). We cannot be precise about the period, but most of our evidence would indicate that they were most intense between 1870 and 1890. And by the end of the century the transformation of the material consumption had reached an astonishing pitch. Top families disposed of large fortunes which

were ostentatiously spent. The European influence in their style of life was shown in the houses they built, both in town and country, in their European clothing, even in their preference for French cuisine. Witnesses remarked: "Dining is in European style; gentlemen wear evening dress, and as for the ladies, it is impossible to describe what the Parisian designers provide for the rich families of our high society"(12). "One is amazed at the magnificent Palaces some of the wealthy natives have built"(13)... and, "households are splendid. .. tapestries, bronzes, Italian Renaissance plates, Sevres dinner-sets, curtains and carpets, all brought from Paris". (14).

However, large income alone cannot explain the bearing of 'aristocratic' attitudes and manners on the part of the high class. For high consumption might have been accompanied by a different style of consumption. P. Baudin, among others, wonders at the fact that: this society... keeps up class habits that have long ago disappeared in our European society. Their good taste, and Parisian elegance, without a false note, are remarkable ... "(15).

The fact that Argentines chose the European Upper Classes as a model to be imitated was not an isolated event. It was the effect of a more generalized attitude which found expression in cultural as well as economic matters. Liberalism had provided the Independence Movements and that of the National Organisation with an ideology which remained alive for several generations to come. And the economy of the country had been successfully tied up to the European market. Europe

was thus bound to furnish a model of social behaviour. There is also another historical reason: Spanish tradition with its emphasis on "hidalguia" (nobility) certainly played an important role in the development of aristocratic attitudes.

Though family origin continued to be emphasized, the style of life defined membership of the upper social circle. Many old fine families "though esteemed, remained in the background"(16) as their income imposed a limit to their style of life (at least as far as material consumption was concerned). In "La Gran Aldea" Lucio V. López paints a masterly picture of the transition between past and present (17), and Mansilla regrets the decline of many old families (18).

Links between the wealthy aristocracy and their less fortunate relatives survived in spite of their different styles. But, in the course of time these differences led to a differentiation in terms of prestige and eventually to a loosening of these links. The incapacity of many families to keep up with their wealthier relatives and friends must have diminished their chances of frequenting the proper circles (Fray Mocho was fond of ridiculing the efforts of poor "decent families" to maintain their links with these circle) (19).

As the acquisition of the proper style of life was crucial to gain access to the upper circle, family origin could be sometimes overcome. In Mansilla's words "take the case of those English and Irish of the "Calle del 5" who made money and now belong to "lo más chic" of Buenos Aires, like many other (foreigners who used to sell

pork, sausages or oranges). And the son of the country is decaying. Except for few families, the rest are vanishing"(20).

Nonetheless the importance of lineage as a symbol of status did not decrease. Very likely good families of scanty resources served as a channel of access of newcomers to the upper circle of the wealthy aristocracy. Thus intermarriage between fine poor and new rich fused "lineage" with economic standing.

By the end of the century the aristocracy had consolidated as a status group. It had developed a peculiar style of life, and established a set of criteria to decide who "belonged". As well as social honour, the high class enjoyed wealth and controlled political power. "Though their character of great landowners was decisive, their social standing depended also on their long residence and active participation in the institutional life of the country" (21). Even today when the high class no longer control political power or are the sole enjoyers of wealth, they still monopolize social honour. Moreover, they generally define themselves as descendants of traditional families, attribute their prestige to their family origin and style of life, and use as criterion of membership the frequentation of the same circles (22).

Unlike the social elite, the lower native group retained their traditional style of life for a longer period. We discussed above the social and economic conditions of what was known as "gente inferior". We said that in regions where Indians were numerous status differences were stronger and followed more clearly an ethnic line. Indians and

Mestizos bore upon them a social stigma based on blood and reinforced by the belief in their supposed inborn character, namely laziness, apathy and contempt of the law (23). The native "peones" of the Littoral shared that stigma though in their case ethnic considerations were definitively weaker. By the end of the century that stigma vanished and the social perception of "peones" was neutral, or even came to be adorned with elements of glorification. This was a phenomenon circumscribed to the "peon" of the pampas, because the rest of the "criollo" population of the Interior continued to be an object of social contempt. We shall return to this later on.

As old a settler as any member of the high class (perhaps older) the "peon" was the cultural heir of that other country-man called "gaucho". The "Gaucho" did not recognize any other private property than houses, gardens and domestic animals. Land belonged to nobody, and cattle to the hunter. He was generous and hospitable; for hospitality was a "principle of the camp" for both "gaucho" and "estanciero". Questioning an unknown guest was the rudest behavior anyone could imagine.

In a period when none but a very small minority could make money out of the exploitation of the land, it is not surprising that the "gaucho" was not concerned with money. The gaucho "lacked regularity of habits, thrift, provision for the future and rational planning of his behaviour" (24). Everything depended on his personal ability. "as he had to be able to find his way over the pampa, to catch his food and

build his shelter (25). Hence his individualism and rejection of all established authority, and acceptance only of leadership based on his acknowledgement of the personal qualities of the chief. Eventually his incorporation into the work on estancias, and the fencing of land, improvement of cattle, farming, and the railways put an end to his free existence (26).

In spite of all these changes in labour conditions the "peones" retained many features of the personality of the 'gaucho', particularly his apathetic attitude towards making money. This seems to have been a very widespread characteristic of the native lower strata. Wilcken remarks that "The grave defect of a native colonist is that he is a spendthrift who misuses his money, never thinks either of improving his land or of increasing his personal comfort... but on the other hand he is reluctant to incur debts and honest in fulfilling his duties" (27).

Hospitality, generosity, honesty and the endurance of hard conditions of labour seem to have been features the peon inherited from the gaucho. He also inherited his lack of regularity of habits and his refusal to save. In fact all these were characteristics very much in accordance with the style of life 'peones' maintained. The estancia was a world in itself, where everything they basically needed was provided. It provided food and shelter to "loyal peones", as loyalty was the counterpart of protection. Insofar as the peon kept faithful to his patron, the patron would protect him. The estanciero was a kind of pater-familias and the identification of the peon with the estancia reached

unimaginable levels as... "he was fearless, resourceful and faithful, and endured fatigue to a remarkable degree" (28).

In many ways the "peones" reflected the same values as the old aristocracy which had gone to the background when the wealthy aristocracy came into being. The peones were the bearers of the traditional way of life, with their refusal to make money, their nobility of feelings, their cult of the Past, and even in their attachment to natural leadership.

Foreign immigrants were as far from "peones" and other lower native groups as from the high class. Foreigners were not only different in national origin but also in style of life. As a whole they had characteristics of their own. In an overwhelming proportion they had been recruited from the lowest European strata. Secondly, they had immigrated because they had expectations of making money ("a hacer la América") (29). And finally no matter how successful they eventually became, all of them started under conditions of great personal sacrifice.

Even though foreigners were positively motivated towards money-making this was a feature largely imposed on them by the conditions of their immigration. Earning a living was their fate, and it demanded a great deal of fortitude and sacrifice. This mixture of orientation towards economic achievement and hard external conditions affected the "foreigner's" style of life.

The first settlers became "colonos" (colonists); later on, when

the State disengaged itself from promoting farming colonization and big landowners took over the task, foreigners became tenants in large states, share-croppers or just seasonal labourers during the harvest. Many left the camp, or never went there at all, and concentrated in urban areas where they developed crafts, industries or engaged in commerce (see Appendix V).

At the beginning, life in the colonies was miserable, partly due to climatic misfortunes, partly to lack training in farming on the part of the colonists. Those who persevered eventually succeeded in making money. Reports on the conditions of living in colonies agree in emphasizing three features: first, the adverse conditions colonists had to endure at the beginning; secondly, colonists' greed for money; and thirdly, the relative prosperity they were eventually able to enjoy (30).

In 1873 Wilcken said: "The European farmer is mean and selfish as far as his pocket is concerned .. and because he has discovered the profit children's work can bring he not only refuses to contribute to the foundation of schools but believes he makes a great sacrifice by sending his children to State Schools when they could be looking after cattle or working at the plough-tail"(31). "Being rich, colonists have not had the energy to do anything for their religion. Catholic Priests have remained in the colonies because they are paid by the State; but Protestant ones have had to emigrate lest they died of starvation"(32).

The fate of share-croppers and tenants was even harder than that of colonists ... "To work like beasts was a typical expression applicable to immigrants" (33). "Their sacrifice, consisting in a stern thrifty behaviour, aimed at paying the land to the contractist" (34).. .. They live in miserable huts, having no thoughts but to scrape together dollars, ! dollars !, ! dollars !, either to buy land with or to turn them into gold and return to Italy". "Of course, they did make money much - money... (35)... " The poor immigrant with nothing but his muscle and his industry, has a long and rough road to travel before he reaches independence as a landed proprietor" (36).

The life story of foreign artisans, traders or workers did not differ significantly from those formerly described. Different context, now urban, and other activities, but under the same conditions and aiming at the same goal. V. Galvez tells the story of Gaetano, an Italian, who, associated with other fellow immigrants, cobbled shoes during the day and at night trudged along the streets grinding his hurdy-gurdy. He lived in a "conventillo" (common lodging house) sharing a room with five other "paisanos" (fellow countrymen); ate "polenta" (ground maize), bread and onions and drank cheap wine; he rested only on Sundays. Every month he deposited in a bank what he had been able to save, until he could buy the ground where he built two rooms, one for himself, the other to be let. His life did not change; he continued cobbling shoes during the day and grinding his organ at night. When he saved enough money he brought his nephew from Italy. This

nephew followed Gaetano's example and was eventually able to work on his own; made money and got married. He expected his son would become a lawyer or a journalist (37).

It is difficult to speak of discrimination in the case of foreign immigrants, but, without any doubt there existed rejection on the part of the native population. Their lack of fortune and refinement excluded them from having social contacts with members of the high class even though national origin itself was not a barrier to joining upper circles. Many foreigners or their descendents became distinguished members of the high class, either because their immigration had taken place under different conditions or because their families had come to the country in a previous period and made fortunes as many other families of Spanish origin had done. On the other hand the native "peones" distrusted them to the point of being sometimes hostile.

The key factor in the rejection of foreigners seems to have been their real or supposed orientation towards money. A value eschewed by the high class, that enjoyed money but refused to accept money-making as a rule of life; by those who did not succeed in making money (perhaps as a self-justification) and finally by lower native groups who neither possessed money nor strove to acquire it.

However, the image of foreigners varies from group to group. The social elite and remnants of the old fine people emphasized above all their low origin and lack of education. In the past the leaders of the Organizational Period had dreamt of thousands of immigrants who, as

well as introducing new techniques, would even change the ethnic characteristics of the native population (38) (Of course, they were thinking of the lower strata). That "cultured" population never came, except in small numbers. Germani has prepared a table where immigrants were classified by their occupation at the time of arrival. In the whole period, 1857-1924, more than ninety per-cent belonged to manual occupations (39), either peasants or labourers. Gaston Gori quotes remarks by Sarmiento and Mitre, both prominent political leaders of the XIX th. Century, which show their contempt for immigrants (40).

The emphasis on the immigrant's avarice was more frequent among other 'decent people'. The stereotype of 'gringos' and 'gallegos' as mean and ignorant is frequent in essays, novels and stories. The bitterest attack on 'gringos' on that ground can be found in Maciel's "La Italianización de los Argentinos"(41). And Fray Mocho, who best ridiculed the "Fine People", frequently used their resentment against immigrants as a subject of his stories (42). In a different tone, Mansilla complained of the decline of good families and the uprising of poor immigrants "who had the law of supply and demand as rule of life, ... and whose only preoccupation was how foodstuffs could be more economically adulterated." (Though Mansilla was a member of the high class, he grieved over the decline of the old good families). (43).

The rejection of foreigners among poor "criollos" was of a different nature; though they also disliked the gringos' greed, the stigma

of cowardice and lack of virility was a still stronger reason for rejection. Besides the "criollo" distrusted the rich as much as the poor foreigner. There was resentment against the "gringo angurriente" owner of a big ranch who did not adopt the paternalistic attitude of the "estanciero criollo"(44), and against the railways that came to snatch the poor man's bread (45). But there was also profound contempt for the "gringo maula" who did not know how to defend his honour or even care about it" (46).

The reaction against foreigners was aggravated by two other factors. First of all, by their large number and geographical concentration; and second, by to the nature of their economic activities (see Appendix V).

Germani remarks that "the size of immigration, in relation to the native residents was such that one could speak of a substantial renovation of the population of the country." And adds, "there is no other case, not even United States, in which the proportion of foreigners among the adult population had reached a level as in Argentina. There, for more than sixty years, foreigners made up about seventy per cent of the adult population in the city of Buenos Aires, and nearly a half in the group of most important Provinces (47).

Moreover foreigners introduced a strange element in the economic life of the community. They were farmers, traders, shopkeepers, industrialists, artisans, industrial workers, etc. All professions where the natives were less numerous. Their quasi-monopoly of these

professions added to their number, and their concentration made their physical existence patently visible and their different style of life could not pass unnoticed.

However that attitude of refusal and resentment cannot have been very intense since it faded away with the passing of time. "After sixty years of massive immigration, the fusion of natives and foreigners in a relatively integrated national union, emerged in spite of tensions and conflicts" (48). Germani attributes this process to the integrative role played by the Argentine-born children of foreigners, as well as to the interruption of massive immigration after 1930, and finally to the peculiar characteristics of Spaniards and Italians (The two major currents of immigration) (49).

A foreigner's children were Argentine from a legal point of view, and regarded themselves as such. In this respect the existence of intermarriage played an important role. As the proportion of males among foreigners was high, they sometimes married native women; the reverse, though it existed, was less frequent (50). Besides, the state system of education contributed to creating a sense of identification with the country and her history. Though some foreign communities settled their own educational establishments, the overwhelming majority of children attended national schools. In any case, state control over private schools was very strict, to the extent of fixing their curricula. (Till our days, foreign schools that do not respect the state curricula are not entitled to grant degrees valid in the Argentine). Finally, due

This still raises the point of 'imitation' of 'u. c.'.

to differential economic achievement among foreigners, their style of life departed in various ways from the old pattern. This was even more evident in the case of their descendants (51). Some became members of the high class, as money and a proper education were accepted channels of access (52). As to the majority, today it is difficult to discover whether they have differentiated in terms of status or still only differ in material aspects of style of life as associated with level of income. However, if the present middle class generation acquires economic stability, they (or their children) may develop patterns of behaviour of their own and differentiate from the working class whatever their level of income (and material consumption) may be.

The fusion between foreigners and natives was more intense in the Littoral than in the rest of the country, where the former rarely settled. Particularly in the North-West and East the native population remained more isolated both from an ethnical and cultural point of view.

Internal migrations had long existed in Argentina, but they acquired real intensity in the thirties and forties, when a large number of people mobilized every year towards cities in search of jobs (the main center of attraction was greater Buenos Aires) (53). This was a process closely related to industrialization, as it was the expansion of industry that offered more occupational opportunities.

We mentioned, already that poor people of the Interior bore upon

them a social stigma whose origin dated from the Colonial Period. Bialeto Masse, in a report issued in 1904, denounced their economic exploitation and miserable living conditions, and assumed the defense of the poor criollo praising his virtues and justifying his defects. Bialeto's aim was to obtain the intervention of the Government in favour of the poor and he also tried to stir up public opinion against what he thought was an open attitude of ethnic discrimination (54).

The social vindication of "gauchos" and "peones" did not reach all native lower groups. This could be partially explained by the different economic role they played. Peones eventually became incorporated into the economic life of what was the unquestionable center of the country: agriculture in the Pampean Region. They played their role according to what was expected of them. They fitted in with that society, as their behaviour, attitudes and values were functional to the existing state of affairs. The rest of the native lower group remained outside, both socially and geographically. Besides, the peones entered the political arena within the framework of the traditional parties. They supported either Conservatives or Radicals, but in any case within the accepted rules of the game. When "cabecitas negras" became incorporated into the life of the big cities of the Littoral to their economic claims, they added demands for political participation (55). In 1945 the Cabecitas Negras gave their support to Peron and it was then that their existence became apparent (Though this fact contributed to their being looked down upon by those sections of the population

who opposed Peron, it does seem to have been a determinant factor).

However, there was no perfect correlation among the qualities: migrant, dark, poor, and the label: 'cabecita negra', as no single feature sufficed to classify a person as such. There had to be a simultaneous possession of all three features apart from the fact that the majority of them lived in shanty-towns.

We cannot assess how much the history of contempt weighed in the reaction provoked by "cabecitas negras"; but we see a continuity between past and present. That is, the contempt for the poor criollo of the Interior had always existed, and was awakened by their presence in a territory which was not their own. In this latter respect there is something in common between "cabecitas negras" and immigrants. Both groups took possession of a territory which was not their own in a relatively short period; and because of their large number they quickly became apparent to older residents. They were "strange"; outsiders whose presence could not be overlooked.

In 1958, Germani conducted a survey in a working class area of Greater Buenos Aires. In this research he selected three different groups as units of analysis. The first was made up by families of recent migrants who lived in a shanty-town; the second were migrants of older residence, living in the urbanized section adjacent to that shanty-town ; and finally, he took as control group locally-born families, residents also of the same urbanized section (56).

There are two important findings in this survey. The first is

concerned with the existence of an economic motivation behind the decision to migrate. Search for jobs, expectation of better wages and living conditions prevailed among migrants' answers. Secondly, from the point of view of patterns of behaviour, migrants of older residence were nearer to the locally born than to recent migrants. As Germani concludes, this fact would indicate a process of assimilation on the part of older migrants which may be expected to happen also among recent migrants. However, what remains to be answered is whether they will disappear as a separate status group once they become assimilated into the recipient society. We are inclined to think that it will happen.

Our prediction is based on the important role economic development has played in relation to stratification by status. The departure was a social order where status considerations were stronger than economic ones. Though status groups were based on the monopolization of economic opportunities, the access to these opportunities was itself a consequence of membership of status groups and not the other way round. Besides, membership of status groups was reinforced by the existence of a variable degree of ethnic segregation. In regions like the Pampean where Indians did not submit to the Spaniards, stratification by status was more fluid (except in the case of negro slaves). It was in this region where all the most important changes took place, as economic development geographically concentrated there (with the exception of a few other places in the Interior).

As a consequence of differential economic achievement the social elite itself became transformed. Material aspects of their style of life changed profoundly and if they did not replace family origin, at least they became a crucial element in the determination of status. This departure from the old pattern permitted the incorporation of economically successful people into the elite. This process occurred within certain limits. There were two main sources of economic achievement: land and trade. Merchants and landowners made up just one group from the social point of view. The privilege to buy or receive concessions of land belonged to good families, who at the same time had a say in political business. Besides, many merchants had access to land either because they themselves belonged to good families, or because they could also buy land from previous proprietors (who were unwilling or unable to maintain it). This was the case of many British merchants who subsequently became big landowners. Thus the opportunities of economic achievement were circumscribed to a given group (who was already part of the Good People) and with few exceptions might have reached members of lower groups. And this must have been a phenomenon of the late XIXth. Century. As far as we can see in the latter period there were two channels of access to fortune and subsequently to land property: country-trade and sheep farming by the system of "medianerfa" (share-product).

The presence of foreigners produced a break in the old social order. Foreigners at the beginning formed a status group insofar as

they shared certain common features in their style of life and were regarded as different by both upper and lower native groups.

The transformation of the elite modified the old social order in that criteria of membership changed; nonetheless status-groups remained linked within a hierarchical system of mutually recognized differential prestige: The High Class, The Poor Fine People and the lower native groups. Immigrants were outside that system, as they were rejected by all native groups. When foreigners and above all their children integrated into the recipient society they lost their status characteristics (they ceased to be immigrants). From the point of view of the social order as a hierarchical system the integration of foreigners introduced far reaching changes. That section of the population made up by the fusion of foreigners and natives (and consequently of their children) differed among themselves only in their different economic achievement. Nobody could claim status honour on the basis of family origin, long residence or patterns of behaviour other than these associated with material aspects of their style of life (or differences in formal education). And these are aspects closely connected with income and therefore with occupation. As the rate of occupational mobility was very high, family styles of life changed along with their different

degree of economic success. Within such a context stratification by status was unlikely to emerge and stabilize.

There are certain similarities between the situation of foreigners and cabecitas negras as status groups, as the rejection of the latter resembles very much that which foreigners suffered in the past. Like foreigners, cabecitas negras concentrated in large numbers in urban areas in a short period. Both groups were very poor and entered the occupational ladder at its very bottom. Cabecitas negras were uneducated, but no more than the majority of foreigners had been in their beginnings. They lived in shanty-towns; foreigners largely concentrated in "conventillos" (collective houses). Cabecitas negras supported Peronism while descendants of immigrants backed the Radical Party, which in its time was as much the party of the "populacho" (pejorative name for the people) as Peronism came to be.

Economic achievement, better education and intermarriage, worked in favour of the fusion of foreigners with the native population. We think that the same factors must be working in the case of cabecitas negras. The definition of cabecita is based more on all the other characteristics than on racial ones, since racial distinctions are dubiously recognizable when other external symbols of status are not present.

However, in spite of some similarities between the situation of foreigners and cabecitas negras, there was also a crucial difference.

The historical context in which their appearance took place. Foreigners immigrated in a period of rapid economic change when opportunities to achieve entrepreneurial positions were wide open. When the "cabecitas negras" arrived the chances of upward mobility were comparatively lower, and the locus had changed from entrepreneurship to dependent occupations (mobility within the line of one's own career). So that, a humble beginning would more rarely lead to a top position. "Cabecitas Negras" also experienced an improvement in their standard of living, particularly between 1945 and 1950 but it was not substantial enough to affect their style of life very deeply. Besides, the economic stagnation of the last fifteen years has worked against them.

If, in the future, Argentina can emerge from her present economic situation, rapid occupational mobility will lead to changes in the material aspects of styles of life that will militate against the survival of cabecitas negras as an status group. Their situation will depend on how far they are able to take advantage of economic change and incorporate into the middle class, and on their assimilation of patterns of behaviour associated with their new economic position (a phenomenon we believe is occurring today) (57).

As regards the development of different status patterns of behaviour and the existence of social distance in groups other than the aristocracy, another generation of stable middle class is still necessary. If, as we believe, Argentina is infor a new wave of intense economic transformation which will affect important sections of the middle class, the crystalization of status characteristics will take place gradually.

NOTES

- (1) Bagú, S., "La Estructura Social de la Colonia", Buenos Aires, Raigal, 1952.
- (2) Ferns, H.S. "Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century", Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1960, p. 53.
- (3) Halperín Donghi, T., "El Río de la Plata al comenzar el siglo XIX", Facultad de Filosofía, Bs.As., 1961, pp. 14-16.
- (4) Puiggros, R., "Historia Económica del Río de la Plata", Bs.As., Futuro, 1945, p. 29.
- (5) Ferns, H.S., *ibid.*, pp. 58-60.
- (6) Ferns, H.S., *ibid.*, pp. 55-57.
- (7) Halperín Donghi, T., *ibid.*, p. 79.
- (8) Bagú, S., *ibid.*, pp. 57-58.
- (9) José E. Wilde gives a very good description of the 'Porteño' society in the eighteen twenties and thirties. "Buenos Aires 70 años atrás", Bs.As., EUDEBA, 1966.
- (10) Wilde, José E., *ibid.*, p. 112.
- (11) Mansilla, L.V., "Mis Memorias", Bs.As., EUDEBA, 1966, p. 97.
- (12) Galvez, V., "Memorias de un viejo", Bs.As., Peuser, 1889, Vol. III, p. 383.
- (13) Darbyshire, C. "My life in the Argentine Republic", London, F. Warne & Co., 1917, p. 123.
- (14) Galvez, V., *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 382.

