er-saguier-XV-cap-Introd

GENEALOGY of the ARGENTINE TRAGEDY. The violent transition from a patrimonial-predatory order to a democracy conditioned by a growing neo-colonial praetorianism (1870-1912).

to Marc Bloch,

by Eduardo R. Saguier
Señor Researcher CONICET-Museo Roca
e-mail: saguiere@ssdnet.com.ar
http://www.er-saguier.org

Section I.- Preface.

B.- General Introduction.

The inconclusive nature of the independence revolution (including the war against the Brazil´s Empire) in the territories which formerly constituted Peru's Viceroyalty and after that the old Rio de la Plata's Viceroyalty; as well as the national organization's epic (1862-1880), in the spaces which shaped first the Rio de la Plata United Provinces, then the Argentine Confederation and after that the nation-state known as Argentina, or in other words, the non-solving of its political-military contradictions, would have been intimately linked with the successive and later on crisis, transitions, degenerations and transformations.

Whenever these crisis, disadjustments or cleavages became deeper, the state, inter-ethnic, magic-religious, patrimonial, burocratic and praetorian contradictions which were given in the bosom of the patricianism, the indian hierarchy, the officers' charts, the elite of notables and the social classes worsened. The Habsburg's patriarchal, absolutist, praetorian and colonizing policies (Viceroy Toledo, 1580; Alfaro's Ordinance), the Bourbonic recolonizing and central patrimonial (1776-1792), and the nationalizing-burocratic implemented from the start of the Independence Revolution (1810-1822) and later on by the so-called National Organization (1862-80), were destructuring and restructuring socially, territorially, military and culturally; through a long process of historic phenomena (mobilizations, dissents, wars, blockades, partitions, secessions, annexations, demobilizations, mutinies, mobs,seditions, political and civic-military insurrections, of institutional, juridical and cultural kind) , the mutual relationships of the kingdoms, empires, provinces, countries, ethnicities, cities, states, notables and classes among themselves.[1]

These recurrencies, recursives, and/or repetitions of crisis, cleavages, transitions and traumatic events, took place in a peripheric region of the world (Latin-American Southern Cone), and gave place to a net or schemes of primary mechanisms, consisting of knowledge, institutions, discourses, sub-cultures, moral forces and group processes. This net was the foundation of a complex and uneven historical process (of republicanism, decolonization, detribalism, denomadism, non class division, depatrimony and debureaucratization); as well as the strategies of ethnic invisibility, of

originary self-defense and of praetorianism, caesarism, non-political, authoritarian bureaucracy, counter-insurgency and state terrorism (breaking-up contesting focus or knots and of the originary or indian minorities). The memory recovery of the ethnic resistence against the predatory measures of detribalism and denomadism, of corporative self-criticism and of defensive insurrection strategies as well as the vindication of the hidden victims would help to realize the intimate interlacing and/or the choosing affinity of different conflicts (ethnic-linguistics, magic-religious, social, moral, economic, cultural and political-military), as well as to also understand the secret of the democratic regime failure, and the purely offensive strategies which were repeatedly tried, with a purely symbolic destruction of the military enemy (L. Rozitchner, 1985).

Those failures might have been originated in part in the theory of denial and the distortion of the crimes against humanity which were lived in the remote and near past (conquest, slavery, cob police, bondage, praetorianism, etc.); and in the disdain or contempt that the offensive strategies had tried for a reinterpretation of the religious, ethnic, social, moral, political and military heritage or legacy of a society, of an order and a state whose legal and cultural design had been based originally in the republican creed. Society and state that later on looked to justify itself with the myths of evolution, progress (the lay catechism of the XIX), federalism and race crucible (where some regions and ethnias were superior to others) and with the unequal modernizing articulation of the secular, compulsory and free education; the nationalizing and compulsory military service; the chauvinist pedagogy of a patriotic and apologetic education; and the minority representation and the free, secret and compulsory voting of the Saenz Peña Law (1912). It means, a reinterpretation of those philosophies, myths, legacies and pedagogies, which could nourish an identity of its own and the enlargement of a popular and democratic power, which gives priority to a liberating ethic (San Martin ideas) and reproducing and transforming strategies (without difference of classes, of patrimony,of bureaucracy and praetorianism) and that al least would try to balance its own power with the repressive forces of an oligarchical state.[2]