- (15) P. Baudin, quoted by P. Beyhaut et al. "Inmigración y desarrollo", Facultad de Filosofía de Buenos Aires, 1961. Though Baudin uses many superlatives, his remarks agree with those of other witnesses.
- (16) Frazer, J. F., "The Amazing Argentina", London, Cassell & Co., 1914, p. 32.
- (17) Lopez, Lucio V., "La Gran Aldea", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964.
- (18) Mansilla, L., *ibid.* p. 120.
- (19) Fray Mocho (José S. Alvarez), "Cuadros de la Ciudad", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1961.
- (20) Mansilla, L., *ibid.* p. 120.
- (21) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", Bs. As., Paidós, 1966, p. 197.
- (22) Imaz, J. L. "La Clase Alta de Buenos Aires", Instituto de Sociología, de Bs. As., 1962, pp. 9 & 25-26. Cf. J. L. Imaz "Los que Mandan", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964, p. 123.
- (23) Bunge, C. O., "Nuestra América", Bs. As., Casa Vaccaro, 1918.
- (24) Germani, G., *ibid.* p. 200.
- (25) Nichols, M. W. "The Gaucho", Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Press, 1942, p. 14.
- (26) The incorporation of Gauchos into the work on estancias began in the XVIIIth. Century and intensified in the XIXth. See Puigross, *ibid.*
- (27) Wilken, G., "Las Colonias", Bs. As., Sociedad Anónima 1873, p. 314.

- (28) Darbyshire, C., *ibid*, p. 76.
- (29) There were also socialists and anarchists who had emigrated for political reasons.
- (30) See G. Wilcken, *ibid*; A. Peyret "Una visita a las Colonias de la República Argentina", Bs. As., Imprenta Tribuna Nacional, 1889; E. Zeballos "Descripción amena de la República Argentina", Bs. As., Peuser, 1881-83.
- (31) Wilcken, G., *ibid*, p. 305. Cf. Perkins' report (1863) quoted by J. Schobinger "Inmigración y colonización suizas en la República Argentina en el siglo XIX", Bs. As., Instituto Suizo-Argentino, 1957, p. 92.
- (32) Wilcken, G., *ibid*. p. 303
- (33) Gori, G., "El Pan Nuestro: panorama social de las regiones cerealistas argentinas", Buenos Aires, Galatea-Nueva Visión, 1958.
- (34) Gori, G., *ibid*, p. 30.
- (35) Darbyshire, C., *ibid*, p. 102.
- (36) Frazer, J.F., *ibid*, p. 52.
- (37) Galvez, V., *ibid*. Vol. III, p. 333 and following.
- (38) Germani, G., *ibid*, pp. 180-81.
- (39) Germani, G., "Movilidad Social en la Argentina", Instituto de Sociología de Buenos Aires, p. 7.
- (40) Gori, G., *ibid*, p. 35 and "Inmigración y Colonización en la Argentina", EUDEBA, 1964, p. 83. Cf. J. M. Gutierrez, "El Hombre Hormiga" in "20 Relatos Argentinos", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1966. p. 43.

- (41) Maciel, C.N. , "La Italianización de la Argentina", J. Hernández, Bs. As., 1924. Cf. A.J. Perez Amuchástegui, in his analysis of C. Martel's 'La Bolsa', where foreigners are presented as having interest only in money. "Las Mentalidades Argentinas", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1965.
- (42) Fray Mocho, *ibid.*; Cf. J. B. Alberdi "Doña Rita Material" in "20 Relatos Argentinos", p. 37.
- (43) Mansilla, L.V., *ibid.*, p. 120.
- (44) Booz, M., "Gente del Litoral", Comisión de Cultura, Bs. As., 1944. p. 191. Cf. Gudiño Krämer, L. "Aquerenciada soledad", Ed. Colmegna, Santa Fe, 1946, pp. 87, 116 & 168.
- (45) Obligado, P.S., "La Carretita de Doña María" in "20 Relatos Argentinos", pp. 165-6.
- (46) Gudiño Krämer, L., *ibid.*, p. 156. Cf. M. Booz, *ibid.*, p. 191 and A. Ebelot, "La Pampa", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1961, p. 75.
- (47) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", p. 179.
- (48) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", p. 205.
- (49) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", pp. 205-210.
- (50) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", see table on p. 125.
- (51) See Germani's *Movilidad Social* for an analysis on occupational mobility among foreigners.
- (52) Imaz, J.L., "La Clase Alta", in his population of 1965 high class families, there were 32.5% descendents of immigrants who had arrived in Argentina during the second half of the XIXth. Century., p. 13.

- (53) Germani, G., "El Proceso de Urbanización en la Argentina", Instituto de Sociología, Bs.As., 1959.
- (54) Bialek Masse, J., "Informe sobre el estado de la clase obrera in el interior de la República", Graw, Bs.As., 1904.
- (55) Germani, G., "Procesos de Movilización e Integración y Cambio Social en Latinoamérica", Seminar on "Estructuras Sociales en Proceso de Cambio", Mexico, August 1962.
- (56) Germani, G., "Efectos Sociales de la Urbanización en un área obrera del Gran Buenos Aires", Instituto de Sociología, 1959.
- (57) As regards the persistence of rejection based on ethnic grounds it is interesting to quote the views of high class people.
Jose L. de Imaz in his survey among members of the aristocracy included a question about their opinion of cabecitas negras. Forty-two per-cent of the sample agreed that cabecitas negras would ascend in the social scale. Among the forty-nine per-cent that disagreed, very few based their opinion on racial terms.

C O N C L U S I O N S

In the previous chapters an analysis has been made of two dimensions of the class system in Argentina in relation to the process of economic development, and the impact of the latter upon the evolution of status stratification.

While more definitive conclusions would demand further research, we shall here attempt to summarise those features of the process of economic development whose appreciation we regard as essential for a proper understanding of the changes that have taken place in the class system as well as in the relationship between class and status. In conclusion we shall point out how this empirical analysis has served to specify some of Weber's theoretical concepts.

I. It may be affirmed that, during the period understudy, the class system in Argentina evolved into a more modern model, very similar to those prevailing in highly industrialized societies. The impact of this evolution has been such that the classical division into a small propertied class controlling the greater part of the resources and income and a large majority of the population belonging to the lowest strata has been gradually replaced by a class system with predominance of the middle class and of the urban working class. Through the formation of these classes a stratification continuum has come about, devoid of those abrupt boundaries between classes which bespoke a great economic inequality. A more ample chance of economic mobility gave members of the lower classes access to higher levels, primordially upon the basis of personal chievement.

This transformation of the class system was accompanied by a lessening in the significance ascribed to status elements in relations to class, by the vanishing of hierarchical attitudes in class relations, and by the creation of a vision of society as basically egalitarian as regards opportunity.

Among the features of this economic development that finally led to the emergence of a highly fluid class system, the following deserve special mention.

1) The rate of economic growth was intense, along with the expansion of occupational opportunities at all levels, particularly the middle ones. During the period under study there was a great widening of opportunities for entrepreneurs, white-collar employees, professional men, as well as for skilled levels of the working class, access to which lay open to individuals from the lowest strata.

Furthermore, this expansion in opportunity was so great that the very highest levels in wealth could be attained by persons of humble origin (such as foreign immigrants) and was in no way confined to short distance mobility. A contributing factor was the ready access to education, the university included.

2) With respect to income, the trend throughout was towards a more egalitarian distribution. By this we do not mean that there were not and are not substantial inequalities in income; we merely refer to the trend that has led to the closure of the gap between the high income groups and the lower levels.

3) A large number of individuals were involved in the change.

Here the underpopulation has played a central part. As a trend, apart from cyclic variations, the demand for labour expanded rapidly and was followed by the supply. There did not exist in the Argentine a permanent reserve of labour which would progressively have met the demand as the latter was created. On the contrary, during the first stage, foreign immigration was a condition sine qua non of economic growth, and during the second stage- industrialization beginning in the thirties- the demand for labour absorbed the marginal populations and a sector of the rural labour that migrated in search of new occupational opportunities. Here likewise, the existence of internal migrations was a cause of growth (although it may also be viewed as its consequence)

4) The geographic mobility of the population brought a new element of fluidity into the class system. Though not all of the immigrants (foreign and internal) experienced a marked change in their class situation, the geographic mobility in itself signified a change (from the standpoint of the individual).

5) The time during which the process took place was relatively short. Pronounced changes in class situation occurred within one generation (intra-generational mobility). The generation of grandfathers had their day during the great expansion that followed the development in cattle-breeding and agriculture, and subsequently the fathers of the present generation were favoured by the development in industry.

6) The mechanism of industrial growth was such that mass consu

sumption was reached at a very early stage. Indeed, the existence of mass-consumption was a condition, as well as a consequence, of the way industry developed. This was concentrated upon the production of final consumer goods, under government protection through a policy of import substitution. Experience in this type of production had already been gained, for the consumer industry prior to the thirties was already considerably diversified. Moreover, it demanded but a low technological level and its production cycle was short. As the goods in question were not exportable they had necessarily to be consumed in the home market, eventually reaching low income groups. Mass consumption and the concomitant improvement in the standard of living were possible thanks to the trend towards a more egalitarian income distribution.

The above-mentioned factors have acted within the class system taken as a whole. We must now consider those aspects of the agricultural and industrial development as affecting the class system in their respective sectors.

The outstanding features of agricultural development were: that it took place in such a manner that the basic structure of land ownership was not essentially modified. Concentration of land ownership was not an impediment to agricultural progress. On the contrary, one of the factors in its success on the world market during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was the extensive low-cost production. The land was frequently divided up, albeit without loss of ownership, through a system of tenancy which at first proved beneficial to both

owners and tenants.

The advances in agriculture led to the formation, and subsistence, of a land-owning class (an acquisition class with some elements of a propertied class) whose outstanding characteristics have been: First, their constituting, in origin, an economically mobile group since it was with agricultural development that the possession of land acquired a real weight by becoming a significant source of income. Second, their past, (and present though diminished) importance was due to their control over primordial resources and their role on the external market. Third, the group in question is a coherent one as regards their economic interests. Fourth, and lastly, they have been the only class whose leading members have simultaneously constituted a status group (the aristocracy).

On the other hand, the characteristics of agricultural development hindered the emergence of a numerous rural middle class (compared to the urban middle class) for their access to land ownership was obstructed by the control that the great landlords exercised over it. Nevertheless, one should not think in terms of a peasant population since, particularly at first, the small and even more the middle-sized farmers often enjoyed a high level of income.

Finally, owing to the extensive nature of the agricultural exploitation with a low degree of labour absorption, the rural proletariat has always been few in number and tending clearly to diminish. Their living conditions have varied greatly from one region to another, but on the whole they have been far worse than those of the urban

proletariat (especially up to the forties) and highly unstable (owing to the numerous temporary workers who form part of this class). A good many of its members have swelled the ranks of the internal migrants.

Unlike agricultural development, the process of industrialization occurred in such a manner as to produce a high degree of dispersion of resources in the overwhelming majority of activities. In turn this dispersion permitted the formation, at an early stage, of an ample entrepreneurial class, highly heterogeneous as it was made up by a large number of people from the small industrialist to the big one. Besides, this class lacked the coherence of interests of the landowning class. The secondary role industry played before 1929 and the dependence of this sector on agriculture for obtaining foreign exchange, may explain the lack of awareness, among most industrialists, of their interests as distinct from, or even antagonistic to, agricultural interests. Very likely, their immigratory origin and the fact of their relatively easy economic mobility contributed to this in some degree.

Industrialization also permitted the emergence of a large middle class of employees, and the formation of an important urban working class. As regards the situation of many categories of white-collar and skilled workers, one must bear in mind that the rapid expansion of the demand for qualified people facilitated the access to these positions to members of lower strata who frequently lacked formal training. Besides, the passing from unskilled to skilled

often meant a real improvement of life-chances, and very likely was regarded by the individual concerned as a change in his class situation. In any case, the working class as a whole enjoyed a massive upgrading in the forties and early fifties, partly because of higher wages and partly because of the ease in finding jobs and steady work.

The same factors that affected the class system played an important role in the loss of significance of status in relation to class. One of the problems to be argued here is whether there exists a significant break between the style of life of the working class and that of the middle class, in all those aspects which do not depend on economic position. That is, given equivalence of income, are there different patterns of behaviour that permit the easy recognition of either class? Are these patterns, moreover, permanent enough to prevent a manual worker who becomes non-manual from adopting the style of life of his new membership class? Though in this respect empirical evidence is lacking we are inclined to think that most significant differences are those connected with income. We attribute importance to the operation of three factors, which we believe have contributed to lessening the significance of status: the high rate of economic mobility, the common origin of a substantial proportion of the population (lower class immigrants), and the short time which has not permitted the emergence of stable class patterns of behaviour. A typical case: the generation who are now between 25 and 40 years of age. The majority are sons -or

grandsons- of foreigners. Their parents shared the status of foreigners which disappeared with the passing of time. Those who are now wealthy were born in homes not very different from the homes of other middle or working class people of similar origin. Argentina is lacking in families who for several generations have belonged to the same class, and so have developed patterns of behaviour independently of their economic position.

The high degree of consensus and the existence of equalitarian attitudes in the social interaction of members of different classes are also a result of the class system, open and fluid, and of the loss in significance of status considerations.

The perception of the Argentine society as basically equalitarian in terms of opportunities, which stems from the existence of a high rate of occupational mobility, has been fundamentally reinforced by two factors: political participation and the educational system. The role of political movements, first Radicalism and subsequently Peronism, has been to serve as a means of participation of the middle and lower strata in the power system. With the coming into power of these two parties, the image of a society where only the upper class control political decisions was broken down. (We leave aside whether participation in decisions was real). On its part the school, besides being a vehicle of integration of foreigners' children, has created the image of a country of a great prosperity which is within the reach of everybody who possesses the adequate energy and talent.

Finally, in Argentina it is difficult to find a phenomenon frequent in other undeveloped countries, namely, class respect. That is, the existence of an authoritarian paternalistic attitude on the part of the upper class and submissive attitudes in the lower classes. To the role played by the political movements and the school, one must add the high degree of urbanization and geographical mobility which broke down community links and favoured the emergence of secularized attitudes.

II. In the first chapter we said that Weber's theory guided our research both in the selection of the stratification dimensions to be studied and in the historical approach chosen.

There are two aspects of this empirical research which we consider may help to specify theoretical concepts. First, the role of the variables, i.e. type of source of income and degree of control over the source of income, in the determination of the class situation of entrepreneurs, capitalists and the self-employed. And secondly, the role of economic change in the loss of significance of status in relation to class.

The central feature of Weber's definition of class situation is life-chances, which in the case of positively privileged acquisition classes who are entrepreneurs, property classes whose property has been incorporated into economic process (capitalists) and the independent middle class of the self-employed (who in our research are also considered as entrepreneurs), depend on their access to resources and on the type of resources. Type of resources

is given by the economic activity in which the individuals are engaged, and the control is exercised through their enterprises. So their class situation depends on the number and size of the economic units under their control, and is affected by all those factors that affect these economic units. There are two types of factors to be taken into consideration: those which affect a particular enterprise, and those which affect all the enterprises in a given activity, the latter being dependent on the position of the activity within the whole economy. From the point of view of the individual, his class situation depends also on his membership of economic groups (defined as the aggregate of people who control units within given activities). This approach has been fruitful in our empirical analysis as it enabled us to discover to what extent economic development has favoured the emergence of a landowning class (which has maintained a large measure of its economic power in spite of the transformations during the last decades) and, on the other hand, how far it has hindered the formation of an industrial bourgeoisie of similar characteristics.

The technique of our analysis has been to draw inferences about the individuals, starting from their enterprises. Thus we were able to discuss the conditions for economic development and its impact upon stratification. The contribution of this study to Weber's theory is to have offered a possible line of interpretation to his concept of class situation as dependent on "the kind and extent of control, or lack of it, which the individual has over

goods and services and existing possibilities of their exploitation for the attainment of income or receipts within a given economic order". The distinction between type of source of income and control over the source of income is implicit in Weber's theory when he distinguishes between types of property classes and enumerates the most important types of acquisition classes. With the help of some economic concepts we then search for the correspondence between classes and aspects, or spheres, of the economic process. Thus we arrived at the conclusion that type of activity was a crucial variable as the economic role of different activities varies from country to country and over periods of time. The consideration of this role is particularly important in the analysis of developing countries as economic development affect different activities differently.

The empirical analysis has also confirmed Weber's statement that economic change threatens stratification by status and thrusts the class situation into the foreground. However, there are two aspects of this process which have to be taken into account: the conditions of change and the basis of status ascription.

During the Colony the hierarchical division between Gente Bien and Gente Inferior was based on status of birth, which served as well as the foundation of the legal monopolization of economic privileges (though status distinctions were not equally sharp everywhere in the River Plate). With agricultural development the

social elite segregated part of its members as the basis of status adscription changed. There remained as members of the elite only those of its members who could adopt new style of life in its material aspects, which depended on the possession of an adequate income. In spite of this transformation, status, now re-defined, maintained its significance. The possession of land, if not the only basis, continued to be the economic basis of status adscription. Among foreigners, the conditions of status adscription differed substantially. Furthermore, unlike agricultural development, the process of industrialization tended to disperse resources and income among a great number of people. Besides, access to these resources was not based on adscriptive elements as in the case of land (the access to which was largely determined in its beginnings by membership of the elite and political connections). With their assimilation and economic differentiation, status characteristics among foreigners vanished, giving prominence to class membership. Thus, these two instances indicate that during a process of economic change the existence (or not) of adscriptive bases in the access to economic opportunities is one factor which affects the survival of status.

APPENDIX I MEASUREMENT AND RANKING OF ECONOMIC GROUPS: 1914

In order to analyse economic groups in 1914 we used data taken from the Third National Census (those volumes known as complementary censuses). Note that names of branches will be kept in Spanish so that references can be made to the original Census material.

In chapter I we conceived of an economic group as made up by all units (holdings, firms, concerns, etc.) engaged in the same activity. That is, each group corresponded to a specific branch of activity. Our aim was to find out what economic groups were made up by large economic units, i. e. in what activities resources were probably concentrated in a small number of large firms, which very likely controlled the largest share of their particular market.

According to our original definition economic units should be measured in terms of their degree of control over resources and market. We thought of total output as the simplest single indicator. But unfortunately the censuses did not give data on output for all economic sectors. Agriculture caused a great deal of trouble; for in spite of several attempts it was impossible to estimate how large an output was likely to be for every size of holding. So that we chose "investment" as an alternative indicator. This included capital as well as other inventory items. However we were well aware that investment is not necessarily always correlated with output, and even less so in 1914 when manual procedures prevailed.

The first step was to build up a scale of investment per economic unit, so groups could be measured and ranked according to their average-investment (i. e. investment per economic unit). As the largest average-investment was nearly 15 million pesos, a thousandth of this figure was taken as the base of a scale, which base was made equivalent to one. The following ranks were computed as many times the base as there are number from two to one thousand. That is, an index-number procedure was applied (Table 1.1). As there were very few groups which ranked higher than twenty, Table 1.1 shows ranks in tens between 10 and 100 and afterwards in hundreds.

TABLE 1.1
Ranking of economic units

| <u>RANK</u> | <u>AVERAGE-INVESTMENT</u> | <u>RANK</u> | <u>AVERAGE-INVESTMENT</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 15.000 | 20 | 300.000 |
| 2 | 30.000 | 30 | 450.000 |
| 3 | 45.000 | 40 | 600.000 |
| 4 | 60.000 | 50 | 750.000 |
| 5 | 75.000 | 60 | 900.000 |
| 6 | 90.000 | 70 | 1.050.000 |
| 7 | 105.000 | 80 | 1.200.000 |
| 8 | 120.000 | 90 | 1.350.000 |
| 9 | 135.000 | 100 | 1.500.000 |
| 10 | 150.000 | 200 | 3.000.000 |
| 11 | 165.000 | 300 | 4.500.000 |
| 12 | 180.000 | 400 | 6.000.000 |
| 13 | 195.000 | 500 | 7.500.000 |
| 14 | 210.000 | 600 | 9.000.000 |
| 15 | 225.000 | 700 | 10.500.000 |
| 16 | 240.000 | 800 | 12.000.000 |
| 17 | 255.000 | 900 | 13.500.000 |
| 18 | 270.000 | 1.000 | 15.000.000 |
| 19 | 285.000 | | |

Base 15.000 = 1

The usefulness of these ranks was that they indicated for each group the average size of its component economic units in relation to units in other groups. In other words, they gave, however crudely, an idea of the degree of concentration of resources within each group.

We also had to decide when a group would be considered as made up by large, medium or small firms. So we looked for breaking points in the ranked distribution of groups within each economic sector, and formed our judgment taking into consideration these breakings. Thus the meaning of 'large' is relative to the prevailing sizes of units within each sector.

We considered ranching and farming, each forming a separate economic group. In each of them we also tried to locate breaking points. For we wanted to know how far land was concentrated in large holdings. These two branches are the only ones where units within the branch could be distributed by their size. For all other branches, of industry, commerce, etc., we could know only the average size of a firm. That is, in agriculture we had a better idea of the degree of concentration of resources (see also appendix IV). For the others we assumed that the larger the average investment, the higher the degree of concentration likely within the branch.

As the procedure for estimating average-investment differs from sector to sector we shall treat them separately.

AGRICULTURE

Whereas in industry, commerce and services the Complementary

Censuses bring data on total investment for each type of activity, investment in agriculture had to be indirectly estimated.

The estimates were based on the following data taken from the agricultural Census (Vol. V and VI):

Table 21.1:(a): Farming and ranching together: Distribution of holdings in an interval-scale of size (measured in Hectares). Total number of hectares in each interval. (This table also includes waste-land).
(b) Number of holdings in ranching and farming.

TABLE 21.1 (a)
Agriculture. Distribution of holdings: 1914

| | <u>Number Holdings</u> | <u>Hectares</u> | <u>Average-size</u> |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| -25 | 100.836 | 964.410 | 9.56 |
| 26 -50 | 34.662 | 1.337.910 | 38.60 |
| 51 -100 | 45.364 | 3.479.210 | 76.70 |
| 101 -500 | 86.685 | 19.848.907 | 228.98 |
| 501 -1000 | 13.825 | 9.645.336 | 697.67 |
| 1.001 -5000 | 19.998 | 47.952.890 | 2.397.88 |
| 5.001 -10000 | 3.161 | 25.254.982 | 7.989.55 |
| 10.001-25000 | 1.566 | 25.397.126 | 16.217.83 |
| 25.001-& over | 506 | 28.959.853 | 57.232.91 |
| TOTAL | 306.603 | 162.840.624 | |

TABLE 21.1 (b)

Agriculture. Distribution of holdings. 1914

| | Total Number of Holdings in: | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------------|
| | Ranching | Farming | Waste-land | TOTAL |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (excluding 3) |
| 25 | 17.125 | 68.604 | 15.107 | 85.729 |
| 26 -50 | 12.017 | 18.403 | 4.242 | 30.420 |
| 51 -100 | 15.500 | 25.730 | 4.134 | 41.230 |
| 101 -500 | 34.685 | 46.596 | 5.404 | 81.281 |
| 501 -1000 | 10.121 | 2.921 | 783 | 13.042 |
| 1001-5000 | 18.054 | 777 | 1.167 | 18.831 |
| 5001-10000 | 2.882 | 76 | 203 | 2.958 |
| 10001-25000 | 1.453 | 21 | 92 | 1.474 |
| 25001 & over | 478 | 7 | 21 | 485 |
| TOTAL | 112.315 | 163.135 | 31.153 | 275.450 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. V

Table 21.2: (a) Farming and (b) Ranching apart. Id. as Table 21.1 but based on an interval-scale which is different for each agricultural sub-sector, besides being different from the interval scale used in Table 21.1.

TABLE 21.2

Distribution of holdings in ranching and farming: 1914

| FARMING | | |
|--------------|----------|-------------|
| | HOLDINGS | Ha |
| -10 | 46.993 | 220.188 |
| 11 -100 | 65.750 | 3.055.741 |
| 101 -200 | 27.011 | 4.031.767 |
| 201 -300 | 12.013 | 3.055.731 |
| 301 -500 | 7.567 | 2.938.317 |
| 501 -1000 | 2.925 | 1.965.946 |
| 1001-1250 | 261 | 303.038 |
| 1251-2500 | 382 | 697.064 |
| 2501 & over | 233 | 1.670.156 |
| TOTAL | 163.135 | 17.937.948 |
| RANCHING | | |
| | HOLDINGS | Ha |
| -625 | 81.889 | 12.186.251 |
| 626 -1250 | 11.539 | 10.288.735 |
| 1251 -2500 | 9.286 | 20.238.293 |
| 2501 -5000 | 4.790 | 19.346.105 |
| 5001 -12500 | 3.288 | 27.779.187 |
| 12501-25000 | 1.057 | 19.155.181 |
| 25001-37500 | 213 | 6.676.582 |
| 37501-50000 | 108 | 4.764.466 |
| 50001 & over | 146 | 15.746.337 |
| TOTAL | 112.316 | 136.181.137 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. V & VI.

Table 21.3: Farming and ranching together: Fixed capital investment (land value and cattle excluded) in an interval-scale of Argentine pesos for every size of holding. Number of holdings in each category.

TABLE 21.3

Agriculture, Fixed-Capital Investment. Land Value and Cattle excluded. Holdings in each category

| <u>Ha</u> <u>Thousand msn</u> | <u>-25</u> | <u>26-50</u> | <u>51-100</u> | <u>101-500</u> | <u>501- 1000</u> | <u>1001- 5000</u> | <u>5001- 10000</u> | <u>10001- 25000</u> | <u>25000 & over</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| -5 | 78.279 | 27.857 | 37.556 | 66.921 | 8.213 | 12.500 | 1.409 | 516 | 146 | 233.397 |
| 6 -10 | 4.150 | 1.342 | 2.067 | 8.528 | 2.158 | 1.874 | 339 | 150 | 36 | 20.664 |
| 11 -50 | 2.944 | 998 | 1.390 | 5.183 | 2.392 | 3.527 | 715 | 445 | 107 | 17.701 |
| 51 -100 | 240 | 133 | 135 | 380 | 175 | 582 | 247 | 146 | 71 | 2.109 |
| 101 & over | 116 | 90 | 82 | 269 | 104 | 348 | 248 | 217 | 125 | 1.599 |
| TOTAL | 85.729 | 30.420 | 41.230 | 81.281 | 13.042 | 18.831 | 2.958 | 1.474 | 485 | 275.450 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. V.

Table 21.4: Farming and ranching apart: Distribution of holdings on an interval-scale of annual land tenancy rates per hectare (in Argentine pesos).

TABLE 21.4

Agriculture: Annual Land Tenancy Rates: 1914

| FARMING | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| (Per Year) Pesos per Ha. | Holdings |
| 2.5 | 4.683 |
| 7.5 | 9.897 |
| 15.5 | 11.182 |
| 25.5 | 6.833 |
| 35.5 | 7.997 |
| | 40.592 |

SOURCE: 1914, Vol. V

| RANCHING | |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| (Per Year) Pesos per Ha. | Holdings |
| 0.10 | 3.120 |
| .35 | 1.903 |
| .75 | 1.676 |
| 1.50 | 2.220 |
| 3.50 | 4.731 |
| 7.50 | 7.414 |
| 12.5 | 3.739 |
| 20. | 5.582 |
| | 30.385 |

SOURCE: 1914, Vol. VI

In order to estimate total investment in Agriculture the following procedure was undertaken:

(i) Table 22.1: Farming and ranching apart: Distribution of holdings on an interval scale of size of holdings obtained interpolating tables 21.1 and 21.2. These new interval-scales have a larger number of categories than any of the original ones because: (i) the scale on table 21.2 gives more detail for lower categories of farms due to the fact that they are more concentrated there; (ii) the upper categories of farming were obtained from table 21.1; (iii) details on upper categories of ranching were obtained from table 21.2 and of lower categories from

table 21.1. The average size of holdings was computed for each interval of these scales.

TABLE 22.1

Distribution of holdings: 1914

| FARMING | | | | RANCHING | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | No Holdings (1) | Hect. (2) | Average Ha. (3) | | No Holdings (4) | Hect. (5) | Average Ha. (6) |
| | -10 | 46.993 | 220.188 | 5 | | | |
| 11 | -25 | 21.611 | 367.387 | 17 | 17.125 | 163.715 | 10 |
| 26 | -50 | 18.403 | 717.717 | 39 | 12.017 | 463.856 | 39 |
| 51 | -100 | 25.736 | 1.970.637 | 77 | 15.500 | 1.188.850 | 77 |
| 101 | -200 | 27.011 | 4.031.767 | 149 | | | |
| 201 | -300 | 12.013 | 3.055.731 | 254 | 34.685 | 8.671.250 | 250 |
| 301 | -500 | 7.567 | 2.938.317 | 388 | | | |
| 501 | -1000 | 2.925 | 1.965.946 | 672 | 10.121 | 7.745.780 | 765 |
| 1001 | -1250 | 261 | 303.038 | 1.161 | 3.980 | 4.241.535 | 1.066 |
| 1251 | -2500 | 382 | 697.064 | 1.825 | 9.286 | 20.238.293 | 2.180 |
| 2501 | -5000 | 129 | 419.250 | 3.250 | 4.790 | 19.346.105 | 4.039 |
| 5001 | -10000 | 76 | 607.240 | 7.990 | 2.882 | 23.027.180 | 7.990 |
| 10001 | -12500 | | | | 406 | 4.752.007 | 11.705 |
| 12501 | -25000 | 21 | 262.500 | 12.500 | 1.057 | 19.155.181 | 18.122 |
| 25001 | -37500 | 7 | 381.166 | 54.452 | 213 | 6.676.582 | 31.345 |
| 37501 | -50000 | | | | 108 | 4.764.466 | 44.115 |
| 50001 & over | | | | | 146 | 15.746.337 | 107.852 |
| | 163.135 | 17.937.948 | (109) | | 112.316 | 136.181.137 | (1.213) |

SOURCE: Tables 21.1 & 21.2

ii) Table 22.2. Farming and ranching together: Total fixed capital investment for each category of an interval-scale of size of holdings. (This table was worked out from table 21.3). Average fixed capital investment per hectare computed for each category of the interval-scale of size of holdings.

TABLE 22.2

Fixed-capital investment per hectare: 1914

| SCALE Ha. | (1) Invest. per holding m\$ | (2) N° Holdings | (3) Total in- vest. thou- sands pesos | (4) Total Ha. | (5) Per Ha. (\$/Ha) |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|
| -25 | 4.035 | 85.729 | 345.863 | 751.290 | 460.4 |
| 26 -50 | 4.266 | 30.420 | 129.758 | 1.181.573 | 109.8 |
| 51 -100 | 4.133 | 41.230 | 170.383 | 3.159.487 | 53.9 |
| 101 -500 | 5.483 | 81.281 | 445.633 | 18.697.065 | 23.8 |
| 501 -1000 | 10.214 | 13.042 | 133.208 | 9.711.726 | 13.7 |
| 1001 -5000 | 12.406 | 18.831 | 233.615 | 45.245.285 | 5.2 |
| 5001 -10000 | 25.208 | 2.958 | 74.565 | 23.634.420 | 3.2 |
| 10001-25000 | 35.295 | 1.474 | 52.025 | 24.169.688 | 2.2 |
| 25001 & over | 49.103 | 485 | 23.815 | 27.568.551 | .9 |
| 275.450 1.608.865 154.119.085 | | | | | |

SOURCE: Table 21.3

- iii) In order to estimate the average land value (arithmetic mean): First, the figures on table 21.4 were worked out and average land-tenancy-rates per hectare obtained for farming and ranching apart. Thus in farming the annual rate was 17.70 pesos per hectare, and in ranching the annual rate amounted to 7.77 pesos per hectare.
- iv) According to the National Census of 1914 the rate of return on all investments, including land, varied between eight and ten per cent. It also mentions that the current interest rate was about eight per cent. Therefore we assumed that in 1914 the Land Tenancy Rate was nine per cent of the Total Land Value. We did not assume a lower rate because our estimation did not include the probable money value of cattle, which was impossible to estimate apart. Even though we certainly took into consideration the fact that farming included almost no cattle at all, the same proportion (nine per cent) was also applied to it. The reason why we decided to overestimate the per-hectare value of farming land was that the Fixed Capital Investment corresponding to farming (Table 22.2) was surely underestimated. For this table covered both farming and ranching together, and Capital investment in farming is always higher than in ranching. Nevertheless we expect this underestimation can not be a source of great inaccuracy. For whereas farms were more concentrated on the lower categories of the scale of size of holdings, ranches usually belonged to middle or upper categories. Moreover we can expect that small ranches had nearly as high a capital investment as farms of a similar

size. The loss in accuracy was certainly more important in large farms because there we had to use an average which included large farms as well as large ranches and the latter certainly required less Fixed Capital than farms of a similar size.

Thus if the annual land-tenancy rates were 9 per-cent of the land-money-value: this figure amounted to 196.7 pesos per hectare in farming and to 86.3 pesos in ranching (for 9% of 196.7 and 86.3 equals to 17.7 and 7.77 respectively).

- v) Table 22.3 & 22.4: Total investment in Agricultural holdings (farming and ranching apart) of different average-size measured in hectares. This table has been worked out adding up fixed capital investment per hectare (table 22.2) and average land value per hectare (see above) for each interval of size of holdings and multiplying these figures by average number of hectares on each interval of size of holdings (Table 22.1).

Thus colum (4) of each table shows estimates of average investment per holding for every size of holding.

- (vi) As we wanted to work out some kind of control over the estimates of investment in agriculture, we thought of two independent controls, as follows: (a) The National Census gives an estimation of what is there called "The Collective Wealth of the Argentine People" (Vol. VIII). There it is pointed out that an hectare of land cost between one hundred and two hundred Argentine pesos. According to the Census estimates the total money value of all agricultural

TABLE 22.3

FARMING: Total investment per holding: 1914

| Interval Scale Hectares | Average Ha. Fixed per holding Capital (1) | per Ha. (2) | Total Capital per Ha. (3)-(2) +196.7 | Investments per holding (4)-(3).(1) | N° Holdings (5) | Total invest. (6)-(5).(4) | RANKING of column (4) (7) |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| -25 | 5 | 460.4 | 657.1 | 3.285 | 46.993 | 154.372.005 | 1 |
| | 17 | | | 11.171 | 21.611 | 241.416.481 | 1 |
| 26 -50 | 39 | 109.8 | 306.5 | 11.954 | 18.403 | 219.989.462 | 1 |
| 51 -100 | 77 | 53.9 | 250.6 | 19.296 | 25.736 | 496.601.856 | 2 |
| | 149 | 23.8 | 220.5 | 32.855 | 27.011 | 887.446.405 | 3 |
| 101 -500 | 254 | | | 56.007 | 12.013 | 672.812.091 | 4 |
| | 388 | | | 85.554 | 7.567 | 647.387.118 | 6 |
| 501 -1000 | 672 | 13.7 | 210.4 | 141.389 | 2.925 | 413.562.825 | 10(°) |
| | 1161 | 5.2 | 201.9 | 234.406 | 261 | 61.179.966 | 20 |
| 1001 -5000 | 1825 | | | 368.468 | 382 | 140.754.776 | 30 |
| | 3.250 | | | 656.175 | 129 | 84.646.575 | 50 |
| 5001 -10000 | 7.990 | 3.2 | 199.9 | 1.597.201 | 76 | 121.387.276 | 200(°) |
| 10001 -25000 | 12.500 | 2.2 | 198.8 | 2.486.250 | 21 | 52.211.250 | 200 |
| 25001 & over | 54.452 | .9 | 197.6 | 10.759.715 | 7 | 75.318.005 | 800(°) |

T O T A L

163.135 4.269.086.091

(1) From table 22.1 column (3).

(5) From table 22.1 column (1)

(2) From table 22.2 column (5).

(7) From table 1.1

TABLE 22.4

RANCHING: Total investment per holdings: 1914

| Interval Scale Hectares | (1) Average Ha. per holding | (2) Capital invest- ment | (3)=(2) +86.30 Fixed Capital plus land per Ha. | (4)=(3).(1) per holding | (5) N° Holdings | (6)=(5).(4) Total invest. | (7) RANKING of column (4) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| -25 | 10 | 460.4 | 546.70 | 5.467 | 17.125 | 93.622.375 | 1 |
| 26 -50 | 39 | 109.8 | 196.1 | 7.648 | 12.017 | 91.906.016 | 1 |
| 51 -100 | 77 | 53.9 | 140.2 | 10.795 | 15.500 | 167.322.500 | 1 |
| 101 -500 | 250 | 23.8 | 110.1 | 27.525 | 34.685 | 954.704.625 | 2 |
| 501 -1000 | 765 | 13.7 | 100.0 | 76.500 | 10.121 | 774.256.500 | 6 |
| | 1.066 | | | 97.539 | 3.980 | 388.205.220 | 7 |
| 1001 -5000 | 2.180 | 5.2 | 91.5 | 199.470 | 9.286 | 1.852.278.420 | 20(°) |
| | 4.039 | | | 369.569 | 4.790 | 1.770.235.510 | 30 |
| 5001 -10000 | 7.990 | 3.2 | 89.5 | 715.105 | 2.882 | 2.060.932.610 | 50 |
| | 11.705 | 2.2 | 88.5 | 1.035.893 | 406 | 420.572.558 | 70 |
| 10001-25000 | 18.122 | | | 1.603.797 | 1.057 | 1.695.213.429 | 200(°) |
| | 31.345 | | | 2.733.284 | 213 | 582.189.492 | 200 |
| 25001 & over | 44.115 | 9 | 87.2 | 3.846.828 | 108 | 415.457.424 | 300 |
| | 107.852 | | | 9.404.694 | 146 | 1.373.085.324 | 700(°) |
| T O T A L | | | | | 112.316 | 12.639.982.003 | |

(1) From table 22.1 Column (6)

(5) From table 22.1 Column (4)

(2) From table 22.2 Column (5)

(7) From table 1.1

holdings was distributed among four items, as follows:

Agriculture:

Agriculture: Total investment: 1914

| In Thousands pesos | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Land | 12.222.769 |
| Cattle | 3.202.976 |
| Installations and Buildings | 1.073.767 |
| Machinery & Chattels | 405.411 |
| | 16.905.123 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VIII

Our estimates, adding up all categories of holdings, amount to 16,909,068 thousand pesos (columns (6) of Tables 22.3 and 22.4), which includes 1,608,865 thousand pesos in fixed capital (Table 22.2 column 3).

The difference seems reasonably small taking into consideration that it is distributed among 154,119 thousand hectares of land. According to each estimate the average investment per hectare is 109.69 pesos and 109.71 pesos respectively. (b) The Economic Commission for Latin America ("El desarrollo económico de la Argentina" 1958) has estimated Capital investment in each economic sector (1900, to 1955). The rate of fixed capital in agriculture over fixed capital in industry amounts to 0.97. The same rate worked out on our estimates amounts to 1.10. This difference reflects the over estimation of fixed capital in agriculture already mentioned.

vii) Finally, different sizes of holdings were ranked according to the ranking of economic units (table 1.1) which indicates investment per economic -unit within a given interval (see table 22.3 & 22.4, column 7). We locate several breaking points in the distribution of agricultural holdings. In farming (table 22.3, column 4) there are three gaps, the first between ranks 6 and 10 and the second between ranks 50 and 200, and finally between 200 and 800. And in ranching gaps were located between 7 and 20, 70 and 200 and 300 and 700. These gaps were considered as the braking points on each distribution.

The following tables (22.5 & 22.6) show the per-cent distribution of holdings, hectares and investment in both farming and ranching.

TABLE 22.5

Per cent distribution of land and investment. Farming: 1914

| Interval | | Hs. per | % | % of | | Sum of rank groupings | | |
|----------|----------------------------|---------|------------|---------------|------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| Scale | Hs. | Holding | Holdings | % Hs. | Investment | col(3) | col(4) | col(5) |
| (1) | | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1 | -10 | 5 | 28.81 | 1.23 | 3.62 | | | |
| 1 | 11 -25 | 17 | 13.25 | 2.05 | 5.66 | | | |
| 1 | 26 -50 | 39 | 11.28 | 4.00 | 5.15 | | | |
| 2 | 51 -100 | 77 | 15.78 | 10.99 | 11.63 | | | |
| 3 | 101 -200 | 149 | 16.56 | 22.48 | 20.79 | | | |
| 4 | 201 -300 | 254 | 7.36 | 17.03 | 15.76 | | | |
| 6 | 301 -500 | 388 | 4.64 | 16.38 | 15.17 | 97.68 | 74.16 | 77.78 |
| 10 | 501 -1000 | 672 | 1.79 | 10.96 | 9.69 | | | |
| 20 | 1001 -1250 | 1.161 | .16 | 1.70 | 1.43 | | | |
| 30 | 1251 -2500 | 1.825 | .23 | 3.89 | 3.30 | | | |
| 50 | 2501 -5000 | 3.250 | .08 | 2.34 | 1.98 | 2.26 | 18.89 | 16.40 |
| 200 | 5001 -10000 | 7.990 | .05 | 3.39 | 2.84 | | | |
| 200 | 10001-12500 12501-25000 | 12.500 | 0.01 | 1.46 | 1.22 | 0.06 | 4.85 | 4.06 |
| 800 | 25001 & over | 54.452 | (0.004) | 2.12 | 1.76 | (0.004) | 2.12 | 1.76 |
| N | | 163.135 | 17.937.948 | 4.269.086.091 | | | | |

(2) From table 22.3 Column (1)

(4) Computed from Table 22.1 Column (2)

(3) Computed from Table 22.1 Column (1)

(5) Computed from Table 22.3 Column (6)

TABLE 22.6

Per cent distribution of land and investment. Ranching: 1914

| Ranks | Intervale | | Average Ha per holding | % Holdings | % Ha | % of Investment | Sum of rank groupings | | |
|-------|--------------|--------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | Scale | Ha. | | | | | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | col(3) | col(4) | col(5) |
| | | -10} | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 11 | -25} | 10 | 15.25 | 0.12 | 0.74 | | | |
| 1 | 26 | -50 | 39 | 10.70 | 0.34 | 0.73 | | | |
| 1 | 51 | -100 | 77 | 13.80 | 0.87 | 1.32 | 39.75 | 1.33 | 2.72 |
| | 101 | -200} | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 201 | -300} | 250 | 30.88 | 6.37 | 7.55 | | | |
| | 301 | -500} | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 501 | -1000 | 765 | 9.01 | 5.69 | 6.13 | | | |
| 7 | 1001 | -1250 | 1.066 | 3.54 | 3.11 | 3.07 | 43.43 | 15.17 | 16.75 |
| 20 | 1251 | -2500 | 2.180 | 8.27 | 14.86 | 14.65 | | | |
| 30 | 2501 | -5000 | 4.039 | 4.26 | 14.21 | 14.01 | | | |
| 50 | 5001 | -10000 | 7.990 | 2.57 | 16.91 | 16.30 | | | |
| 70 | 10001 | -12500 | 11.705 | .36 | 3.49 | 3.33 | 15.46 | 49.47 | 48.29 |
| 200 | 12501 | -25000 | 18.122 | .94 | 14.07 | 13.41 | | | |
| 200 | 25001 | -37500 | 31.345 | .19 | 4.90 | 4.61 | | | |
| 300 | 37501 | -50000 | 44.115 | .10 | 3.50 | 3.29 | 1.23 | 22.47 | 21.31 |
| 700 | 50001 & over | | 107.852 | .13 | 11.56 | 10.86 | .13 | 11.56 | 10.86 |
| N | | | | 112.316 | 136.181.137 | 12.639.982.003 | | | |

(2) From Table 22.4 Column (1)

(4) Computed from Table 22.1 Column (5)

(3) Computed from table 22.1 Column (4)

(5) Computed from Table 22.4 Column (6)

INDUSTRY

The industrial census of 1914 brings data on the number of firms, employment and investment classified by branch of activity. As the grouping of branches in 1914 differed from that used in subsequent censuses the first task was to reclassify them according to the code applied in 1954. (See complete Code, at the end.):

TABLE 1.2
Industrial Census of 1954

| Code Number | Sub-sector | N° of branches in each sub-sector |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| 2.100 | Food-stuffs | 29 |
| 2.200 | Tobacco | 2 |
| 2.300 | Textiles | 15 |
| 2.400 | Confection | 25 |
| 2.500 | Timber | 16 |
| 2.600 | Paper and Cardboard | 6 |
| 2.700 | Printed matter | 3 |
| 2.800 | Chemicals | 24 |
| 2.900 | Oil Refineries | 2 |
| 3.100 | Rubber | 3 |
| 3.200 | Leather | 9 |
| 3.300 | Stones, Glass, Pottery | 15 |
| 3.400 | Metals(excluded Machinery) | 25 |
| 3.500 | Machinery(excluded electrical machinery) | 9 |
| 3.600 | Electrical machinery & appliances | 6 |
| 3.700 | Various industries | 11 |
| Total number of branches | | 202 |

- 1) From the classification of activities into the categories of the Census of 1954 one hundred and fifteen different branches of industry were finally obtained. For each of these branches the arithmetic mean of investment (here called average-investment), was com-

puted, so that they could be ranked according to the average-size of their respective economic units. The following table shows the number of branches in each rank as well as the distribution of firms, employment and investment.

TABLE 32.1
Distribution of industrial firms: 1914

| Rank | N° Firms | Employment | Capital m\$ | N° Branches |
|------|----------|------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 | 31.638 | 170.493 | 317.972.275 | 32 |
| 2 | 4.927 | 43.584 | 104.387.568 | 25 |
| 3 | 6.869 | 47.115 | 267.486.336 | 13 |
| 4 | 1.672 | 20.522 | 86.675.076 | 5 |
| 5 | 683 | 15.805 | 46.532.867 | 9 |
| 6 | 43 | 767 | 3.641.400 | 4 |
| 7 | 283 | 6.511 | 29.060.693 | 4 |
| 8 | 38 | 749 | 4.159.900 | 1 |
| 9 | 59 | 1.937 | 7.400.460 | 2 |
| 10 | 16 | 3.094 | 2.294.500 | 1 |
| 20 | 1.098 | 29.168 | 209.871.400 | 10 |
| 40 | 66 | 5.143 | 37.239.745 | 3 |
| 60 | 24 | 1.808 | 21.107.000 | 1 |
| 80 | 40 | 4.500 | 43.825.462 | 2 |
| 200 | 44 | 14.685 | 120.130.264 | 1 |
| 400 | 18 | 14.787 | 99.282.409 | 1 |
| 500 | 1 | 220 | 7.500.000 | 1 |
| T | 47.519 | 380.888 | 1.408.567.355 | 115 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VII

- ii) The following stage was to locate breaking points on this distribution. So average-employment in each branch was used as an auxiliary variable. In table 32.2 branches are classified by their rank and average-employment. The cells indicate the number of branches in each category.

iii) Though table 32.2 indicates great variability within each rank, some groupings can be located: first, branches of rank 40 and over; secondly, branches of ranks between 9 and 20; thirdly, between 5 and 8 and finally, branches of ranks lower than 5.

Table 32.3 shows the distribution of industrial firms, employment and investment.