To prove then this hypothesis, over the genealogy of the Argentine tragedy or the Argentine political catastrophism, we faced the case of the forming of power and anti-power structures, or of hegemony and counter-hegemony, in the context of diverse and complex relationships, without pretending to fall, as Rouquié ascertains (1981) in sociological dissolutions nor in institutional overestimates.[3] With the aim of proving the mentioned hypothesis we take axis in the violence and corruption acts, pedagogic, sexual, martial and ethnic which took place in the bosom of the military jurisdiction during the local hegemony of the patrimonial and burocratic orders (1870-1912), contemporaneous to the world partition of the colonial and neo-colonial spaces (Asia, Africa, Middle East and Latin-America) and the armed peace with the neighboring countries (Chile-Brazil); facts that were ignored, underestimated and/or praised in the official and military historiography (Balestra, García Enciso, Walther, Scunio, Punzi, etc.).

It is necessary then to recover --from the veil of silence with which they were ideologically shrouded— the morality, the actions and the actors taken in reprisal, as well as to reinterpret the dialectics between a right of resistance truly exceptional called upon by the popular-democratic sectors and the perverse combination of an exceptional state vindicator of the pushes or coup d'etat and of the conditioning power, that

according to Walter Benjamín, are the common rule imposed by the increasing factors of power (Mate, 2003). To defeat these conditioning factors, it is also necessary to adopt the strategy of dividing or fractioning the praetorian and caesarean devices, and in that sense to study the military-civic relationships and the military institutions in themselves, in time of originary violence, internal conflict, ethnic war, revolution from above, military peace, conditioned democracy and oligarchial restoration, such as initiation rituals, revolutionary boards, war councils, expeditionary campaigns, qualifying boards, secret lodges, military purges, armament commissions, policies of provincial disarmament, military instruction courts and the complex and intricated nets of orders, reports, parts, bulletins and ministry sheets.

In the long period of the Argentine modern state crisis (1880-1912), in the global context of an increasing neo-colonial dependence of imperial nature, a mixed patrimonial-meritocratic regime took place, where multiple historic phenomena happened, such as: a) the battery of deviations and perversions (deaths, suicide attempts, sodomies, escapes, expulsions and mutinies) events which took place in the initial decades of the Military School (1870-1900); b) the conspiracies, threatening mutinies and revolutions, which happened in 1874 and 1880, during the organic crisis which took place in the revolutionary triennium (1890-1893), and precisely in 1905, repressed by shootings, discharges, prisons, confinements and most summary judgments; c) the debates over military intelligence and the false option between the voluntary and corrupt military service or the compulsive and nationalizing service (conscription); d) the debates over the civic-military revolts; and e) the exogenous and endogenous deviations, all of them based on hundreds of reports, sheets, inquiring statements and chronicles and journalistic editorials (1890-1892-1893-1904-1905-1932).

For those purposes, we will analyze the role of the different neo-colonial policies: the reproductive, the transforming and the reforming ones, the predatory ones over agraph communities or "people without history", the meritocratics in the education and civil service, and the praetorians in the bosom of the army (but not in the military navy, which remains for a future further research). We will also study the patrimonial-republican and burocratic-oligarchic orders as ruptures with the colonial burocratic-patrimonial and class orders and with the post-independence political-boss order and as estimates of the modernizing progress (military-colonizing strategies and/or "civilizing missions" in the indigenous frontier, federal interventions in the provinces, military teaching institutions, military service and nationalizing strategies of "armed peace", peace keeping policies of official disarmament and deformed burocratic structures).