TABLE 32.3

Distribution of employment and investment: Industry. 1914.

| Rank | % Firms | % Employment | % Investment | Sum of rank Groupings | | | N° Branches |
|----------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|----------------|
| | | | | Firms | Employ | Invest | |
| 1 | 66.58 | 44.76 | 22.57 | | | | 32 |
| 2 | 10.37 | 11.44 | 7.41 | | | | 25 |
| 3 | 14.46 | 12.37 | 18.99 | | | | 13 |
| 4 | 3.52 | 5.39 | 6.15 | 94.93 | 73.96 | 55.12 | 5 |
| 5 | 1.44 | 4.15 | 3.30 | | | | 9 |
| 6 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.26 | | | | 4 |
| 7 | 0.60 | 1.71 | 2.06 | | | | 4 |
| 8 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 2.21 | 6.26 | 5.92 | 1 |
| 9 | 0.12 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | | 2 |
| 10 | 0.03 | 0.81 | 0.16 | | | | 1 |
| 20 | 2.31 | 7.66 | 14.90 | 2.46 | 8.98 | 15.59 | 10 |
| 40 | 0.14 | 1.35 | 2.65 | | | | 3 |
| 60 | 0.05 | 0.47 | 1.50 | | | | 1 |
| 70 | - | | | | | | |
| 80 | 0.08 | 1.18 | 3.11 | | | | 2 |
| 200 | 0.09 | 3.86 | 8.53 | | | | 1 |
| 400 | 0.04 | 3.88 | 7.05 | | | | 1 |
| 500 | (0.002) | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.40 | 10.80 | 23.37 | 1 |
| N | 47.519 | 380.888 | 1.408.567.355 | | | | 115 |

SOURCE: Tables 32.1 & 32.2

OTHER SECONDARY SECTORS

The procedure formerly described was also applied in order to measure economic units in secondary sectors other than industry, namely mining, construction (divided into two branches) and energy.

Table 42.1 shows the ranking for each of them.

TABLE 42.1

Other Secondary. Ranking of Branches: 1914

| Sectors | Rank | Nº Firms | Employment | Capital m\$ | Nº Branches |
|--|------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| Mining | 6 | 158 | 5.215 | 11.929.070 | 1 |
| Energy | 70 | 305 | 9.916 | 300.884.056 | 1 |
| Construction: Building-Construction | 7 | 300 | 8.720 | 27.149.681 | 2 |
| Road works | 20 | 39 | 2.272 | 10.486.133 | |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VII

TERTIARY SECTOR

Similarly commercial firms and those engaged in services and transport were first classified according to the Code used in the census of 1954 and subsequently the average-investment computed for each branch of activity.

Tables 52.1; 62.1 and 72.1 show the per cent distribution of branches in ranks as well as the number of firms, total employment and investment in each category.

TABLE 52.1
Ranking of commercial branches: 1914

| Rank | No Firms | Employment | Total Investment | No Branches |
|----------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 1 | 48,595 | 132,998 | 433,586,114 | 22 |
| 2 | 9,038 | 35,074 | 253,875,888 | 7 |
| 3 | 2,350 | 8,257 | 92,933,094 | 7 |
| 4 | 22 | 146 | 1,057,490 | 1 |
| 5 | 3,805 | 23,368 | 261,499,861 | 4 |
| 6 | 954 | 5,607 | 81,163,902 | 4 |
| 7 | 379 | 2,657 | 34,537,885 | 4 |
| 8 | 423 | 3,694 | 50,245,354 | 1 |
| 9 | 165 | 1,079 | 20,853,901 | 2 |
| 10 | 157 | 1,629 | 25,129,506 | 2 |
| 11 | 515 | 5,547 | 83,578,118 | 2 |
| 13 | 370 | 3,360 | 70,696,932 | 1 |
| 14 | 14 | 180 | 2,806,845 | 1 |
| 16 | 1,690 | 4,839 | 41,883,532 | 2 |
| 19 | 337 | 4,087 | 94,180,745 | 2 |
| 30 | 10 | 257 | 3,695,000 | 1 |
| T | 63,824 | 232,779 | 1,551,724,167 | 63 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VIII

TABLE 62.1
Ranking of branches of services: 1914

| Rank | No Firms | Employment | Total Investment | No Branches |
|----------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 1 | 18,466 | 60,312 | 121,512,510 | 13 |
| 2 | 943 | 6,168 | 22,396,632 | 5 |
| 3 | 12 | 55 | 452,300 | 2 |
| 4 | 553 | 1,705 | 27,211,315 | 1 |
| 6 | 11 | 107 | 876,000 | 1 |
| 7 | 1,124 | 9,089 | 109,556,554 | 2 |
| 9 | 8 | 53 | 984,598 | 1 |
| 10-20 | 812 | 3,632 | 58,632,810 | 1 |
| 30 | 8 | 243 | 3,467,902 | 1 |
| 60 | 34 | 524 | 30,145,993 | 1 |
| 80 | 19 | 1,666 | 20,334,029 | 1 |
| 200 | 31 | 806 | 93,220,217 | 1 |
| T | 22,021 | 84,358 | 488,790,860 | 30 |

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VIII

TABLE 72.1

Ranking of branches of transport and communication: 1914

| Rank | No Firms (1) | Employment (2) | Investment (3) | No Branches (4) | Average Employment (5) |
|--------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 3 | 346 | 2,953 | 41,844 | 1 | 8.5 |
| 5 | 1 | 12 | 65,000 | 1 | 12 |
| 8 | 38 | 1,109 | 117,007 | 1 | 29 |
| 12 | 4 | 169 | 170,125 | 1 | 42 |
| 100 | 10 | 305 | 1,473,600 | 1 | 30 |
| 700(*) | 30 | 14,166 | 309,080,924 | 1 | 472.2 |
| (*) | 20 | 132,431 | 1.434 million gold pesos | 1 | 6,621.5 |
| | 449 | 151,145 | | 7 | |

(*) Tramways (*) (*) Railways

SOURCE: Third National Census, Vol. VIII & X

From the cross-section of average-investment with average-employment in each branch tables were prepared for commerce and services (Tables 52.2 and 62.2).

TABLE 52.2

Distribution of branches by rank and average employment. Commerce. 1914

| Ranks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | No Branches |
|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| Emplay. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 19 | 30 |
| -2.4 | 6 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 |
| -3.4 | 14 | 2 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 21 |
| -4.4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 9 |
| -5.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| -6.4 | | | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 5 |
| -7.4 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 5 |
| -8.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| -9.4 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 5 |
| -10.4 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 4 |
| -11.4 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| -12.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| -13.4 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25.4-26.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| No Branches | 22 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

TABLE 62.2

Distribution of branches by rank and average employment: Services, 1914

| Ranks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N° |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----------|----|
| Employ. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 30 | 60 | 80 | 200 | Branches | |
| -2.4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | |
| -3.4 | 6 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | |
| -4.4 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| -5.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 4 | |
| -6.4 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| -7.4 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| -8.4 | 2 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | |
| -9.4 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| -10.4 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14.4-15.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24.4-25.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29.4-30.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41.4-42.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| 82.4-83.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| N° | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 30 | |
| Branches | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Several breaking-points could be located and so groupings of branches obtained for each distribution. Namely, in commerce between ranks 1 and 3; between 4 and 10; 11 and 19 and finally branches of rank 30 and over. And in services branches of rank 1; between 2 and 4; 6 and 10; and 12 and over. As there were very few branches in Transport two breaking-point were located on table 72.1 (column 5), between ranks 5 and 8 (and so grouping 3 and 5) and on the other between 12 and 100. Railways and tranways were so far away from other branches, and from each other that each had to be considered as a separate group. The per-cent distribution of firms, employment and investment is shown on tables 52.3, 62.3 and 72.3.

TABLE 52.3

Distribution of employment and investment. Commerce: 1914

| Rank | $\%$ | | $\%$ Investment | <u>Sum of rank groupings</u> | | | No Branches |
|----------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | Firms | Employment | | Firms | Employ- ment | Invest- ment | |
| 1 | 70.60 | 57.13 | 27.94 | | | | 22 |
| 2 | 13.13 | 15.07 | 16.36 | | | | 7 |
| 3 | 3.41 | 3.55 | 5.99 | 87.14 | 75.75 | 50.29 | 7 |
| 4 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.07 | | | | 1 |
| 5 | 5.53 | 10.04 | 16.85 | | | | 4 |
| 6 | 1.39 | 2.41 | 5.22 | | | | 4 |
| 7 | 0.55 | 1.14 | 2.23 | | | | 4 |
| 8 | 0.61 | 1.59 | 3.24 | | | | 1 |
| 9 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 1.34 | | | | 2 |
| 10 | 0.23 | 0.70 | 1.62 | 8.59 | 16.40 | 30.57 | 2 |
| 11 | 0.75 | 2.38 | 5.39 | | | | 2 |
| 13 | 0.54 | 1.44 | 4.56 | | | | 1 |
| 14 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.18 | | | | 1 |
| 16 | 2.46 | 2.08 | 2.70 | | | | 2 |
| 19 | 0.49 | 1.76 | 6.07 | 4.26 | 7.74 | 18.90 | 2 |
| 30 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 1 |
| N | 68.824 | 232.779 | 1.551.724.167 | | | | 63 |

SOURCE: Tables 52.1 & 52.2

TABLE 62.3

Distribution of employment and investment. Services 1914

| Rank | % Firms | | % Investment | Groups | | | N° Branches |
|-------|---------|------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|
| | Firms | Employment | | Firms | Employ | Invest | |
| 1 | 83.86 | 71.49 | 24.86 | 83.86 | 71.49 | 24.86 | 13 |
| 2 | 4.28 | 7.31 | 4.58 | | | | 5 |
| 3 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.09 | | | | 2 |
| 4 | 2.51 | 2.02 | 5.57 | 6.84 | 9.40 | 10.24 | 1 |
| 6 | 0.05 | 0.13 | 0.18 | | | | 1 |
| 7 | 5.10 | 10.77 | 22.41 | | | | 2 |
| 9 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.20 | | | | 1 |
| 10-20 | 3.69 | 4.31 | 12.00 | 8.88 | 15.27 | 34.79 | 1 |
| 30 | 0.04 | 0.29 | 0.71 | | | | 1 |
| 60 | 0.15 | 0.62 | 6.17 | | | | 1 |
| 80 | 0.09 | 1.97 | 4.16 | | | | 1 |
| 200 | 0.14 | 0.96 | 19.07 | 0.42 | 3.84 | 30.11 | 1 |
| N | 22.021 | 84.358 | 488.790.860 | | | | 30 |

SOURCE: Tables 62.1 & 62.2

TABLE 72.2

Ranking of transportation branches (*)

| Rank | % Firms | % Employment | % Investment | N° Branches |
|------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| 3 | 86.71 | 64.93 | 2.24 | 1 |
| 5 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 3.48 | 1 |
| 8 | 9.52 | 24.38 | 6.27 | 1 |
| 12 | 1.00 | 3.72 | 9.11 | 1 |
| 100 | 2.51 | 6.71 | 78.90 | 1 |
| N | 399 | 4.548 | 1.867.576 | 5 |

(*) Trams & railways excluded

SOURCE: Table 72.1

Table 1.2

Census 1954. Code of Secondary Activities

| | |
|-------|--|
| 1000 | INDUSTRIAS EXTRACTIVAS (Mining) |
| 1001 | Combustible, minerales, sólidos. |
| 2 | Minerales metalíferos, extracción. |
| 3 | Petróleo, yacimientos. |
| 4 | Piedra caliza, canteras con y sin elaboración de cal. |
| ° 5 | Piedras, mármol, arena y demás materiales para construcción, extracción, incluso elaboración en formas diversas. |
| 6 | Sal común, yacimientos. |
| 7 | Diversos materiales no mencionados especialmente, extracción. |
| 2000 | INDUSTRIAS MANUFACTURERAS (Industry) |
| 2100 | ALIMENTOS Y BEBIDAS (Foodstuffs). |
| °2101 | Aceites comestibles, fábricas y refinerías. |
| ° 2 | Agua gaseosa y bebidas sin alcohol. |
| ° 3 | Arroz, descascaración, molienda y otras operaciones. |
| ° 4 | Azúcar. |
| ° 5 | Café y especias, tostado y molienda. |
| °° 6 | Carnes conservadas, embutidos y similares, y grasa comestibles, no elaboradas en frigoríficos. |
| 7 | Aves faenadas y congeladas. |
| ° 8 | Carnes, elaboración incluyendo la matanza de reses (frigoríficos) |
| °° 9 | Cerveza |
| °° 10 | Chocolate y sus productos, caramelos, pastillas, turrone, etc. no elaborados en confiterías o panaderías. |
| 11 | Dulces, mermeladas y jaleas. |
| ° 12 | Fideos y otras pastas alimenticias, frescas y secas. |
| ° 13 | Frutas, legumbres, secas y en conserva |
| °° 14 | Galletitas y bizcochos. |
| °° 15 | Harina y otros productos de la molienda del trigo. |
| 16 | Helados |
| 17 | Legumbres y cereales, excludo trigo, en forma de harina u otras preparaciones. |
| °° 18 | Licores y otras bebidas alcohólicas y refrescos. |
| 19 | Malta, levadura de cereales y polvo de hornear. |

- °° 20 Manteca, crema, queso y demás productos de lechería.
- °° 21 Masa, pasteles, sandwiches y artículos similares, no elaborados en panaderías o fábricas de productos análogos.
- °° 22 Pan y otros productos elaborados en panaderías.
- 23 Pescados, mariscos, etc., en conserva.
- 24 Productos dietéticos.
- 25 Sidra.
- 26 Vinagre.
- ° 27 Vinos.
- ° 28 Yerba mate, molienda.
- °° 29 Varios.

- 2200 TABACO (Tobacco)
- °2201 Cigarrillos
- °2202 Cigarros, cigarritos y tabaco picado.

- 2300 TEXTILES (textiles)
- °2301 Algodón, desmotado.
- 2 Cerda, elaboración y tejeduría.
- °° 3 Cordones, trencillas, cintas, etc.
- ° 4 Estopa.
- ° 5 Fibras textiles.
- °° 6 Hilados y tejidos de lana.
- ° 7 Lana, lavado.
- 8 Medias.
- 9 Pelo para sombreros.
- 10 Tejidos elásticos, con o sin confección de artículos terminados.
- ° 11 Tejidos y artículos de punto de lana, algodón o mezcla.
- 12 Tejidos de seda.
- °° 13 Teñido, blanqueo y apresto de textiles.
- °° 14 Trenzas, sogas, cabospiola y piolín.
- °°°15 Varios.

- 2400 CONFECCIONES (Clothing).
- 2401 Bolsas de arpillera.
- 2 Bolsas de arpillera, reparación.
- °° 3 Bordados, vainillas, plegados, festones, ojalado y zurcido.
- °° 4 Calzado de tela con cuero u otras materias.

- 5 Camisas y ropa interior para hombres confeccionadas en casas dedicadas a esa sola producción.
- 6 Colchones de lana, estopa, etc.
- 7 Corbatas
- 8 Fajas, corsés, corpiños, etc.
- 9 Gorras y sombreros de tela para hombre.
- 10 Hilos, bobinado en carreteles, ovillos, etc.
- 11 Impermeables y perramus, capas, ponchos, etc. de telas impermeables.
- 12 Ligas y tiradores.
- 13 Pañuelos
- 14 Prendas de vestir y otros artículos confeccionados con pieles.
- 15 Ropa exterior o interior para hombre, mujer o niño y otros artículos de tela confeccionados en grandes tiendas o almacenes.
- 16 Ropa exterior para hombre o niño, confeccionadas en establecimientos denominados roperías, que también producen ropa interior de cama, etc.
- 17 Ropa exterior para hombre o niño, confeccionadas en sastrerías.
- 18 Ropa exterior para mujer o niño confeccionadas en casas de modas o talleres de modistas.
- 19 Ropa de mujer o niño, para uso exterior o interior, confeccionadas en establecimientos denominados tiendas y/o lencerías, que también producen ropa de cama.
- 20 Sombreros de fieltro, castor, etc. para hombres y fieltros para sombreros.
- 21 Sombreros de paja.
- 22 Sombreros para mujer hechos en fábricas o casas de modas.
- 23 Tapicerías, cortinas, etc.
- 24 Toldos, carpas, velas, banderas, etc.
- 25 Varios.

- 2500 MADERAS (Wood)
- 2501 Ataúdes, urnas y ornamentos funerarios.
- °° 2 Cajones para envases y embalajes.
- 3 Carbón vegetal
- ° 4 Corchos, tapones y otras formas.
- 5 Instalaciones para comercio, oficinas, etc. (mostradores, estanterías, vitrinas, y análogos).
- °° 6 Maderas, aserrado y preparación (aserraderos y corra-
lones).
- 7 Maderas compensadas y placas para carpinterías.
- °°° 8 Maderas, elaboración de diversas formas (carpinterías)
torneado y otras operaciones análogas.
- ° 9 Maderas, extracción y corte incluyendo algunas formas de
aserrado (obraje)
- 10 Moldes para fundición de metales.
- °° 11 Muebles excluidos los de mimbre.
- °° 12 Muebles y diversos artículos de mimbre, caña, paja, etc.
- ° 13 Parquets.
- 14 Puertas y ventanas, marcos, etc.
- °° 15 Toneles, cascos, barricas, barriles, etc.
- °° 16 Varios.

- 2600 PAPEL Y CARTON (Paper & Pasteboard)
- °2601 Cajas y otros envases de cartón.
- 2 Celulosa y pasta mecánica de madera.
- ° 3 Cuadernos, blocks, libros en blanco y artículos simila-
res de librería.
- ° 4 Papel, cartón y cartulina.
- 5 Sobres y bolsas de papel.
- ° 6 Varios

- 2700 IMPRENTA Y PUBLICACIONES (Printing)
- °2701 Diarios, periódicos y revistas.
- °°° 2 Imprenta, incluso litografía y talleres de encuadernación.
- °°° 3 Industrias anexas de las artes gráficas (estereotipia, electro-
tipis, fotograbado, fundición de tipos composición, etc.) no
efectuados en imprentas o talleres de diarios o revistas.

- 2800 PRODUCTOS QUIMICOS (Chemicals)
- 2801 Aguas para lavar
 - 2 Aceites vegetales.
 - 3 Alcohol, destilerías y desnaturalización.
 - 4 Ceras para lustrar
 - 5 Colores, pinturas y barnices.
 - 6 Curtiembres.
 - 7 Específicos veterinarios
 - 8 Fósforos.
 - 9 Fuegos artificiales.
 - 10 Fungicidas, insecticidas y fluidos desinfectantes
 - 11 Cases, comprimidos y licuados
 - 12 Hilado de seda artificial
 - 13 Jabón, excepto de tocador.
 - 14 Perfumes y artículos para higiene y tocador incluso esencias y extractos alcohólicos.
 - 15 Preparaciones farmacéuticas y especialidades medicinales.
 - 16 Preparaciones para limpiar y pulir.
 - 17 Sal, molienda.
 - 18 Sebo y grasa animales, preparación de huesos.
 - 19 Sustancias explosivas y cápsulas o cartuchos cargados.
 - 20 Sustancias y productos químicos o farmacéuticos no mencionados especialmente.
 - 21 Tinta para escribir.
 - 22 Tintas para imprenta.
 - 23 Tintas y pomadas para calzado.
 - 24 Velas de estearina, parafina, etc.
- 2900 DERIVADOS DEL PETROLEO (Oil Refineries)
- 2901 Aceites minerales y grasas para lubricación y otros derivados del petróleo, no comprendidas los preparados en refinería de petróleo.
 - 2 Petróleo, refinerías.
- 3100 CAUCHO (Rubber)
- 3101 Calzado de caucho con tela y otras materias.
 - 2 Cubiertas y cámaras para automotores.
 - 3 Varios.

- 3200 CUERO (Leather)
- °° 201 Arneses, guarniciones, valijas, baúles, etc.
 - °° 2 Calzado.
 - 3 Carteras para mujer.
 - 4 Correas de suela para transistores.
 - °° 5 Cueros y pieles, curtido, teñido y apresto.
 - °°° 6 Guantes.
 - 7 Reparación de calzado.
 - ° 8 Saladeros y peladeros de cuero.
 - 9 Varios.
- 3300 PIEDRAS VIDRIO CERAMICA (Stone, Glass and Pottery)
- °3301 Alfarería y cerámica.
 - 2 Artículos de cemento y fibrocemento, tanques, piletas, macetas, etc.
 - ° 3 Cal, elaboración (sobre esta actividad ver también en extractivas)
 - 4 Cal, molienda e hidratación.
 - ° 5 Cemento portland y blanco
 - 6 Diversos minerales y piedras, molienda y otras operaciones.
 - °°° 7 Escultura, molduras y otros artículos de yeso.
 - ° 8 Espejos, incluso biselado tallado y otras operaciones.
 - 9 Ladrillos de máquina y otros, refractarios e no.
 - ° 10 Ladrillos producidos en horno y polvo de ladrillo.
 - °° 11 Mármol, granito y otras piedras, corte, tallado, etc.
 - ° 12 Mosaicos.
 - ° 13 Otros artículos de piedra, tierra, vidrio, etc.
 - °° 14 Vidrios y cristalería en diversas formas.
 - 15 Vitraux d'art.
- 3400 METALES EXCLUIDA MAQUINARIA (Metal Works)
- °3401 Alambre, trefilación, galvanización y otras operaciones
 - °° 2 Alhajas, relojes y otros artículos de metales preciosos, elaboración y reparación efectuadas en talleres de joyería y relojería.
 - ° 3 Artefactor y artículos diversos de bronce y otros metales no ferrosos.

- 4 Artículos de hierro con o sin parte de otros metales, no mencionados especialmente.
- 5 Artículos de hojalata, hierro, zinc, etc. incluso la fabricación de envases, elaborados en establecimientos llamados hojalaterías mecánicas o no, plomerías, etc. comprendida la cromolitografía sobre metales.
- 6 Artículos rurales (molinos de viento, tanques, bebederos, portones, tranqueras, bretes, tejidos de alambre, etc.)
- 7 Básculas y balanzas.
- 8 Bulones, tornillos, remaches, clavos.
- 9 Cajas fuertes, muebles metálicos, etc.
- 10 Camas de hierro y bronce, y elásticos para las mismas.
- 11 Caños de hierro y acero.
- 12 Cobre, bronce y otros metales no ferrosos; elaboración y reparación de diversos artículos efectuados en talleres llamados broncerías.
- 13 Cobre y bronce y otros metales no ferrosos, fundición y elaboración en diversas formas.
- 14 Cocinas y otros artefactos análogos excluyendo los eléctricos.
- 15 Grabado, cincelado, repujado y estarpado sobre metales, incluso la fabricación de medallas.
- 16 Herrajes y guarniciones para puertas, ventanas, muebles, etc.
- 17 Hierro y acero y otros metales, fundición y elaboración en formas y artículos diversos.
- 18 Hierro, galvanización.
- 19 Hierro trabajado en diversas formas en talleres llamados herrerías.
- 20 Niquelado, cromado, plateado y otras operaciones similares sobre metales.
- 21 Orfebrería, platería, metal blanco, peltre y demás aleaciones, elaboración de artículos de menaje y otros.
- 22 Plomo, estaño y otros metales no ferrosos con exclusión de cobre y bronce, fundición y elaboración en formas diversas.

- °°°23 Plomo, estaño y otros metales no ferrosos, fundición de sus minerales
- 24 Puertas, ventanas, celosías y otros artículos para construcciones.
- ° 25 Trabajos efectuados en talleres mecánicos incluso producción de algunos artículos o repuestos (no comprende talleres mecánicos de automóviles).
- 3500 VEHICULOS Y MAQUINARIA (EXCLUIDA LA ELECTRICA) (Machinery)
- °3501 Astilleros y talleres navales.
- 2 Ascensores.
- 3 Automóviles y camiones, armado y fabricación de carrocerías.
- 4 Bicicletas, triciclos, etc, fabricación, armado, reparación.
- 5 Carros y carruajes: construcción y reparación, incluso las herrerías y carpinterías rerales.
- 6 Máquinas y motores, exclusive los eléctricos; construcción, armado y reparación, incluso la fabricación de repuestos.
- 7 Talleres de ferrocarriles.
- 8 Talleres de tranvías.
- 9 Talleres mecánicos para automóviles, ómnibus, micro-ómnibus y fabricación de repuestos (incluye talleres de vulcanización).
- 3600 MAQUINARIA Y APARATOS ELECTRICOS (Electrical Appliance).
- 3601 Acumuladores, pilas, baterías.
- ° 2 Artículos y aparatos diversos para electricidad.
- ° 3 Instalaciones eléctricas, incluso reparaciones.
- 4 Lámparas y tubos para electricidad.
- 5 Motores eléctricos, construcción y reparación, incluso la fabricación de repuestos.
- 6 Radiofonía, armado, construcción y reparación de aparatos, incluso la fabricación de repuestos.