Likewise, we will ponder over the successive crisis, transitions, transformations and reforms of said orders, from a colonial patrimonial-burocratic order to a restoring political bossing order, from this one to a republican predatory-patrimonial order, from this other one to a prebendary and oligarchic order, and finally, from this last one to an increasing nationalizing military corporation in the bosom of a burocratic-praetorian order. It will be significant in the study of these violent transitions to analyze the praetorian institutional devices through which different crisis were warded off or how the military units were formed, divided, mutinied, broken up, melted again and transferred; and its bodies of chiefs, officers, non-officers and soldiers (voluntary, hitched, destined and enlisted), were outplaced, indicted, processed, condemned, executed, exiled, given amnesty and discriminated in their passing, destinations and promotions.

C.- Periodicity and Interpretations.

The notion of praetorianism was applied in the XVIII and XIX centuries essentially to the ancient world, as was tried by Montesquieu for whom said power regime was intimately linked to despotism.[4] As an intent to improve Montesquieu's work (***Considerations over the Causes of Roman Grandeur and its Decline***), Gibbon reiterated over the pretorianism inherent to the debacle of Rome--leaving himself to be influenced by the theory of the four phases-- which was at the same time the source of inspiration for their evolutionary thesis, among many others, Hegel, Constant, and Guizot; and later on by Auguste Comte himself with his law of the three phases or stages: theologic, metaphysic and positive; and Lewis Morgan, with his theory of the three phases: savagery, barbary and civilization.[5]

But differentiating itself from the linear evolutionism of Comte and Morgan as a result of a sort of conceptual crisis, several late authors essayed exhaustive taxonomies formed by several historical categories: among them the political categories (caesarism, despotism, absolutism, totalitariansm, regalism, putschism), the religious ones (messiahnism, millenialism, secularism, fundamentalism), the ethnic groups (racism, chauvinism), the military ones (bureaucracy, praetorianism), the social ones (nomadism, urbanism, unionism, collectivism), the economic ones (mercantilism, protectionism, industrialism, imperialism) and the cultural ones (laicism, fetichism, catastrophism).

As well as for Lévi-Strauss --influenced by Freud—those cultural ranks such as the one called fetichism were not considered an exclusive element of the geographic region nor an historic stage whatsoever; for Haubert (1969) neither was the messihanism; and for Farhang (1996), Hajjar (1995) and Peters (1999) the fundamentalism.. With reference to ethnic categories like racism neither Finzsh (2005) considers itself exclusive of regions or specific stages, nor Shinondola (2005) with relation to chauvinism or xenophobia. And as to political categories such as imperialism, Pagden (1995) neither reduced them to determined periods and places, nor Baehr (1998) with respect to caesarism; nor Rapoport (1962) with relation to praetorianism; nor Altamirano (1994), Bouju (1998-99) and Sullivan (1990) with relation to despotism; nor finally Dobbelaere (1981), Graham (1992) and Ivereigh (1994) with reference to secularism.

For all these authors, with their respective differences and specifities, said ranks and their different derivations should not be associated themselves or fixed exclusively to a definite form of government whatsoever, whether ancient or modern, pre-colonial, colonial or neo-colonial, feudal or capitalistic, European or American and democratic or despotic. Said categories were also applied in modern times, where several authors, among them, Lasswell (1941), Finer (1962), Gilmore (1964), Huntington (1962, 1968), Perlmutter (1977), Irwin (2000, 2001) and Bowman (2002), made a difference between the political bosses from praetorianism, this last one from caesarism or bonapartism (for Louis Napoleon), and all of them from militarism, from military professionalism, from authoritarian bureaucracy and from state terrorism.