- 3700 VARIOS (Various)
- 3701 Baúles, valijas, etc., de fibra o de madera y otros materiales, menos cuero.
- ooo 2 Botones, boquillas, peines y otros artículos de gaitita, bakelita, ebonita, celuloide, asta, hueso, etc.
- ooo 3 Escobas, plumeros, brochas, cepillos, pinceles.
- 4 Estuches de toda clase.
- 5 Hielo.
- oo 6 Hormas, encopias, sacabocados, etc., para calzado.
- o 7 Instrumentos musicales, construcción y reparación.
- 8 Juguetes.
- 9 Carteles, Letreros, afiches de toda clase incluso los luminosos.
- 10 Optica y copia de planos.
- o 11 Películas cinematográficas.
- o 12 Teñido, limpieza, lavado y planchado de ropas, talleres de compostura de sombreros.
- ooo13 Varios.
- 4000 ELECTRICIDAD Y GAS (Energy)
- o4001 Fábricas de electricidad.
- o 2 Gas para alumbrado y calefacción.

- - - - -

- o Branches in 1914
- oo Branches in 1869 and 1914
- ooo Branches in 1869

APPENDIX II OCUPATIONAL STRATA: 1869

In the National Census of 1869 occupations were recorded just by their names; so we had first to classify them into occupational groups. As in appendices I and III names will be kept in Spanish as a reference to the original material.

1. Names of occupations were first grouped by branch of economic activity and subsequently grouped into subsectors, according to the Code of 1954. (Table 1.2, App. I).

2. Occupations of each subsector (and branch) , were classified into different categories of employment, as follows:

- i) Self-employed:
 - a) Big employers: Those occupations whose names denote owners of farms, factories or commercial firms, etc. They employed a labour force.
 - b) Medium and small employers: owners of small firms or farms. They may have employed a labour force.
 - c) Self-employed: Very likely they did not employ a labour force.
 - d) Peddlers, home-workers, skilled artisans (some of them may have been skilled workers).

ii) Clerical workers:

- a) Technicians, administrators, top civil servants, etc.
- b) White collars.
- c) Low rank employees.

iii) Professionals:

- a) University trained professionals.
- b) Other trained professionals.
- c) Low rank professionals.

iv) Manual Workers:

- a) Foremen & skilled workers.
- b) Unskilled workers.

Each of the former sub-categories within each economic sub-sector (or branch) formed an occupational group.

3. In each subsector of actively occupational groups were ranked in a descreasing order, from those that probably had the highest income to those with the lowest. Here it was assumed that within each category of employment income depended either on wealth in the case of the self-employed or on the degree of training in the case of professionals, salary and wage earners.

4. The ranking of occupations in each sector

4a. Agriculture: The four levels of self-employment were ranked, followed by the two levels of manual work. (See table 22.1).

Mayordomos (administrators of estancias) were ranked as high as medium farmers.

In the Census there is a category recorded as "jornaleros, peones, gafianes, etc." (daily-labourers, rural workers, etc.); though some urban workers may have been included, this category was allocated to Agriculture (see below 4b).

TABLE 22.1

Occupational distribution. Agriculture: 1869

| | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Estancieros, Hacendados, ganaderos, cabañeros (cattle breeders) | 46.542 | | |
| Asucareros (Sugar cane growers) | 3 | | 46.545 |
| Agricultores (farmers) | 8.653. | | |
| Mayordomos | | 543 | 9.210 |
| Tamberos, etc. (dairy-farmers) | 547 | | |
| Other small farmers and tenants | 3.267 | | 3.823 |
| Islanders, Timberworkers | 581 | | 581 |
| Labradores (peasants) | 104.108 | | |
| Pastores (shepherds) | 11.047 | | |
| Capataces (foremen) | | 4.267 | |
| Peones, puesteros (workers) | | 2.941 | 122.363 |
| Peones, boyeros, obrajeros | | | |
| cañeros, jornaleros, gañanes, etc. | | 164.316 | 164.316 |
| TOTAL | 174.771 | 172.067 | 346.838 |

4b. Industry: With the exception of a small number of occupations which denoted employers, the rest were bound to be small craftsmen, who only exceptionally employed labour. The latter were themselves divided into three levels for each branch of industry (see Table 32.1, summary of industrial subsectors) and ranked accordingly. The small number of skilled workers were ranked as high as self-employed of the second level. (Table 32.2)

TABLE 32.1

Distribution of self-employed by sub-sector and level of employment.

Industry: 1869

| Subsector of industry | Small Craftsmen | Other self-employed | Home Workers | TOTAL |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| 2.100 Food-stuffs | 7.408 | | 1.644 | 9.052 |
| 2.200 Tobacco | 9 | 4.302 | | 4.311 |
| 2.300 Textiles | 281 | 92.566 | | 92.847 |
| 2.400 Clothing | 1.791 | 3.313 | 98.398 | 103.502 |
| 2.500 Wood | 14.994 | | | 14.994 |
| 2.600 Paper and Pasteboard | 6 | | | 6 |
| 2.700 Printing | 128 | | | 128 |
| 2.800 Chemicals | 1.566 | | | 1.566 |
| 2.900 Oil Refineries | | | | — |
| 3.100 Rubber | | | | — |
| 3.200 Leather | 4.975 | 14.557 | | 19.532 |
| 3.300 Stone, Glass & Pottery | 2.107 | | | 2.107 |
| 3.400 Metal Works | 6.416 | | | 6.416 |
| 3.500 Machinery | 244 | | | 244 |
| 3.600 Electrical Appliances | | | | — |
| 3.700 Various | 443 | | | 443 |
| Unknown | 778 | 310 | 2 | 1.090 |
| TOTAL | 41.146 | 115.048 | 100.044 | 256.238 |

TABLE 32.2

Occupational distribution. Industry: 1869

| | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| 'Saladeristas' | 68 | | 68 |
| Other Industrialists | 373 | | 373 |
| Small Carftmen | 41.146 | | 41.146 |
| Skilled workers | | 4.435 | 4.435 |
| Other self-employed | 115.048 | | 115.048 |
| Home-workers | 100.044 | | 100.044 |
| Workers in unknown branch | | 16 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 256.679 | 4.451 | 261.130 |

Even if some unskilled workers had been transferred from the category of "Jornaleros" (4. a) the picture of this sector would have not changed. Assuming that there were 10 to 20 workers per-employer, at the most there may have been eight thousand workers.

There were also masons, painters and other self-employed in construction, but with the exception of a few (see final Table page 179) no major distinction could be made.

4c. Commerce: With the exception of dealers in land-produce, overseas merchants (top groups) and some peddlers (lower group) the remaining, traders, shopkeepers and the like, were ranked together. Some qualified clerks were included.

TABLE 52.1

Occupational distribution: Commerce: 1869

| | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| Acopiadores de frutos "Introdutores" | 159 | | 159 |
| Administrators | | 3.345 | 3.345 |
| Traders and shop-keepers | 37.927 | | 37.927 |
| Peddlers | 1.158 | | 1.158 |
| "Botelleros" "Repartidores" | 5 | 156 | 161 |
| Total | 39.249 | 3.501 | 42.750 |

4d. Services and Transport: Tables 62.1 and 72.1 show the ranking of occupations in these sectors.

TABLE 62.1

Occupational Distribution: Services: 1869

| | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Banqueros (Bankers) | 7 | 2 | |
| Deputados-Sen. (M. of Parliament) | | 17 | 26 |
| 'Empresarios' (Entrepreneurs) | 19 | | |
| 'Barraqueros' (Owners of Depots) | 179 | | |
| 'Armadores' (Shipwrights) | 7 | | 205 |
| University trained professions | 1.831 | | 1.831 |
| Agents, consignees, etc. | 251 | | |
| Qualified employees (civil servants included) | | 9.113 | 9.364 |
| Other liberal professions | 354 | | |
| Artists | 1.871 | | |
| Teachers and journalists | | 2.367 | 4.592 |
| 'Corredores, viajantes' | 924 | | 924 |
| Small entrepreneurs (inn-keep- ers, barbers, etc.) | 2.045 | | 2.045 |
| Unqualified employees (mozos, porteros, serenos) | | 10.114 | 10.114 |
| Self-employed workers | 1.620 | | |
| Minor artists | 240 | | 1.860 |
| Other self-employed | 246 | | |
| Domestic servants (cooks, maids) | | 24.362 | 24.608 |
| Limpiabotas (shoe-polishers) | 32 | | |
| Lavanderas y planchadoras (washer-women) | 36.580 | | |
| Workers | | 53 | |
| Other Domestic Servants | | 58.703 | 95.368 |
| TOTAL | 46.206 | 104.731 | 150.937 |

TABLE 72.1
Occupational distribution: Transport 1869

| | Employers and self- employed | Salary and wage- earners | Total |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Ship-owners (embarcaciones) Trained employees and supervisors | 714 | 194 | 908 |
| Small entrepreneurs Employees | 75 | 3.068 | 3.113 |
| Wagon-drivers, boat-men, etc. (rastreadores, carreros, lan- cheros) Other low rank employees and sea-men | 5.032 | 9.371 | 14.403 |
| Skilled workers | | 9.184 | 9.184 |
| Unskilled workers | | 1.823 | 1.823 |
| TOTAL | 5.821 | 23.640 | 29.461 |

5. Strata within each subsector were drawn up based only on the researcher's judgement, supported by historical knowledge. (See lines drawn on tables).

6. Similar strata of different economic sectors were assembled in as many layers as necessary.

7. The final strata were drawn up locating breaking points between those that seemed separated further from each other, as follows (see table I, Chapter 3, page 179):

- a) The first breaking point was located between strata I and II; it separated cattle-breeders and overseas merchants from the rest.
- b) The second, between strata III and IV, leaving together the second and third strata. This grouping segregated University trained professionals, industrialists and other entrepreneurs from the rest.
- c) Thirdly, between strata IV and V to separate craftsmen and civil servants from the rest.
- d) And finally between strata V and VI because it marked the limit between predominantly non-manual strata and manual strata.

APPENDIX III OCCUPATIONAL STRATA:1914

As in 1869 the National Census of 1914 brings data on the economically active population, where occupations have been recorded by their names. But, unlike 1869, in this census, data on economic activities were also gathered (see Appendix I). So that the ranking of economic units in different branches of activity permitted the ranking of self-employed occupations.

1 - To start with, names of occupations were classified by branch of activity according to the code of 1954 (on economic activities). Subsequently occupations were classified into levels of employment as follows:

- i - Self-employment:
 - a-Employers: Those occupations which definitively denoted employment of labour-force.
 - b-Self-employed: those who may or may not have employed labour force.
 - c-Peddlers, home workers, skilled artisans who also may have been skilled workers.
- ii - Clerical work: classified when possible into different levels of training.
- iii- Manual work:
 - a - Foremen
 - b - Skilled workers
 - c - Unskilled workers.
- iv - Professionals: Classified into three levels of qualification

- a - University trained professionals.
- b - Minor university trained professionals and technicians.
- c - Low rank professionals.

2 - Occupations, and the number of people engaged, were assigned to their respective branch of activity, On the card corresponding to each branch, data on rank of average-investment, number of firms, and total employment were also recorded. That is, these were the same cards used to analyse branches of activity (Appendix I). Each card was controlled to verify that the number and sizes of firms were consistent with the number and type of self-employed occupations assigned to them; and also that the total employment recorded on the card was consistent with the number of clerical and manual workers allotted to them.

The former procedure aimed at ranking employers and self-employed according to the rank of their respective branch of activity. Though there must have been great variations among individual members of each branch, as these estimates were only approximate the procedure seemed to us reasonably good.

3 - As the actual procedures differed greatly for each sector of activity they will be treated separately.

3a - Agriculture

In the Census there are several names of occupations of ranchers and farmers of different types (Table 21.1). The names of occupations

already indicate a ranking because different self-denomination implies the exploitation of different sizes of holdings.

TABLE 21.1

Occupations in 1914 . Agriculture.

| Ranching | | Farming | |
|----------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Ganaderos, etc. | 60.849 | Timber owners and concessionaires | 131 |
| | | Farmers | 288.763 |
| | | Colonists | 144 |
| | | Vine-growers | 1.064 |
| Tamberos (Dairy) | 3.507 | Chacareros (Small Farmers) | 29.748 |
| Pastores (shepherds) | 42.137 | Labradores (peasants) | 65.333 |
| Total | 106.493 | | 385.183 |
| Grand Total | 491.676 | | |

Our aim was to rank occupations according to the ranking of agricultural holdings obtained from the complementary census (App. I tables 22.5 and 22.6). In Table 22.1, Column 2 and 3 show the distribution of different sizes of agricultural holdings ranked according to their average-investment.

TABLE 22.1

Estimates of heads of agricultural holdings: 1914

| Sections | Rank | (1) Average Hs. | (2) (3) N° of Holdings | | (4) Total Number Holdings | (5)-(4).1.5 Estimate |
|----------|-------|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | Farming | Ranching | | |
| I | 200 | 18.000 | | 1.524 | | |
| | " | 8.000 | 104 | | 1.628 | 2.444 |
| II | 20-70 | 2.000-11.000 | | 17.364 | | |
| | 10-50 | 600- 3.500 | 3.697 | | 21.061 | 33.596 |
| III | 7 | 1.000 | | 3.980 | | |
| | 6 | 400 | 7.567 | | 11.547 | 17.321 |
| Total | | | | | | 53.361 |
| | 2-6 | 250-760 | | 44.806 | | |
| | 2-4 | 77-250 | 64.760 | | 64.760 | 97.141 |
| | 1 | 100 | | 44.642 | - | |
| | 1 | 50 | 87.007 | | - | 191.766 |
| Total | | | | | | 288.907 |

- ii. The complementary census gives the number of heads ('directores') of agricultural holdings (farming and ranching together). This figure (419.424) divided by the number of holdings (275.451) indicate that there were 1.5 heads per-holding.
- iii. If the number of holdings in each group is multiplied by 1.5, an estimate number of "heads" is obtained for each category (column 5)
- iv. As the table shows, the estimates for the three first groupings approximately correspond to the number of "estancieros, hacendados, etc.". Here farming and ranching are considered together because an owner of a big farm would have never called himself farmer (agricultor) but "estanciero". Moreover estancias were (and are) normally mixed exploitations where farming and ranching were undertaken simultaneously. Though one might prevail over other.
- v. As regards the fourth and fifth groupings of farming holdings (column 2), they would roughly correspond to those "agricultores" whose farms were recorded in the complementary census; but there must have been many more farmers whose farms were not enumerated at all, though in the population census they themselves were registered. Small farms as well as other sorts of small firms are not usually recorded, for whereas complementary census schedules are sent by mail, population data are obtained by interviewers. Besides, in small holdings the farmer's family also

work on the farm so that they themselves are farmers.

Thus assuming that some of the "agricultores" belonged to farms of ranking 2 to 4 (holdings between 77 and 250 Hs.) the number of farms (64,760) was multiplied by 1.5 and so an estimate number of medium farmers obtained. The remaining "agricultores" were assigned to the lowest ranks of holdings.

vi. As far as the last two groupings of ranching holdings are concerned their number exceeds the number of other cattle-breeders (other than big ones) enumerated by the population census. Therefore no further distinction could be drawn except to locate all of them below "agricultores".

vii. The differences between the number of holdings in the lower ranks and the number of small cattle-breeders may have at least three explanations, which are not exclusive. First, most likely some "estancieros" owned or worked on more than one holding; therefore at least part of those assigned to the first three groupings of holdings should be located in the fourth. That is, some "estancieros, criadores, etc." would be ranked higher than they should. Secondly, some heads of holdings, recorded as ranching, might have declared themselves as "agricultores, colonos, etc.". In part, though "colonos" most probably were farmers, they might have been also cattle-breeders. And thirdly, part of the holdings of the lowest sizes might have formed part of big ranches though they were recorded in the Census as separate units. Thus the number of ranching holdings would be overestimated.

viii. Finally salary and wage earners in Agriculture were ranked according to our best judgement and part of "jornaleros" assigned to this sector (Table 12.1). This is a category globally recorded with no specification of sector of activity; it means, "day-labourers, workers, peons, etc."

ix. The final distribution came to be as follows (Table 22.2)

TABLE 22.2

Occupational distribution. Agriculture: 1914

| | Employees & Self-employed | Salary & Wage-earners | Total |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| "Estancieros" Average Holdings of: Ranching—more than 18 thousand hectares Farming—more than 8 thousand hectares | 2.444 | | 2.444 |
| "Yerbateros", "Explotadores Bosques" Ranching, average holdings between 2.000 and 11.000 Hs. Farming, 600–3.500 Hs. Ranching average Holding 1.000 Hs. Farming average Holding 390 Hs. | 131 58.405 | | 58.536 |
| "Agricultores" average-holding 75 to 250 Hs. | 97.141 | | |
| "Vitivinicultores" (Vine-growers) | 1.064 | | 98.205 |
| "Colonos" (Colonists) "Mayordomos" "Agricultores", holding less than 75 Hs. and most likely above 25 | 144 191.622 | 2.298 | 194.064 |
| "Chacareros", "tamberos" and the like (dairy-farmers, small farmers) | 33.255 | | 33.255 |
| "Capataces" (foremen) | | 1.231 | 1.231 |
| "Pastores" (shepherds) "Labradores" (peasants) "Peones" "Domadores" | 42.137 65.333 | 24.158 1.027 | 132.655 |
| "Jornaleros" | | 300.626 | 300.626 |
| TOTAL | 491.676 | 329.340 | 821.016 |

3. b Industry

i. Occupations classified by branch of industry and level of employment were grouped according to the ranking of their respective branch (table 32.1). Thus there were two systems of ranking; one given by the ranking of branches (Appendix I table 32.3) and the other by the level of employment.

TABLE 32.1

Ranking of self-employed occupations. Industry: 1914

| COMPLEMENTARY CENSUS | | | POPULATION CENSUS | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| (1) Ranks | (2) N° Firms | (3) Employment | (4) Employers | (5) Self-employed | (6) Home workers artisans |
| 0 | - | - | - | 18.366 | - |
| 1 | 31.638 | 170.493 | 423 | 182.785 | 58.461 |
| 2 | 4.927 | 43.584 | 295 | 46.625 | 148.992 |
| 3 | 6.869 | 47.115 | 175 | 3.429 | 2.846 |
| 4 | 1.672 | 20.522 | 194 | 793 | 732 |
| 5 | 683 | 15.805 | 58 | 28.817 | 4.544 |
| 6 | 43 | 767 | | 960 | |
| 7 | 283 | 6.511 | 25 | 1.391 | 2.084 |
| 8 | 38 | 749 | | | 1.233 |
| | 46.153 | 305.546 | 1.170 | 283.166 | 218.892 |
| 9 | 59 | 1.937 | 122 | | 251 |
| 10 | 16 | 3.094 | | | 362 |
| 11 | 503 | 19.871 | | | |
| 12 | 2 | 19 | | | |
| 13 | 31 | 697 | | | |
| 14 | 11 | 243 | | | |
| 15 | 401 | 4.909 | | | 1.217 |
| 16 | 150 | 3.429 | | | 77 |
| | 1.173 | 34.199 | 122 | | 1.907 |
| 40 | 66 | 5.143 | | | 2.434 |
| 60 | 24 | 1.808 | | | 90 |
| 80 | 40 | 4.500 | | | 137 |
| 200 | 44 | 14.685 | 97 | | |
| 400 | 18 | 14.787 | | | 504 |
| 500 | 1 | 220 | | | |
| | 193 | 41.143 | 97 | | 3.165 |
| | 47.519 | 380.888 | 1.389 | 283.166 | 223.964 |
| Unknown- branch | | | 8.617 | 3.785 | 1.625 |
| TOTAL | | | 10.006 | 286.951 | 225.589 |

ii. As well as occupations which could be assigned to branches there were others of unknown branch, though their level of employment was stated.

Of ten thousand employers, 8.617 were industrialists of an unknown branch. In order to estimate their probable distribution all cards of branches of industry were analyzed one by one, and we sorted out those where no employers or self-employed were assigned (Table 32.2). Two branches where the number of employers was considerably smaller than the number of firms recorded in the complementary census were also included on table 32.2

We assumed that there must have been at least one head per-firm in each of the branches included in table 32.2 and they were very likely enumerated in the same way as manufactures. Adding up all firms on table 32.2 (8528) and subtracting this figure from 8.617 there still remained 89 industrialist of unknown branch.

TABLE 32.2

Branches of Industry with no occupations recorded in the population census.

| Rank | Branch Number | | Nº Firms | Average Employment |
|------|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2306 | Tejidos de lana | 16 | 170.0 |
| | 2129 | Diversos alimentos | 42 | 9.0 |
| 2 | 2102 | Hieleros.Fabr.agua gaseosa | 742 | 5.2 |
| | 3712 | Lavado-plegado-tintor. | 195 | 13.6 |
| | 3403 | Caldererías, cobre-bronce | 59 | 10.5 |
| | 3407 | Fab.balanzas y Pesas y medidas | 19 | 9.9 |

TABLE 32.2 (2)

Branches of industry with no occupations recorded in the population census.

| Rank | Branch Number | | Nº Firms | Average Employment |
|-------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------|
| 2 | 3401 | Alambre | 65 | 7.0 |
| | 3208 | Saladeros, cuero | 8 | 5.6 |
| | 2821 | Tintas | 4 | 8.8 |
| | 2304 | Estopa | 11 | 9.4 |
| | 3414 | Fab. estufas y cocinas | 86 | 9.8 |
| | 2113 | Conservas, frutas, liq. etc. | 99 | 16.2 |
| 3 | (*) 2127 | Bodegas (4.317) | 4.142 | 3.8 |
| | 2114 | Galletitas | 207 | 10.0 |
| | 2303 | Cintas | 3 | 15.3 |
| | 2820 | Acidos y grasas | 137 | 8.0 |
| | 2701 | Imprentas | 938 | 12.3 |
| 4 | 3711 | Cinematografía | 1 | 6.0 |
| 5 | 2105 | Café | 54 | 9.6 |
| | 3602 | Artefactos leg. (fáb) | 35 | 26.9 |
| | 3409 | Cajas fuertes | 15 | 14.5 |
| | 3303 | Hornos, yeso y cal | 134 | 24.2 |
| | 2606 | Placas, fotos, papeles técnicos | 2 | 24.5 |
| 6 | 2301 | Desmont. algodón | 69 | 17.3 |
| | 3305 | Cemento | 29 | 15.2 |
| 6 | 2513 | Pisos parquet | 4 | 46.3 |
| 7 | 3205 | Curtiembres | 189 | 18.4 |
| | 3411 | Caños y planchas hierro | 5 | 11.6 |
| | 2815 | Específicos farmacéuticos | 28 | 19.9 |
| TOTAL | | | 7.338 | |

TABLE 32.2 (3)

Branches of industry with no occupations recorded in the population census.

| Rank | Branch Number | | Nº Firms | Average Employment |
|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 9 | 2802 | Fab. aceite no comestible | 12 | 22.3 |
| 10 | 2808 | Fab. de fósforos | 16 | 193.4 |
| 11 | 2509 | Obras forestales(493)(*) | 439 | 39.8 |
| | 2307 | Lavadero Lana | 10 | 255.0 |
| 12 | 2803 | Alcoholes | 2 | 9.5 |
| 13 | 2103 | Arroz | 9 | 25.4 |
| | 2101 | Aceite comestible | 22 | 21.3 |
| 14 | 2805 | Pinturas y barnices | 10 | 19.8 |
| | 2313 | Estampado algodón | 1 | 45.0 |
| 15 | 2115 | Molinos harineros | 401 | 12.2 |
| | 3417 | Acero-hierro laminación | 119 | 19.9 |
| TOTAL | | | 1.041 | |
| 40 | 2305 | Fibras vegetales | 3 | 22.0 |
| | 3404 | Hierro esmaltado, aluminio | 8 | 97.8 |
| | 2201 | Cigarrillos | 55 | 78.1 |
| 60 | 2401 | Bolsos yute | 24 | 75.3 |
| 80 | 2604 | Papel cartón | 11 | 172.8 |
| | 2109 | Cerveza | 29 | 89.8 |
| 400 | 2108 | Frigoríficos | 18 | 821.5 |
| 500 | 2902 | Petróleo | 1 | 20.0 |
| TOTAL | | | 149 | |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | 8.528 | |

(*) In brackets: total number of firms.

iii. The ranking of occupations was done using as a basis the grouping of branches obtained from Appendix I, (Table 32.3). Thus Employers were ranked from the upper to the lower groupings of branches; followed by three levels of self-employed (also according to the ranking of branches). Finally skilled-artisans and home-workers were located at the bottom of the distribution. As regards this latter category (column 6-table 32.1) we decided that those who belonged to branches of high rank (9 and over) very likely were wage-earners; whereas the rest might have been independent workers.

TABLE 32.3

Branches of industry not recorded in the industrial census

| Branch number | Type of activity | Nº People engaged in each branch |
|---------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2423 | Tapiceros | 1658 |
| 2409 | Gorristas | 364 |
| 2824 | Veleros | 261 |
| 2818 | Graseros | 125 |
| 2804 | Cereros | 23 |
| 2809 | Pirotécnicos | 217 |
| 3206 | Guanteros | 144 |
| 3423 | Plomeros | 1509 |
| 3422 | Estañadores | 32 |
| 3412 | Cobrereros | 372 |
| 3413 | Bronceros | 711 |

TABLE 32.3 (2)

Branches of industry not recorded in the industrial census

| Branch number | Type of activity | N° People engaged in each branch |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 3418 | Galvanizadores | 57 |
| 3709 | Letristas | 208 |
| 3704 | Estuchistas | 377 |
| 3703 | Plumereros | 111 |
| 3701 | Bauleros | 251 |
| 3703 | Cepilleros | 177 |
| | Escoberos | 597 |
| | Pinceleros | 30 |
| | Electricistas | 11.142 |
| TOTAL | | 18.366 |
| Self-employed of unknown branch. | | |
| | Afiladores | 429 |
| | Ajustadores planos | 109 |
| | Ajustadores | 1.915 |
| | Desfiladores | 122 |
| | Empujadores | 160 |
| | Escaleristas | 21 |
| | Modelistas industria | 255 |
| | Tallistas | 474 |
| | Zinqueros | 300 |
| TOTAL | | 3.785 |

iv. Also on table 32.1 there were 18,366 self-employed whose occupations did not fit into any of the branches recorded in the Complementary census; most likely because none of their firms were large enough as to be included there. For this reason these 18,366 were ranked as self-employed of rank 1. Similarly self-employed occupations of unknown branch were also ranked at rank 1 (see detail on table 32.3).

v. Very few wage-earning industrial occupations were enumerated in the population census; however we knew that the total employment in industry amounted to nearly 400 thousand. As in the population census there were two general categories "Empleados" (white-collar) and "jornaleros" (workers) we inferred that some of them must have belonged to the industrial sector.

Though the complementary census does not distinguish between clerical and manual workers there are special analyses of some branches of industries. (Introduction to Vol. VII, Census of 1914). From these studies we gathered that the proportion of clerical workers over total employment varied between 33 and 291 per-thousand. As the majority of industrial firms were small we thought that 33 per-thousand for the whole industrial sector was a sound estimate of clerical workers. These 12 thousand (3.3% over 380 thousand) white-collar workers were subtracted from the category "empleados" and allotted to Industry.

As far as manual workers were concerned part of the category "jornaleros" were considered as industrial (see ahead 4).

vi. Occupational strata are shown in table 32.4

TABLE 32.4

Occupational strata. Industry 1914

| Rank | Employers | Self-employed | Home Workers & Peddlers | White Collar | Manual Workers | Total |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------|
| 40 | 243 | | | | | 243 |
| 9-30 | 1.166 | | | | | 1.166 |
| 1-8 u.k | 8.508 89 | | | | | 8.597 |
| 4-8 | | 31.961 | 5.014 | | | 36.975 |
| 2-3 | | 50.054 | 4.720 | 12.569 | | 67.343 |
| 1 u.k | | 190.009 14.927 | 52.204 | | 5.072 | 262.212 |
| 4-8 2-3 1 u.k | | | 3.579 4.370 6.257 1.625 | | 40.682 | 56.213 |
| - | | | 142.748 | | | 142.748 |
| | | | | | 4.606 323.031 | 327.637 |
| TOTAL | 10.006 | 286.951 | 220.517 | 12.569 | 373.391 | 903.434 |

3. Construction

As in industry, the ranking of occupations in this sector was based on data obtained from the complementary census (App. I, Table 42.1). The following table was prepared where occupations were assigned to their respective branch of activity.

TABLE 42.1
Ranking of self-employed occupations: Construction: 1914

| Rank | COMPLEMENTARY CENSUS | | POPULATION CENSUS | | |
|--------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|---------|
| | N° Firms | Employment | Employers | Self-empl. | Workers |
| 50 Roadworks | 14 | 1.932 | 1.793 | 3.533 | |
| 4 | 25 | 340 | | | |
| 9 Building | 197 | 7.663 | 5.887 | 71.119(*) | |
| 2 Painting | 103 | 1.057 | | 23.550 | |
| Others | 27 | 197 | | 1.071 | |
| Total | 366 | 11.189 | 7.680 | 95.740 | 3.533 |

(*) Masons

1. The distribution of employers was done estimating a top group which would belong to the few firms recorded in the Complementary census; so that the number of firms was multiplied by 1.5 and the result substracted from the total number of employers (Table 42.2). The rest were considered as small entrepreneurs. Though most self-employed workers in construction very likely hired labour force, with the exception of the largest firms, they were not enumerated in the complementary census. For this was (and still is) an activity mostly

performed by "contratistas"; men who hired labour temporarily for given works.

TABLE 42.2

Occupational strata. Constructions 1914

| Rank | Employers | Self-employed | Manual workers | Total |
|-------|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------|
| 50 | 20 | | | 20 |
| 9 | 276 | | | 276 |
| 4 | 35 | | | 35 |
| - | 1,738 | | | |
| - | 5,611 | | | 7,349 |
| - | | 23,550 | | |
| - | | 1,071 | | |
| - | | 62,319 | | 86,940 |
| - | | | 8,800 | |
| - | | | 3,533 | 12,333 |
| Total | 7,680 | 86,940 | 12,333 | 106,953 |

ii. In the Census there were recorded 71 thousand masons. (Table

42. 1). A part of them must have been wage-earners; taking into account the figures on employment given by the complementary census nearly 9 thousand masons were assumed as being building-workers. (Table 42. 2).

3d. Commerce

The ranking of merchants, traders and shop-keepers was more difficult because the vast majority of them were just recorded as "comerciantes" (traders). As table 52.1 shows, very few cases could be assigned to branches of commerce. This general category must have also included "entrepreneurs in services" who declared themselves as "comerciantes" (see 3. e)

Cards with data on branches of commerce were sorted out and divided by groupings of ranks (according to App. I table 52.3). The few branches where occupations could be ascribed were left apart.

(Table 52.1)

TABLE 52.1

Ranking of self-employed occupations: Commerce: 1914

| COMPLEMENTARY CENSUS | | | POPULATION CENSUS | | |
|-------------------------|--------|------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Rank | Firms | Employment | Employers | Self-employed | Very small shop-keepers & peddlers |
| 1 | 48.595 | 132.998 | | 21.683 | |
| 2 | 9.038 | 35.074 | | 680 | |
| 3 | 2.350 | 8.257 | | 1.992 | |
| 4 & over | 8.841 | 56.450 | | | |
| 'Abastecedores' | | | 3.449 | | |
| 'Cerealistas' | | | 831 | | |
| 'Exportadores' | | | 49 | | |
| 'Importadores' | | | 106 | | |
| 'Comerciantes' | | | | 173.402 | |
| 'Compradores' | | | | 319 | |
| 'Vendedores ambulantes' | | | | | 18.672 |
| 'Aguadores' | | | | | 98 |
| TOTAL | 68.824 | 232.779 | 4.435 | 198.076 | 18.770 |

ii. In 1914 the Complementary Census did not enumerate the number of heads of commercial firms as was done in 1946. Though the latter gives 1.16 owners per commercial firm we assumed this figure as being 1.4 in 1914. The reason was that forty years back the number of owner's relatives working in the firm must have been higher than in 1946; in particular, small shops must have been family concerns.

iii. For every grouping of ranks, traders were estimated multiplying the number of firms by 1.4 (Table 52.2) Once an estimate of traders in services was subtracted the remaining 129 thousand were

TABLE 52.2

Estimates of "comerciantes"

| Rank | "Comerciantes"(173.402) | | Traders ascribable to branches, and others | Total |
|------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | Nº Firms | Estimate of Traders | Nº Firms | |
| 30 | 10 | 14 | 986 | 1.000 |
| 11-19 | 2.926 | 4.096 | - - | 4.096 |
| 4-10 | 4.905 | 8.267 | - 3.449 | 11.716 |
| 2-3 | 10.454 | 14.635 | 934 2.672 | 17.307 |
| 1 | 37.134 | (**)129.638 | 11.461 12.532 9.470(*) 18.770 | 142.710 9.470 18.770 |
| | | 156.650 | 47.879 | 204.529 |
| Table 62.2 | Traders in Services | 16.752 | | |
| | | 173.402 | | |

(**) The Lower Ladder of rank 1

(*) Note: This number corresponds globally to these branches and perhaps to others of small trade not specified in the Complementary Census.

allotted to rank 1. For they surely included small traders whose shops were not recorded in the complementary census as well as others too small to have been registered in the Census.

iv. Overseas merchants, "cerealistas" (traders in cereals) and "abastecedores" (traders in livestock) were ranked high though no branches of these types were recorded (very likely because these activities were not considered as commercial by the censal authorities), (Table 52.3)

v. Salary-earning occupations were classified into three levels of qualification. The first level included managerial positions; the second the vast majority of people who declared themselves as "clerical workers" and finally those whose names implied low rank employment (Table 52.3).

TABLE 52.3
Occupational strata. Commerce 1914

| Rank | Employers | Self-Employed | Home workers peddlers | White Collar | Manual workers | Total |
|-------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------|
| 30 | 155 831 14 | | | | | 1.000 |
| 11-19 | 4.096 | | | | | 4.096 |
| 4-10 | 8.267 3.449 | | | 1.298 | | 13.014 |
| 2-3 | | 17.307 | | | | 17.307 |
| 1 | | 142.170 | | 147.563 | | 289.733 |
| | | 9.470 | | | | 9.470 |
| | | | | 18.083 | | 18.083 |
| | | | 18.770 | | 64.589 | 83.359 |
| F | 16.812 | 168.947 | 18.770 | 166.944 | 64.589 | 436.062 |

- vi. From the category "empleados" of unknown branch 12 thousand were subtracted and considered as industrial (see above 3b - v.). The remaining were included in the second level of commercial clerks. (Table 52. 3).
- vii. As in other sectors some "jornaleros y peones" were included in Commerce (below 4).
- viii. Table 52. 3 shows the occupational distribution in Commerce.

3a. Services

The distribution of occupations among different branches of services indicates that the vast majority were not ascribable to any particular branch. But the table also shows many occupations whose branches had not been recorded in the complementary census. (Table 62. 1).

- i. As in Commerce, there must have been many entrepreneurs who called themselves "Comerciantes" (what is logically possible in Spanish). So that cards of branches with no occupations assigned were set apart and traders in services estimated, multiplying the number of firms by 1. 4. In one case (Inns), the number of owners was smaller than the number of firms. Therefore an extra number of "entrepreneurs" was estimated. The final figure (16. 752) was subtracted from the category "comerciantes" and included in Services. (Table 62. 2).

TABLE 62.1

Ranking of entrepreneurs in services

| Rank | COMPLEMENTARY CENSUS | | POPULATION CENSUS | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| | N° Firms | Employment | Employers | Self-employed | Peddlers and home workers |
| 1 | 18.466 | 60.312 | 593 | 17.265 | |
| 2 | 943 | 6.168 | 440 | | |
| 3 | 12 | 55 | 185 | | |
| 4 | 553 | 1.705 | 4.906 | | |
| 7 | 1.124 | 9.089 | 1.525 | | |
| 9 | 8 | 53 | | | |
| 10 | 812 | 3.632 | 3.560 | | |
| 60 | 34 | 524 | | | |
| 80 | 19 | 1.666 | | | |
| 200 | 31 | 806 | | | |
| 'Acopiadores' | | | 1.327 | | |
| 'Banqueros' | | | 68 | | |
| 'Empresarios' | | | 1.404 | | |
| 'Agentes Maritimos' | | | 118 | | |
| 'Agentes' | | | 638 | | |
| Other self-employed | | | | 2.753 | |
| Various, home workers | | | | | 4.817 |
| | 22.021 | 84.358 | 14.764 | 20.018 | 4.817 |

II. TABLE 62.2

Entrepreneurs in services recorded as "comerciantes"

| COMPLEMENTARY CENSUS | | ESTIMATES | |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Rank | N° of Firms | | |
| 1 | 6.201 | (*) 9.108 | 8.621 |
| 1 | 6.506 | (*) 9.108 | |
| | | (**)-1.366 | (**)-8.042 |
| 3 | 2 | | 3 |
| 6 | 11 | | 15 |
| 30 | 8 | | 11 |
| | | | 16.752 |

(*) Number of inns

(**) Innkeepers in Population Census

(***). Estimate of innkeepers.

ii. Agents were also ranked following the ranking of their branches except in two cases where they were ranked by approximation (Table 62.3).

TABLE 62.3

Ranking of agents

| Rank | Branches | N° Firms | N° of Agents |
|-------|--------------------|----------|--------------|
| 1 | References | 11 | |
| 1 | Trade-brands | 2 | 593 |
| 1 | Employment | 42 | |
| - | (°) Other | - | 638 |
| 2 | Estate | 4 | - |
| | Advertisement | 27 | 55 |
| 3 | Insurance | 10 | 185 |
| 4 | Money exchange | | |
| | and stock-exchange | 553 | 5.506 |
| - | (°) Shipping | - | 118 |
| 10 | Consignment | 812 | 3.560 |
| TOTAL | | 1.461 | 10.655 |

(°) Not recorded in the Complementary Census.

iii. Those occupations not ascribable to any branch were ranked by assimilation to other categories. Such was the case of bankers, "acopiadores" (middle-men who deal with land-produce) and "empresarios" (entrepreneurs).

Furthermore, there were five branches of services, with 922 firms, which did not include economically active population at all (colonizing companies, pawn-shops, depots, garages and 'mensajerías' - stage-lines). Perhaps, some "empresarios" corresponded to these branches.

iv. The ranking of salary - earners, professionals and workers was done by approximation to other categories once each group had been classified into different levels of employment (see above, 1). Here the main problem was the category 'civil servants' which could not be discriminated into different levels of hierarchical positions (Table 62.4).

TABLE 62.4

Occupational strata. Services: 1914

| Rank | Employers | Self-employed | Home-workers Peddlers | White collar | Manual Workers | Professionals Teachers Journalists | Domestic service | Total |
|--------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|---------|
| 30-200 | 11 68 | | | | | | | 79 |
| 10 | 3.560 | | | | | 19.945 | | |
| 7 | 1.413 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 1.439 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 15 | | | | | | | |
| - | 1.404 | | | | | | | 27.776 |
| 4 | 68 | | | | | | | |
| " | | 4.838 | | | | | | |
| 3 | 185 | | | | | 5.437 | | |
| " | | 3 | | | | 53.286(*) | | |
| 2 | 55 | | | 346 | | | | |
| " | | 385 | | | | | | |
| - | | 118 | | | | | | 64.721 |
| 1 | 593 | | | 113.809 | | | | |
| | | 638 | | | | | | 115.040 |
| - | | 2.063 | | | | | | |
| - | | 690 | | 362 | | 2.561 | | 5.676 |
| 1 | | 33.988 | | 17.592 | | | 2.013 | |
| | | | | | | | | 53.593 |
| - | | | 4.817 | | | | 117.626 | 122.443 |
| | | | | | 64.392 | | 199.700 | 264.092 |
| TOTAL | 8.811 | 42.723 | 4.817 | 132.109 | 64.392 | 81.229 | 319.339 | 653.420 |

(*) Teachers are considered salary-earners.

3.f. Transport

Data from the complementary census could not be used because it was too scant and hardly coincided with the "occupations" of the population census. For this reason the ranking of occupations was done according to what their names denoted.

i. As far as the self-employed were concerned there were two categories of owners of boats (either medium or small) and two types of road carriers.

ii. But the majority of occupations were made up of either salary or wage earners. This result is historically consistent as transport was usually performed by the railways. Clerical and manual workers were ranked by assimilation to other categories (Table 72.1).

TABLE 72.1

Occupational strata. Transport: 1914

| Rank | Employers | Self-Employed | White Collar | Manual Workers | Total |
|-------|-----------|---------------|------------------|----------------|---------|
| -10 | 355 | | 10.994 22.766 | | 34.115 |
| | 87 | 507 | | | 594 |
| | | | 45.292 | 10.896 | 56.188 |
| | | 26.210 | | 6.671 | 32.881 |
| | | | | 54.526 | 54.526 |
| Total | 442 | 26.717 | 79.052 | 72.093 | 178.304 |

4. Distribution of "jornaleros and peones"

Finally the category "workers" was distributed among different sectors. Subtracting employment as recorded by the population census from total employment given by the complementary census we obtained the estimate share of workers of each sector (Table 12.1). There remained thirteen hundred "jornaleros", who could not be assigned to any sector. Though Energy did not include any occupation of the population census (neither employers, nor workers) its share of workers was taken into consideration. According to the complementary census there were three hundred power-stations. Their owners or administrators must have been included in some of the general categories (Table 12.1).

TABLE 12.1
Distribution of "jornaleros"

| Sector | Employment complementary census | Employment population census | Estimate unskilled workers |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Agriculture | 326.015 | 25.389 | 300.626 |
| Industry | 380.888 | 57.857 | 323.031 |
| Construction | 11.189 | 12.333 | |
| Energy | 8.100 | - | 8.100 |
| Commerce | 231.533 | 166.944 | 64.589 |
| Services | 82.692 | 210.040 | 61.652 |
| Transport | 151.145 | 96.619 | 54.526 |
| TOTAL | | | 812.524 |
| Unknown sector | | | 1.388 |
| Grand-Total | | | 813.912 |

5. Forming Strata

An occupational group was defined as made up by individuals who performed the same activity (given by the sector) and shared equal position, that is level of employment, discriminated by its ranking. Secondly, occupational strata were drawn by assembling occupational groups of equivalent ranking. And finally, breaking points were located on the former distribution. The first three divided groups by levels of ownership ; strata where either big owners (I and II) medium (III) or small (IV and V) prevailed were put apart. In other words it followed the grouping of their respective economic units. And finally the last breaking point was based on the division between manual and non-manual work (between strata VI and VII). As from the seventh downwards manual occupations prevailed, this was considered as the beginning of the Popular strata (see Table IV, chapter 3, pag.183). The main criticism to these estimates of occupational distributions in 1914 (and in 1869 as well) is that no actual statistics on income distribution were used; therefore estimates were based on historical evidence. In this way the estimates and their analysis did not follow separate lines. Finally, the decision to draw a lower middle stratum can also be questioned, because income differences with the first layer of the lower stratum could not have been very large. Nevertheless that stratum was kept as a separate one because in terms of individual mobility this stratum offered better opportunities.

APPENDIX IV DISTRIBUTION OF LAND: 1914-1960

Here we intended to measure the degree of concentration of land in 1914, 1937, 1947 and 1960. Though our research ends in 1955, in this case we had to use data taken from the census of 1960. The nearest agricultural census to 1955 was that recorded in 1952. But the use of this census presented two problems. Firstly, the possible late effects of the Peronist Agricultural Policy would not have been reflected in our analysis. Secondly, the way holdings were recorded in 1952 made a fair comparison with other censuses almost impossible. For what in this census is considered as waste land can not be isolated from land under exploitation. The latter as recorded in 1947 covered an area of 163 million hectares, which increased to 175 million in 1960. In 1952 the total area, waste land included, was of 200 million hectares. We could not find out to what sizes of holdings the 15 million hectares of waste land corresponded as this figure was globally recorded.

We shall define land as being concentrated when at least 50 percent of the total area under exploitation is in holdings of 4,000-5,000 hectares. This is the proportion we found for 1914. And with slight differences it is maintained for the rest of the period, which allows us to assume that there was little change in the degree of concentration of land between 1914 and 1960. As we wanted to know in greater detail how much land concentration had changed we prepared the following simple measurement:

1. - For each year, a table was prepared with the distribution of holdings and the area for different intervals of size of holdings (Table 1.1).

TABLE 1.1
Distribution of land by size of holdings

| Interval- Scale Hectares | 1 9 1 4 | | 1 9 3 7 | | 1 9 4 7 | | 1 9 6 0 | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| | Holdings | Area Ha. | Holdings | Area Ha. | Holdings | Area Ha. | Holdings | Area. Ha. |
| -25 | 85.729 | 751.290 | 129.669 | 1.373.123 | 161.452 | 1.594.838 | 181.404 | 1.759.545 |
| 26-100 | 71.656 | 4.341.060 | 122.487 | 7.234.701 | 128.285 | 7.613.830 | 127.463 | 7.710.135 |
| 101-200 | 27.011 | 4.031.767 | 63.900 | 9.446.200 | 63.025 | 9.259.725 | 58.795 | 8.778.295 |
| 201-1000 | 67.311 | 24.377.024 | 64.380 | 27.559.513 | 62.976 | 25.632.675 | 63.153 | 26.544.616 |
| 1001-5000 | 18.828 | 44.897.610 | 20.634 | 42.019.725 | 20.151 | 47.158.500 | 18.697 | 48.014.090 |
| 5001-10000 | 2.958 | 23.634.420 | 3.171 | 23.977.500 | 3.393 | 24.452.250 | 3.110 | 23.928.680 |
| 10001 & over | 1.958 | 51.738.238 | 2.082 | 50.597.500 | 2.149 | 48.085.000 | 2.551 | 58.407.136 |
| T | 275.451 | 154.119.084 | 406.323 | 162.208.262 | 441.431 | 163.816.818 | 457.173 | 175.142.497 |

SOURCE: National Censuses

2. - We assume that had land distribution not changed, the per-cent distribution for each year would have been approximately the same.

(Table 1.2)

TABLE 1.2

Per cent distribution of land by size of holdings.

| Interval- Scale Hectares | 1914 | | 1937 | | 1947 | | 1960 | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| | Holdings | Area | Holdings | Area | Holdings | Area | Holdings | Area |
| -25 | 31.01 | 0.48 | 31.92 | 0.84 | 36.58 | 0.97 | 39.68 | 1.01 |
| 26-100 | 25.92 | 2.82 | 30.15 | 4.46 | 29.06 | 4.65 | 27.88 | 4.40 |
| 101-200 | 9.77 | 2.62 | 15.73 | 5.83 | 14.28 | 5.65 | 12.86 | 5.01 |
| 201-1000 | 24.72 | 15.81 | 15.85 | 16.99 | 14.27 | 15.66 | 13.81 | 15.15 |
| 1001-5000 | 6.81 | 29.35 | 5.08 | 25.91 | 4.57 | 28.80 | 4.53 | 27.42 |
| 5001-10000 | 1.07 | 15.34 | 0.78 | 14.78 | 0.77 | 14.92 | 0.68 | 13.66 |
| 10000 & over | 0.71 | 33.58 | 0.51 | 31.19 | 0.48 | 29.35 | 0.56 | 33.35 |
| T | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

3. - As the total area under exploitation varied from year to year we prepared a table where the values of area for each year were computed as if the former year's per-cent distribution had not changed (expected values). Thus we compared 1937 in relation to 1914, 1947 to 1937 and finally 1960 to 1947.

4. - The difference between actual and expected values for each interval of size of holdings were recorded in table 1.3.

TABLE 1.3

Difference between actual and expected area by size of holdings.

| Interval-Scale Hectares | 1937 - 1914 | 1947 - 1937 | 1960 - 1947 |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| -25 | + 594.523 | + 235.158 | + 60.663 |
| 26-100 | + 2.660.428 | + 242.073 | - 433.991 |
| 101-200 | + 5.196.344 | - 290.795 | - 1.117.256 |
| 201-1000 | + 1.914.386 | - 12.254.537 | - 882.699 |
| 1001-5000 | - 5.588.400 | + 14.837.442 | - 2.426.949 |
| 5001-10000 | - 905.247 | + 240.124 | - 2.202.581 |
| 10001 & over | - 3.872.034 | - 3.009.456 | + 7.002.813 |
| T | + 10.365.681 | + 15.554.798 | + 7.063.476 |
| | - 10.365.681 | - 15.554.798 | - 7.063.476 |

5. - From table 1.3 one may deduce: Firstly, that the more intense subdivision of land occurred most notably between 1914 and 1937. For whereas holdings of less than one thousand hectares covered an area larger than expected; the opposite happened to medium-sized and large holdings. Secondly, between 1937 and 1947 medium-sized holdings gained ground over either large or smaller holdings. Thirdly, in the last period, 1947-1960 there seems to have occurred a process of concentration of land in very large holdings (more than ten thousand hectares).

6. - These changes can be appreciated more clearly in table 1.4. There for each interval of size of holdings the ratio was computed between actual minus expected value over expected. This ratio indicates to what extent each interval of size of holdings either gained or lost area in relation to what might have been expected. In an ideal case when all intervals have maintained their share in the total area the ratio should be equal to zero value. The larger the ratio the more intense the change between the beginning and end of the period. And the sign indicates whether a given interval has gained or lost ground in relation to other intervals.

7. - Some conclusions may be drawn from table 1.4. Firstly: The most intense changes occurred between 1914 and 1937. The ratio-values for holdings with less than 200 hectares are considerably higher than the ratio-values for any other category in the same period and in any other period.

TABLE 1.4

Inter-period ratio of change

| Interval | 1937-1914 | 1947-1937 | 1960-1947 |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| -25 | + 76.36 | + 17.30 | + 3.57 |
| 26-100 | + 58.16 | + 3.28 | - 5.32 |
| 101-200 | + 122.27 | - 3.04 | - 11.29 |
| 201-1000 | + 7.46 | - 32.32 | - 3.22 |
| 1001-5000 | - 11.74 | + 45.91 | - 4.81 |
| 5001-10000 | - 3.64 | + 9.92 | - 8.43 |
| 10001 & over | - 7.11 | - 5.89 | + 13.62 |

Secondly, between 1914 and 1937 the ratio-values of holdings with more than 200 hectares are very small. This indicates that in absolute terms, these intervals of holdings did not lose area (see figures on table 1.1). Rather small holdings increased their share because the total area under exploitation grew from 154 million to 162 million hectares.

Thirdly, between 1937 and 1947 with the exception of the intervals 200-1000 and 1000-5000 all the other ratio values, either positive or negative, are very small. Similarly, ratio-values in the period 1947-1960 are very small. But whereas between 1937 and 1947 different intervals were affected both in their share and absolute area, between 1947 and 1960 changes affected the share rather than the absolute area.

This can be seen comparing the absolute areas for each size of holdings in table 1.1

Areas did not change significantly except for holdings with more than ten thousand hectares. The growth in area of this last category may have occurred as a consequence of the incorporation of new land in Patagonia. Comparing figures in the National Censuses of 1947 and 1960 we can see that about ten million hectares of land were incorporated during this period in Patagonia. This new land may have been distributed in large holdings.

8. - Though our evidence is not at all conclusive we are inclined to think that redistribution of land was more intense between 1914 and 1937 than after, particularly as far as small holdings were concerned. Our figures do not warrant our making any inference about the possible causes behind redistribution of land between 1914 and 1960; we can only say that whatever causes existed they worked more intensively during the first period even though they did not produce a substantial change in the degree of concentration of land. Returning to table 1.2, we can see that approximately half the total area continued to belong to holdings with more than five thousand hectares. As between 1937 and 1947 the ground lost by very large holdings (more than 10 thousand) was compensated by the gain in holdings between 5 and 10 thousand hectares. Though in an opposite direction, between 1947 and 1960 there was also a compensation between holdings of 5 to 10 thousand and more than 10 thousand hectares.

If we assume that between 1947 and 1960 all new land was given over to exploitation in large holding, even so our conclusions would not change.

If we subtract ten million hectares from the last interval in 1960 the total area would still remain as in 1947.

9. - Though figures of 1952 Census are not fairly comparable we give them in tables 1.5 to 1.8.

TABLE 1.5

Distribution of land by size of holdings, 1952

| Interval-Scale (Hectares) | Holdings | Area |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| -25 | 235.953 | 2.164.239 |
| 26-100 | 143.380 | 8.575.138 |
| 101-200 | 65.672 | 9.812.770 |
| 201-1000 | 70.859 | 29.796.896 |
| 1001-10000 | 27.966 | 83.915.971 |
| 10001 & over | 2.868 | 65.944.192 |
| Total | 546.698 | 200.209.206 |

TABLE 1.6

Per cent distribution of land by size of holdings, 1952

| Interval-Scale Hectares | Holdings | Hs. |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| -25 | 43.16 | 1.08 |
| 26-100 | 26.23 | 4.28 |
| 101-200 | 12.01 | 4.90 |
| 201-1000 | 12.96 | 14.89 |
| 1001-10000 | 5.12 | 41.91 |
| 10001 & over | 0.52 | 32.94 |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 |

TABLE 1.7

Difference between actual and expected by size of holdings

| Intervale-Scale Hectares | 1952 - 1947 | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| -25 | + | 222.210 |
| 26-100 | - | 734.590 |
| 101-200 | - | 1.499.050 |
| 201-1000 | - | 1.555.866 |
| 1001-10000 | - | 3.615.494 |
| 10001 & over | + | 7.182.789 |
| Total | + | 7.405.000 |
| | - | 7.405.000 |

TABLE 1.8

Inter-period ratio of change

| Intervale-Scale Hectares | 1952 - 1947 | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------|
| -25 | + | 11.44 |
| 26-100 | - | 7.89 |
| 101-200 | - | 13.25 |
| 201-1000 | - | 4.96 |
| 1001-10000 | - | 4.13 |
| 10001 & over | + | 12.22 |

From the comparison between 1947 and 1952 we may arrive at similar conclusions to those drawn when we compared 1947 to 1960.

10. - Finally we should like to point out that an accurate analysis of land distribution should be carried out on a regional basis. We know of some research projects being done in this line but unfortunately we have not had access to them. Besides, we do not know whether they are historical studies.

Moreover, we should like to remark that here we did not deal with land property, but only with distribution of land by size of holdings.

We are convinced that an analysis of the concentration of land property is urgently needed; until this is done, very few conclusions can be made on a sound basis.

APPENDIX V

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION (1857-1924)

There are two studies, one by Germani, the other by Beyhaut and others, which will be used here to give a short account of the process of foreign immigration in Argentina (*). This process covered a period of over sixty years (1857-1924) during which more than five million people came to Argentina.

In relation to the existing population, immigration in Argentina was the largest of modern immigrations. Though the rate of return to their home-countries was very high, many immigrants definitively settled in this country.

TABLE 1
Rate of Return of Foreign Immigrants

| | Immigration | Emigration | Rate of Return (%) |
|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| 1857-1860 | 20.000 | 8.900 | 44.5 |
| 1861-1870 | 159.570 | 82.976 | 51.6 |
| 1871-1880 | 260.885 | 175.763 | 67.2 |
| 1881-1890 | 841.122 | 203.455 | 24.1 |
| 1891-1900 | 648.326 | 328.444 | 50.4 |
| 1901-1910 | 1.764.103 | 643.881 | 36.5 |
| 1911-1920 | 1.204.919 | 935.825 | 77.6 |
| 1921-1924 | 582.351 | 183.546 | 31.5 |
| Total | 5.481.276 | 2.562.790 | 46.8 |

SOURCE: Beyhaut et.al., "Inmigración y Desarrollo", no page number indicated.

(*) Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1966.
Beyhaut, et. al., "Inmigración y Desarrollo", Facultad Filosofía, Bs. As., 1961.

Foreign immigrants were predominantly adults and males, in other words they were predominantly a potentially active population. The following table shows the distributions by sex and age of foreign immigrant, over the period of massive immigration. This fact explains why in 1895 whereas foreigners made up only 25.4% of the whole population of the country, they accounted for 38.8% of the economically active population. In 1914 the corresponding figures were 29.9% (of the population) and 46.1% (of the active population)(^{*}).

TABLE 2

Per cent distributions by age and sex

| | 1-12 years | 13-60 years | More than 60 years | Male female | |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|
| 1857-1860 | 17.38 | 81.21 | 1.41 | 80.51 | 19.49 |
| 1861-1870 | 7.63 | 91.27 | 1.10 | 76.45 | 23.55 |
| 1871-1880 | 16.21 | 82.71 | 1.08 | 70.36 | 29.64 |
| 1881-1890 | 15.25 | 83.69 | 1.10 | 69.57 | 30.43 |
| 1891-1900 | 15.80 | 83.21 | .99 | 70.67 | 29.33 |
| 1901-1910 | 15.86 | 83.10 | 1.04 | 72.65 | 27.35 |
| 1911-1920 | 14.67 | 84.10 | 1.23 | 69.86 | 30.14 |
| 1921-1924 | 10.23 | 88.43 | 1.34 | 70.41 | 29.59 |
| 1857-1924 | 14.71 | 84.21 | 1.08 | 71.08 | 28.92 |

SOURCE: Beyhaut et.al., ibid, no page number indicated.

(^{*}) Germani, G., "Estructura Social de la Argentina", Bs.As., Raigal, 1955.

The patterns of settlement as well as the geographical distribution of foreigners shifted during the whole period considered here. The first immigrants settled in the provinces of Santa Fe, Entre Rios and Corrientes, where agricultural colonies were sponsored by the Argentine Government. Towards the end of the XIXth century, the new waves of foreign immigrants either went to rural areas to work as tenants or simple labourers or remained in cities where they engaged in industrial or commercial activities. In a later period foreign immigrants again played an important role in the colonization of large rural areas in Mendoza and the North-eastern provinces. The vine industry and many subtropical cultures, such as cotton and Paraguayan tea, were carried on to a large extent by foreign colonizers. Many foreigners, especially Italians, were harvest hands, arriving annually in steerage from Europe, and returning when the harvest was over.

In cities, foreigners built up industries and carried on commercial activities and services. The concentration of foreigners in urban areas, especially Greater Buenos Aires, can be seen from the following table 3.

Growth in industry and in tertiary activities became a correlative of foreign population and remained so until the middle twenties. In 1895, 81.8% of all industrial concerns were in the hands of foreigners; twenty years later this proportion had decreased to 64.3%, but it has to be taken into account that many owners of industrial concerns, Argentine

TABLE 3

Proportion of Foreigners in each Departmental Category(*)

| | 1869 | 1895 | 1914 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Greater Buenos Aires | 47 | 50 | 49 |
| 100.000 inhabitants and over | 9 | 34 | 35 |
| 50.000 - 99.999 inhabitants | 8 | 18 | 22 |
| 20.000 - 49.999 " | 12 | 23 | 26 |
| 2.000 - 19.999 " | 7 | 19 | 23 |
| Rural (under 2000 ") | 3 | 9 | 14 |
| Whole Country | 12 | 25 | 30 |

(*) Departments were included in each category according to the size of their largest urban center.

SOURCE: Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", p. 195.

by birth and classified as such in the census, were sons of foreigners.

The next table shows the proportion of foreigners in several occupational categories.

TABLE 4

Foreigners per hundred in each category

| | 1895 | 1914 |
|--|------|------|
| Industrial owners | 81 | 66 |
| Traders, shopkeepers, and similar | 74 | 74 |
| Labourers and white collar in commerce | 57 | 53 |
| Labourers and white collar in industry | 60 | 50 |
| Professionals | 53 | 45 |
| Craftsmen and home-workers | 18 | 27 |
| Civil servants | 30 | 18 |
| Shopassistants | 63 | 51 |
| Domestic servants | 25 | 38 |

SOURCE: Germani, G., "Política y Sociedad", p. 195.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Theory

- AHUMADA, J. "El Desarrollo Económico y los Problemas del Cambio Social en América Latina". (ST/ECLA/CONF. 6/L.A. -1).
- ANDIC, F.M. "Desarrollo Económico y Distribución del Ingreso en Puerto Rico", Banco Gubernamental de Fomento para Puerto Rico, 1964.
- BAIRD, E. & S. FIRE. "The use of income tax data in the National Resources Committee estimate of the distribution of income by size", Studies in Income & Wealth, Vol. III, N.Y., National Bureau of Economic Research, 1939. -
- BANK, A. "A Cross Polity Survey". Massachussets, Institute of Technology, 1963.
- BARBER, B. "Social Stratification", Hartcourt, Brace & World; Inc. New York, 1957.
- BENDIX, R. & S. LIPSET. "Class, Status and Power; a Reader in Social Stratification", Glencoe, Ill, The Free Press, 1953.
- BENDIX, R. "Max Weber, An Intellectual Portrait", Doubleday & Co, Garden City, New York, 1960.
- BENDIX, R. "Max Weber's Sociology Today", International Social Science Journal, Unesco, Vol. XVII, 1, 1965.
- BERGEL, E.E. "Social Stratification", New York, Mc Graw-Hill., 1962.
- BIERSTEDT, R. "An Analisis of Social Power", in American Sociological Review 15, December 1950, pp. 730-738.
- BOALT, G. "Social Mobility in Stokholm: a Pilot Investigation", in Transactions of the IInd World Congress of Sociology, London, 1954, Vol. II, p. 67.
- BLAU, P. "Exchange and Power in Social Life", New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

- BOTTOMORE, T. B.** "Classes in Modern Society", London, 1955.
- BRADY, ROBERT, A.**, "Business as a System of Power", New York Columbia University Press, 1943.
- COSIO VILLEGAS, DANIEL**, "El crecimiento económico programado y la organización política". - (ST/ECLA/CONF.6/L. C. 2 A). -
- COSTA PINTO, L. A.** "Estructura de clases y cambio social", Paidós, Buenos Aires, 1964.
- COSTA PINTO, L. A.** "Social Stratification in Brazil: a General Survey of Some Recent Changes", Transactions of IIIrd World Congress of Sociology ISA, London, 1956.
- CRUM, W. C.** "Individual Shares in the National Income"; Review of Economics and Statistics, XVII, 1935.
- CUBER, J. F. & W. F. KENKEL**, "Social Stratification in the United States", New York, Appleton Century. Crofts, Inc. 1954.
- COX, O.**, "Max Weber on Social Stratification. A Critique", A. S. R. XV, 1950, p. 223.
- DAHL, R. A.** "The Concept of Power", in Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, N° 3, July 1957.
- DAHL, R. A. & LINDBLON, CHARLES E.**, "Politics, Economics & Welfare", New York, Harper & Brothers, N. Y., 1953.
- DAHRENDORF, R.**, "Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society", Stanford, Stanford University Press, California, 1959.
- DAHRENDORF, R.**, "Social Structure, Class Interests, and Social Conflict", Transactions, IIIrd. World Congress of Sociology, ISA, London 1956, III V. p. 291.
- DE KADT, E.** "Conflict and Power in Society", International Social Science Journal, Vol. XVII, N° 3, 1965, pp. 454-471.
- Economic Commission for Latin America** "Características de la economía interna y su desarrollo", 1929-1959. (E/CN 12 /563). -

- Economic Commission for Latin America "La estructura del empleo en América Latina". Boletín Económico para América Latina, Vol. II, N° 1, February 1957.
- FELDMAN, A.H. "Economic Development and Social Mobility" in Economic Development and Cultural Change, the University of Chicago, Vol. III, N° 3, April 1960, pp. 311-21.
- FELLNER, W. "Competition Among the Few" New York, Augustus M. Kelly, 1960. (Reprint). -
- FELLNER, W. "Readings in the Theory of Income Distribution"; selected by a committee of the American Economic Association - Philadelphia - Toronto, The Blakston Co., 1951.
- GALBRAITH, J.K. "American Capitalism. The Concept of Counter-vailing Power", Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1952.
- GALBRAITH, J.K. "Monopoly and the Concentration of Economic Power", in Ellis, Howard. S(ed). "Survey of Contemporary Economics", AEA, Philadelphia, 1949.
- GERMANI, G. "Estrategia para estimular la movilidad social", Departamento de Sociología, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- GERMANI, G., "Scheme for the Identification of Research Problems in Social Stratification".
- GERMANI, G., "Indicadores objetivos de clase", Instituto de Sociología, Buenos Aires.
- GIBRAT, R. "Les inégalités économiques", Paris, Librairie du Recueil Serer, 1931.
- GINSBERG, M., "Sociology", London, 1953.
- GORDON, M. "Social Class in American Sociology", Durham, North Carbline, Duke University Press, 1958.
- GOLDTHORPE, J.H. & D. LOCKWOOD, "Affluence and the British Class Structure", The Sociological Review, XI(2), July, 1963.

- GUADAGNI, A.** "La estructura ocupacional y el desarrollo económico en Chile", Cuadernos Latinoamericanos de Economía Humana, N° 15. -
- HODGES, H. M.** "Social Stratification: Class in America", Cambridge, Mass., Schenkman 1964.
- HOSELITZ, J.** "Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth", Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1960.
- KAHL, J.** "Educational and Occupational Aspirations", Harvard Educational Review, 23, 1953, pp. 186-203.
- KAHL, J.** "Social Stratification & Values in Metropoli & Provinces: Brazil & México" Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, doc. N° 9, Bs. As., 1964.
- KAHL, J.** "The American Class Structure", New York, Reinhardt & Company, Inc., 1957.
- KAUTSKY, J. H.** "Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries"; Nationalism and Communism, New York - London, J. Wiley, 1962.
- KELSAL, R. K., A. LOCKWOOD, P., & A. TROPP,** "The New Middle Class in the Power Structure of Great Britain", in Transactions of the IIIrd. World Congress of Sociology, Vol. III, London, 1956.
- KERR, C. & Others.** "Industrialism and Industrial Man"; the problems of labour and management in economic growth, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1960.
- LASSWELL, THOMAS.** "Class and Stratum, an Introduction to Concepts and Research", Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1965.
- LASWELL, H. D. & KAPLAN,** "Power & Society", New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950.
- LASWELL, H. D.** "The Decision Process": Seven Categories of Functional Analysis", Maryland, University Bureau of Governmental Research. Studies in Government Series, College Park, 1956.
- LASWELL, H. D.** "Power and Personality", New York, Academy of Medicine, Salmon Memorial Lectures, 1947. -

- LENSKI, G. E. "American Social Classes. Statistical Strata or Social Groups" in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LVIII, 1952.
- LENSKI, G. E. "Status Crystallization: a Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status", American Sociological Review, 19 (1954) p. 405-413.
- LIPSET, S. M. & H. ZETTERBERG, "A Theory of Social Mobility", Transactions, IIIrd. World Congress of Sociology, ISA, London, 1956.
- MAYER, K. B. "Class and Society", New York, Random House, 1955.
- MAYER, K. "The Theory of Social Classes", Harvard Educational Review, Summer, 1953.
- Mc. GUIRE, "Social Stratification and Mobility Patterns" in American Sociological Review, XV, 1950, p. 195.
- MARSHALL, T. H. "The Nature of Class Conflict" in Bendix & Lipset. "Class, Status & Power".
- MEDINA ECHAVARRIA, J. "El desarrollo económico de América Latina", UNESCO, February 1962 (p.p/ 23/32).
- MILLS, C. WRIGHT, "White Collar", The American Middle Classes", New York, Oxford University Press, 1956.
- MILLS, C. WRIGHT, "The Power Elite", New York, Oxford University Press, 1956.
- MILLER, S. M. "The Concept and Measurement of Mobility", Transactions of IIIrd World Congress of Sociology, ISA, London, 1956 (vol. III).
- MINKES, A., "Statistical Evidence, and the Concept of Tertiary Industry", Economic Development & Cultural Change, July 19
- MORRIS, R. & R. MURPHY, "The Situs Dimension in Occupational Structure" in American Sociological Review, April 1959, p. 231.
- MOORE, W. "Industrialization and Labor Aspects of Economic Development", Ithaca, Cornell University, 1951.

- MOORE, W. & A. S. FELDMAN, "Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas", Social Science Research Council, New York, 1960.
- NAVARRETTE, I. M. de "Distribución del Ingreso y Desarrollo Económico de México", Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México, 1960.
- NICHOLSON, J. L., "The Distribution of Income", Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Economics and Statistics, Vol. 6, N° 2.
- OSSOWSKI, S. "Class Structure in the Social Consciousness", London Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963.
- OSSOWSKI, S. "Old Notions and New Problems: Interpretations of Social Structure in Modern Society", Transactions of IIIrd World Congress of Sociology, ISA., 1956.;
- PORTER, J., "The Vertical Mosaic. An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada", The University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- REISSMAN, L. "Class in American Society", London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960.
- ROY, A. D. "Some Thought on the Distribution of Earnings". Oxford Economic Papers, New Series 3, 135.
- RUGGLES, R. "Ingreso Nacional, Introducción y Análisis, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956.
- SILVERT, K. H., "The Conflict Society. Reaction and Revolution in Latin America", New Orleans, 1961.
- SOROKIN, P. "What is Social Class", in Bendix & Lipset, "Class, Status and Power".
- SPENGLER, J. J. "Changes in Income Distribution and Social Stratification", in American Journal Sociology, 59, 1953.
- SVALASTOGA, K., "Prestige and Class Mobility", Copenhagen, Scandinavian University Books, 1959.
- TONNIES, F. "States and Classes" in Bendix & Lipset (ed.) "Class, Status and Power".

- TUMIN, M. & A. FELDMAN**, "Social Class and Social Change In Puerto Rico", Princeton, N. J. Princeton University Press, 1961.
- VRIES, E. de, & J. M. ECHAVARRIA**, "Social aspects of Economic Development in Latin America", Paris, UNESCO, 1963.
- WEBER, MAX**. "The Theory of Social and Economic Organization", T. Parsons (ed.), Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press, 1947.
- WEBER, MAX**. "From Max Weber. Essays in Sociology", New York, Oxford University Press, 1958.
- WEBER, MAX**. "Class, Status and Party" in Bendix and Lipset (ed.), "Class, Status and Power".

2. Economic Groups

- AHUMADA, J.** "Teoría del desarrollo económico y cuentas nacionales", Santiago, 1955 (mimeograph).
- ALVAREZ, J.** "Las Guerras Civiles Argentinas", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1966.
- ANALES DE LA SOCIEDAD RURAL ARGENTINA**. 1910. British Museum Ac/3538/3 Ac. Bs. As. S. R. A. 1911.
- ARGENTINE YEARBOOK** (1922-23 ed.); British Museum. P. P. 2594 or a. h. 1921.
- BANCO HIPOTECARIO, BOLETIN**. 1937-1946-1947-1952.
- BANCO HIPOTECARIO, MEMORIA E INFORME**, 1937-1946-1947-1952.
- BANK OF ENGLAND, U. K.** Overseas Investment 1938 - 48, H. M. S. Office 1950.
- BAQUEIRO, J. L.** "Catálogo Industrial Peuser", 1963.
- BEYHAUT, G., GOROSTEGUI, H., & ALTERS**, "Inmigración y Desarrollo Económico", Instituto de Historia Social, Bs. As., 1961.

BOREA, D. "La Colonización", 1923.

BUENOS AIRES HERALD, "Vinculación argentina-norteamericana, orígenes, desenvolvimiento futuro", Buenos Aires, 1946.

BUNGE, A. "La Economía Argentina", Vol. III, Política económica y aduanera, Agencia General de Librerías y Publicaciones, Buenos Aires, 1928.

BUNGE, A. "Los problemas económicos del presente", Buenos Aires, 1920.

BUNGE, A. "Una Nueva Argentina", Kraft, Buenos Aires, 1940.

BUNGE, A. y M. A. SASOT, "El estado industrial y comerciante", Ed. Economía Argentina, Buenos Aires, 1932.

BURGUIN, M. "The Economic Aspects of Argentine Federalism", 1820-1852", Cambridge Mass, Harvard University Press, 1946.

CARCANO, M. A., "Evolución histórica del régimen de la tierra pública; 1810-1916", Buenos Aires, Librería Mendelky, 1917.

Censos Nacionales Generales: 1869, 1895, 1914, 1947.

Extracto Estadístico de la República Argentina, 1916.

Anuario Estadístico de la República Argentina, 1957.

Informe Demográfico de la República Argentina, 1944-1954.

Censos Agropecuarios Nacionales: 1888, 1908, 1937, 1952.

Censos Ganaderos: 1922, 1930.

Censos Industrial y Comercial de la República: 1908, 1914.

Censos y Estadísticas Industriales Nacionales: 1935, 1937, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1943, 1946, 1948, 1950.

Censo Nacional Minero, Industrial y Comercial: 1954.

Censo Bancario de la República Argentina: 1925.

- Censo de Empleados Administrativos, Funcionarios Judiciales, Personal Docente, Jubilados y Pensionistas Civiles de la República Argentina: 1893, 1894.**
- COLE, G. D. H.** "Introduction to Economic History, 1750-1950", London, Mac Millan and Co, 1953.
- COLE, G. D. H.** "Presente y futuro del dinero", México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1947.
- CONFEDERACION GENERAL ECONOMICA**, "Programa Conjunto para el Desarrollo Agropecuario e Industrial", Buenos Aires, 1962-1963.
- CONSEJO FEDERAL DE INVERSIONES**, "Bases para el Desarrollo Regional Argentino", Buenos Aires, 1963.
- CORTES CONDE, R.** , "Cambios históricos en la estructura de la producción agropecuaria en la Argentina", en Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 5 N° 20, January-March, 1966.
- CHALKEY, H. O.** "Economic Conditions in the Argentine Republic", London, H. M. S. O., 1919.
- CHUECO, M. C.** "Los pioneers de la Industria Argentina", Buenos Aires, Imprenta de la Nación, 1886.
- DARBYSHIRE** "My life in the Argentine Republic", London, F. Warne & Co., 1917.
- DEL VALLE, A.** "La Política Económica Argentina en la década del 80", Buenos Aires, Raigal, 1955.
- DE WITT DICKENS, Paul**, "American Direct investment in Foreign Countries", Washington, 1931.
- DIRECCION ECONOMICA RURAL**, Boletín 1946.
- DIRECCION NACIONAL DE ESTADISTICA Y CENSOS**, "ANUARIOS", 1911.
- DI TELLA & ZYMELMAN**, "Etapas del Desarrollo Económico Argentino", Ph. D. Thesis (mimeograph).
- DORFMAN, A.** "Evolución de la economía industrial Argentina", Colegio Libre de Estudios Superiores, Bs. As., 1938

DORFMAN, A., "Evolución Industrial Argentina", Losada, Buenos Aires, 1942.

DORFMAN, A., "Historia de la industria argentina", Escuela de Estudios Argentinos", Bs.As. 1942.

DREES, CHARLES, "Americans in Argentina", Buenos Aires, 1922.

DUNN, R., "American Foreign Investment", New York, 1926.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA "El desarrollo económico de la Argentina" Santiago, Chile, 1956 (Mimeograph edition).

EDELBERG, G. "Un comentario sobre el efecto de arrastre de Hirschman", Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 4, T. II (N° 14-15), July-December 1964.

ESTADISTICA HIPOTECARIA 1946-1947-1952.

FELLNER, W. "Competition Among the Few; Oligopoly and Similar Market Structures". New York, Augustus M. Kelley, 1960.

FERNS, H. S. "Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century", Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1960.

FERRER, A. "La Economía Argentina", México, Fondo Cultura Económica, 1963.

FERRER JAMES. "United States - Argentine Economic Relations, 1900-1930" Ph. D. Dissertation, Berkeley, California, 1964.

FIAT., "La industrialización y el ahorro de divisas en la Argentina", O.E.C.E.I., Bs. As., 1959.

FIAT., "Importaciones, industrialización, desarrollo económico en la Argentina", O.E.C.E.I., Bs. As., 1963.

FIAT., "Economía agropecuaria argentina", O.E.C.E.I., Bs. As. 1964.

FILLOL, T.R. "Social Factors in Economic Development: the Argentine Case", M. I. T. Press, 1961.

- FRAZER**, "The Amazing Argentina", London, Carsell & Co., 1914.
- FUCHS**, J. "La penetración de los trusts yanquis en la Argentina", Cartago, Bs. As., 1959.
- FURTADO**, C. "Development and Underdevelopment", Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1964.
- GAIGNARD**, R. "Origen y evolución de la pequeña propiedad campesina en la Pampa seca argentina", Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 6 N° 21, April - June, 1966.
- GERMANI**, G. "Estructura Social de la Argentina; análisis estadístico", Bs. As., Raigal, 1955.
- GERMANI**, G. "Política y sociedad en una época de transición; de la sociedad tradicional a la sociedad de masas"; Bs. As. Paidós, 1966.
- GIBERTI**, H. "El Desarrollo Agropecuario", Instituto de Sociología, Bs. As., 1961.
- GIBERTI**, H. "Historia económica de la ganadería argentina". Bs. As. Raigal, 1954.
- GIBERTI**, H. "Uso racional de los factores directos de la producción agraria", Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 6, N° 21. April - June, 1966.
- GONDRA**, R., "Historia Económica de la República Argentina", Bs. As., 1943.
- GORI**, G., "El Pan Nuestro; panorama social de las regiones cerealistas argentinas", Bs. As., Galatea - Nueva Visión, 1958.
- GORI**, G., "Inmigración y Colonización en la Argentina", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964.
- GREAT BRITAIN**, DEPARTMENT OF OVERSEAS TRADE, "Report on the Commercial, Economic and Financial conditions in the Argentine Republic", 13 Vols. London, 1920-1932.

- HALPERIN DONGHI, T.**, "La expansión ganadera en la campaña de Buenos Aires 1810-1852", *Desarrollo Económico*, Vol. 3, N° 1-2, April - September, 1963.
- HALSEY, F.**, "Investment in Latin America"(I) Argentina; USA Department of Commerce, 1925.
- HERNANDEZ, José** "La instrucción del estanciero", Ed. Casavalla, 1881.
- HOMAN, P.; A. G. HART, & A. W. SAMETS**, "The Economic Order", Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1958.
- HOPKINS, J. A.** "La estructura económica y el desarrollo industrial de la República Argentina", Bs. As., Corporación para la Promoción del Intercambio, S. A., 1944.
- HORNE, B. C.** "Política agraria y regulación económica", Losada, Bs. As., 1945.
- JORNADAS DE HISTORIA Y ECONOMIA ARGENTINA EN LOS SIGLOS XVIII Y XIX**, Bs. As., Rosario, September, 1964.
- JUNTA DE PLANIFICACION ECONOMICA DE LA PROVINCIA DE BUENOS AIRES** - October - December 1958; July - September 1959.
- KIRKPATRICK, F. A.** "A History of the Argentine Republic".
- KOEBLE, William**, "Modern Argentina: The Eldorado of today".
- LA PLAZA, V. de**, "Exposición contra el proteccionismo exagerado al azucar".
- LYNCH, Benito** "El Estanciero" en "Selecciones", September 1933.
- MAGNIE, J.**, "Work and Play in the Argentine", London, T. Werner Laurie Ltd., 1925
- MARIN, J. C.**, "El empresario industrial argentino", partial report published by ILPES, UNITED NATIONS, Santiago - Chile, 1966 (mimeograph, internal circulation).

- MARTINEZ A.B. & M. LEWANDOWSKI, "The Argentine in the XXth. Century", London, T. Fischer Unwin, 1915.
- MERCADO DE CEREALES A TERMINO EN SU CINCUENTENARIO 1907 - 1957.
- MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, DIRECCION ECONOMIA RURAL (1916 - 1920).
- MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, INFORMES Y ESTUDIOS (3 volumes in 2) 1916.
- MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, Revista Dirección Nacional de Tierras, Año 7, 1956.
- MINISTERIO DE ASUNTOS TECNICOS, "Producto e Ingreso en la Argentina" (1935 - 1954), Bs. As., 1955.
- MINISTERIO DE ECONOMIA, "Informe sobre la industria argentina" Buenos Aires, 1963.
- MINISTERIO DE HACIENDA, Provincia de Buenos Aires, "Boletín Estadístico"; July 1949; July - August 1950; April-June, 1951.
- MINISTERIO DE HACIENDA, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Econometría, "Anuario Estadístico".
- MINISTERIO DE HACIENDA, Provincia de Buenos Aires "Buenos Aires en cifras", 1947.
- MINISTERIO DE HACIENDA, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Cuadernos de Estudios N° 1.
- MINISTERIO DE HACIENDA "La renta económica de la Provincia de Buenos Aires", 1945-1947.
- NORTH, D. "The Economic Growth of the United States; 1790-1860", N.J. Prentice - Hall, 1961.
- ODDONE, J. "La burguesía terrateniente argentina", Ed. Populares Argentinas, Bs. As., 1956.

- OLIVERA, E. "Proyecto para la fundación de una chacra modelo", La Revista de Buenos Aires, Tomo IX, 1866.
- ORTIZ, R. M. "El ferrocarril en la economía argentina", Ed. L. de la Torre, Bs. As., 1958.
- ORTIZ, R. M. "Historia económica de la Argentina, 1850-1930", Bs. As., Raigal, 1955.
- ORTIZ PEREYRA, M., "La tercera emancipación económica y social", J. Lajouane y Co. Bs. As. 1926.
- PETERS, "The Foreign Debt of the Argentine Republic", Baltimore, Johns, Hopkins Press, 1934.
- PICHON RIVIERE, Juan "La estancia en el desarrollo social de la campaña", Política y Sociedad, Universidad del Salvador, Buenos Aires, N° 1, July, 1962.
- PHELPS, Dudley Maynard, "Migration of Industry to South America", New York, 1936.
- PUIGGROS, R., "Historia Económica del Río de la Plata", Bs. As., Ed. Futuro, 1945.
- RENNIE, Isabel, "The Argentine Republic".
- REVISTA DE LA FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS ECONOMICAS - 1948-53, 1952 & 1956.
- REVISTA DE ECONOMIA ARGENTINA, VOL. 1, N° 2, Nov. 1939.
- REVISTA DE ECONOMIA Y ESTADISTICA, Córdoba, Quarterly -1948-1949.
- RICHMOND L. T. "Investment in Argentina", Comments on Argentine Trade, Vol. 33, N° 8, March, 1954.
- RIVAROLA, H. C. "Las transformaciones de la Sociedad Argentina", Coni Hnos, Bs. As., 1911.
- RODRIGUEZ, LUIS D., "La Argentina en 1912", Cía. Sudamericana de Billetes de Banco, Bs. As. 1912.

- ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, "The problem of International Investment", London, Oxford University Press, 1937.
- RUEDA, S. "La Argentina y las firmas norteamericanas", Bs. As., 1958.
- SBARRA, N.H. "Historia del alambrado en la Argentina", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964.
- SCALABRINI ORTIZ, R. "Historia de los ferrocarriles argentinos", Bs. As., Devenir, 1958.
- SCHICKENDANTZ, F. "Las Industrias en Catamarca", 1888.
- SCOTTO, JOSE, "Origen y antigüedad de las familias argentinas", Bs. As., 1912.
- SOCIEDAD RURAL ARGENTINA. ANUARIO. ESTADISTICAS ECONOMICAS Y AGRARIAS, Bs. As., Est. Graf. Gotelli, 1928.
- SOLARI, A. "Sociología Rural Latinoamericana", EUDEBA, 1963.
- TANDY, A.H., "Argentina. Economic and Commercial Conditions", Overseas Economic Surveys, The Board of Trade, Commercial Relations and Exports Department, London H. M. S. O., 1956.
- TAYLOR, C. "Rural Life in Argentina", Baton Rouge, Louisiana, State University Press, 1948.
- THE TIMES BOOK ON ARGENTINA, THE TIMES, LONDON, 1927.
- TORNQUIST, E. "The Economic Development of the Argentine Republic in the last Fifty Years", E. Tornquist & Co. Limited, Bs. As., 1919.
- TORNQUIST, E. "Business Conditions in Argentina" - 1946 - 1949.
- TREVELYAN, G. M., "English Social History", London, Longmans, Green Co., 1947.
- URIEN & COLOMBO "La República Argentina en 1910", Bs. As., Ed. Maucci, 1910.

- WILCKEN, G., "Las Colonias", Sociedad Anónima, Bs. As., 1873.
- WINKLER, MAX, "Investment of United States Capital in Latin America", Boston, 1928.
- ZALDUENDO, E. "Imperialismo económico británico y ferrocarriles en el Siglo XIX", C. I. E. Instituto Di Tella, Bs. As., 1965.
- ZEBALLOS, E. "Descripción amena de la República Argentina", Peuser, Buenos Aires, 1881-1888, Vol. III.

3. Occupational and Social Orders

- ALTHAPARRO, A. J. "De mi pago y de mi tiempo", Bs. As., 1944.
- ALVAREZ, J. "Las guerras civiles argentinas", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1966.
- ASSUNÇÃO, FERNANDO O. "Génesis del tipo gaucha en el Río de la Plata", Montevideo, 1957.
- AYARRAGARAY, L. "Cuestiones y problemas argentinos", Lajouane, ed., Buenos Aires, 1926.
- BAGU, SERGIO, "Estructura social de la Colonia", Buenos Aires, El Ateneo, 1952.
- BIALET MASSE, J. "Informe sobre el estado de la clase obrera en el interior de la República", Graw, Buenos Aires, 1904.
- BOOZ, Mateo. "Gente del Litoral", Comisión de Cultura, Bs. As., 1944.
- BOOZ, Mateo. "Santa Fe, mi país", EUDEBA, 1966.
- BOREA, D. "La colonización oficial y particular" Imp. Gondola, Bs. As., 1923.

- BUNGE, C. O., "El gaucho" in C. Ibarguren et. alt. (ed) "El paisaje y el alma argentinas", Bs. As. Comisión Argentina de Cooperación Intelectual, 1938, pp. 133-141.
- BUNGE, C. O., "La Educación", La España Moderna, Madrid.
- BUNGE, C. O., "Nuestra América", Casa Vaccaro, Bs. As., 1918 (with an introduction by José Ingenieros).
- CANEPA, Luis. "El Buenos Aires de antaño", Talleres Gráficos Linardi, Bs. As., 1936.
- CAPDEVILA, Arturo. "Córdoba del Recuerdo", Espasa-Calpe, Bs. As. 1949.
- DAIREAUX, E. "La vie sociale et la vie legals des étrangers", Hachette, Paris, 1889.
- DAIREAUX, E. "Aristocracia de antaño" Revista de Derecho, Historia y Hechos, I, Vol. II, 1898, p. 36.
- DAIREAUX, G. "Tipos y Paisajes Criollos", Agro Ed., Bs. As., 1945.
- DARBYSHIRE, C. "My life in the Argentine Republic", F. Warne & Co., London 1917.
- DE MATTAIS, E. , "Análisis de la vida argentina", América Lee, Bs. As., 1962.
- DI TELLA, T. "Teoría del primer impacto del crecimiento económico", Instituto de Sociología, Universidad del Litoral, Santa Fe, 1965.
- EBELOT, A. "La Pampa", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1961.
- ELLIOTT, L. E. "The Argentine of Today", Hurst & Blackett, London, 1925.
- FARES, RAIMUNDO, "El llamado a las armas: 17 de octubre de 1945", Ed. Matepha.
- FERNS, H. S. "Britain and Argentina in the Nineteenth Century", The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1960.

- FRAZER, JOHN F.** "The Amazing Argentine", Cassell & Co. Ltd., London, 1914.
- FRAY MOCHO (J. S. ALVAREZ)**, "Cuadros de la Ciudad", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1961.
- GALVEZ, VICTOR.** "Memorias de un viejo". Peuser, Bs. As., 1889.
- GALVEZ, VICTOR.** "Mi Tierra", in Nueva Revista de Buenos Aires, Tomo IX, 1883, pp. 345-374.
- GALVEZ, VICTOR.** "Treinta años antes", in Nueva Revista de Buenos Aires, Tomo IX, 1883, pp. 204-236.
- GALVEZ, VICTOR.** "Mi Tierra: Las ciudades del interior", Nueva Revista de Buenos Aires, Tomo IX, 1883, pp. 560-582.
- GARCIA, J. A.**, "La ciudad indiana", Ed. Claridad, S. A., Bs. As., 1955.
- GERCHUNOFF, F.** "Argentina, país de advenimiento", Losada, Bs. As., 1952.
- GERMANI, G.** "Política y sociedad en una época de transición", Paidós, Buenos Aires, 1966.
- GERMANI, G.** "Estructura Social de la Argentina", análisis estadístico", Bs. As., Raigal, 1955.
- GIBERTI, HORACIO.** "Historia económica de la ganadería argentina", Editorial Raigal, Buenos Aires, 1954.
- GONDRA, LUIS ROQUE.** "Historia económica de la República Argentina"; Sudamericana, Bs. As., 1943.
- GONZALEZ, J. V.** "Tierra Fragosa (Paisajes, tipos y costumbres del oeste riojano). Juan Roldán y Co., Bs. As., 1926.
- GOODRICH.** "Argentina is a New Country", Mouton & Co., The Hague, 1964.
- GORI, G.** "El pan nuestro"; panorama social de las regiones cerealistas argentinas", Bs. As.; Galatea -Nueva Visión, 1958.

- GORI, G. "Inmigración y Colonización en la Argentina", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1964.
- GUDIÑO KRAMER, LUIS. "Aquerenciada soledad", Ed. Colmegna, Santa Fe, 1946.
- HALPERIN DONGHI, T. "El Río de la Plata al comenzar el siglo XIX", Facultad de Filosofía, Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1961.
- HALPERIN DONGHI, T. "La expansión ganadera en la campaña de Buenos Aires, 1810 - 1852", Revista Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 3, N° 1-2, April 1963.
- IMAZ, J.L. "Los que mandan", Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1964.
- IMAZ, J.L. "La clase alta de Buenos Aires", Instituto de Sociología, Buenos Aires, 1960.
- JAURETCHE, A. "El medio pelo", Buenos Aires, Peña Lillo, 1966.
- LIEBERMAN, JOSE. "Los judíos en la Argentina", Bs. As., Ed. Libra.
- LOPEZ, LUCIO V. "La Gran Aldea", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1960.
- MACIEL, C.N. "La italianización de la Argentina", Ed. J. Hernández, Bs. As., 1924.
- MACNIE, J. "Work and Play in the Argentine". T. Werner, Laurie, Ltd., London, 1925.
- MACHADO, J.E. "El Gaucho y el Llanero", Lit. y Tip. Vargas, Caracas, 1926.
- MAFUD, JULIO. "El desarraigo argentino", América Lee, Bs. As., 1959.
- MAFUD, JULIO. "El contenido social del Martín Fierro", América Lee, Bs. As., 1961.
- MANSILLA, L.V. "Mis Memorias", Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1966.

- MARSAL, Fco. "Asimilación de inmigrantes en la Argentina" (a través de una historia de vida). Instituto Di Tella, Bs. As., unpublished.
- MEDINA ECHAVARRIA, J. "El Desarrollo Económico de América Latina", UNESCO, February, 1962.
- NICHOLS, M. W. "The Gaucho", Durham, North Caroline, Duke University Press, 1942.
- OBLIGADO, PASTOR S. & V. GALVEZ, "Tradiciones de Buenos Aires" (Selección), Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1964.
- PATERSON, ROBERTO G. (obras de Vol. XV) "Cien años - 1810-1910", Perrotti, Bs. As., 1927.
- PEREZ AMUCHASTEGUI, A. J. "Mentalidades Argentinas, 1860-1930", Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1965.
- PEYRET, ALEJO. "Una visita a las colonias de la República Argentina", Imp. Tribuna Nacional, Bs. As., 1889. Vol. I-II.
- PINTO, LUIS C. "El gaucho y sus detractores", Bs. As., Ed. Ateneo, 1943.
- PINTOS, JUAN M. "Así fue Buenos Aires", "Tipos y Costumbres, 1900-1950", Bs. As., Coni, 1954.
- POSADA, Adolfo. "Pueblos y campos argentinos". Ed. Caro Raggio, Madrid, 1926.
- POWER, J. "The Land We Live In, History of the Argentine Republic", Bs. As., Frankel & Bremer, 1891.
- POZZO ARDIZZI, L. "Hombres del Surco", Bs. As., Raigal, 1955.
- P. P. Buenos Aires, Nueva Revista Argentina, Vol. IX-X, 1881-84.
- PUIGBO, RAUL. "Historia social y económica argentina". Bs. As. Ed. Esnaola, 1964.
- PYZIK, ESTANISLAO, "Los polacos en la República Argentina", Bs. As., 1944.

- RIVAROLA, H. C. "Las transformaciones de la sociedad argentina" (1853-1910), Bs. As., Coni Hnos, 1911, (Tesis Doctoral).
- SBARRA, NOEL, "Historia del alambrado en la Argentina", EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1964.
- SCOBIE, JAMES R. "Una revolución agrícola en la Argentina", Desarrollo Económico, Vol. 3, N° 1-2, April-September-1963.
- SCHOBINGER, JUAN. "Inmigración y colonización suizas en la República Argentina en el Siglo XIX", Instituto de Cultura Suizo-Argentino. Bs. As., 1957.
- SERGI, JORGE F. "Historia de los italianos en la Argentina", Bs. As. Ed. Italo-Argentina S. A., 1940.
- SHAW, A. E. "Forty Years in the Argentine Republic", London, Elkin Mathews, 1907.
- TANDI, H. "Hombres capaces, relatos de la campaña bonaerense", Buenos Aires, Emecé, 1944.
- TAYLOR, C. C. "Rural life in Argentina", Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1948.
- TAYLOR, C. C. "Argentina loves her cattle" in Agriculture in the Americas, Washington D. C., U. S. Department of Agriculture, Vol. III, N° 3, (March 1943).
- TURNER, T. A. "Argentina and the Argentines", London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1892.
- UBALLES, ROBERTO. "Alazan Viejo", Buenos Aires, 1944.
- URIEN, CARLOS M. y COLOMBO, EZIO. "La República Argentina en 1910", Ed. Maucci Hnos., Bs. As., 1910.
- "20 Relatos Argentinos" (1838-1887), EUDEBA, Bs. As., 1961.
- WILCKEN, G. "Las Colonias", Bs. As., Soc. Anónima, 1873.

WILDE, E. "Tini y otros relatos", Bs. As., EUDEBA, 1960.

WILDE, JOSE A. "Buenos Aires, desde 70 años atrás" (1810-1880), EUDEBA, 1966.

YUNQUE, ALVARO, "La Literatura Social en la Argentina", Bs. As., Claridad, 1941.

ZEBALLOS, E. "Descripción amena de la República Argentina", Bs. As., Peuser, 1881-1888.

ZEBALLOS, E. "Evolución de la cultura argentina", Revista de Derecho, Historia y Hechos, IX, Vol. XXV, 1906, p. 464.

ZEBALLOS, E. "Los porteños", Revista de Derecho, Historia y Hechos, IX, Vol. XXV, 1906, p. 620.