To analize the crisis of the modern nation-state, Finer (1962) started making a difference among four different types of praetorianism or military intervention: and simultaneously Huntington (1962) pointed out three distinct kinds of putschs or coup d'état. In the different levels of military intervention in state politics, Finer (1962) discerned the mere pressure from the extorsion or blackmail, from the disguised moving

of the civil action and from the opened intervention. From all of them, in a constitutional democracy, only the first can be considered as legal and legitimate, while the other levels are growing in intensity until their climax in an opened coup d'état. [6] On the contrary, for Huntington (1962) the distinction should not be of grade but of nature, because their three types of putschs or coups are: the palace or government coup, the revolutionary and the reform one. With reference to praetorianism in itself, Huntington defined it as that political situation where a hiatus or delay or imbalance is produced between a very high level of political participation and a very low level of institutionalisation which determined a chronic instability and/or violence. From this delay, Huntington derived, according to an interpretation done by Alberti (2003), that to put in "syncrony" the two variables, instead of rising the institutionalizing rate it must be lowered the political participation. For that purpose, Huntington arrived to counsel military interventionism as a modernizing force of society and state.

As far as the kinds of autoritarianism, Perlmutter (1982) pointed out four different kinds: the police or gendarme, the praetorian, the corporate and the unique party; and in the forming of the modern army he found out three officer patterns: the professional, the praetorian and the revolutionary. With reference to praetorianism, Perlmutter discriminated --based in Weber-- the praetorian leader from the merely arbitrator, and the explicit or manifest from the merely latent or potential.[7] With reference to praetorianism, according to Rapoport, these regimes alternated and alternate much more frequently with those only quasi-democratic or quasi-despotic (totalitarian) than with those which are totally democratic or despotic (totalitarian).[8] Cohen (1971), Bertocci (1982), Alagappa (1995) and Khakwani (2003), analyzing the Asian south and south-west, distinguished also the direct praetorianism from the indirect, according to the type of alliances and separations which the burocratic military system had agreed and/or kept with the civil sectors. Finally for Welty (1998), the Perlmutterian typology of the officer or soldier, depending acritically from the Weber-Parsonian doctrines of the professions and from their distinction between historic or traditional autoritarianism and the modern one (starting from which its theoretical notion of praetorianism had been born), it only conceals the fact that said praetorianism and its supporters came to promote the power of neocolonialism and imperialism.[9]

Differently from imperialism and neocolianism, pointed out by Welty as absent from these analysis; and risking to fall in redundancies, the military praetorianism, which supposed a military predominence without limits, it would be for Irwin (2001), "…an abusive military behaviour with the society in general and specially the political management of a given society".[10] And within this praetorian authoritarianism, Huntington identified three types of pretorianism which share in general the same characteristics: the oligarchic or aristocrat, the radical (or from left) and the plebeian or from the masses. The case most known of the radical praetorianism in Latin America should have been the Tenentismo in Brazil.[11] While the leading praetorianism would be what we know as caesarism or bonapartism, the praetorianism of the masses is the one which is discussed in a post-caesarist period. The three variants are ideal types whose elements can happen simultaneously in each concrete reality, but which distinguish among themselves by the group of power which is behind each of them, whether oligarchy, radical grups (left) or mass movements. In each of said realities the military have held in the majority of cases a leading role.[13]

In the case of peripheric Europe, particularly in the case of Spain, Boyd (1979), Payne (1996) and Balfour (2002) discovered how the colonial war in Morocco (1909)

conditioned the emergency of a praetorian policy which resulted in the bloody civil war thirty years afterwards (1936-39). For the African case and specially the one of Nigeria, Nuscheler (1979) and Diamond (1995) ascertained the importance for the conception of pretorianism, the absence of a civil order and of a legitimizing of the institutions. And in Martin (1985), Gershonil (1996) and Reno (1998) what is relevant for the African case is to study the "warlords". For the Latin-American case and disintegrating by countries, other authors lifted an axis in the Mexican Porfirianism (Hernández Chávez, Gutiérrez Santos, Vanderwood), in the venezuelan Castro-gommecism (Ziems, Segnini, Irwin); in the Peruvian Leguism (Astiz, Villanueva) and the Brazilian Praetorianism (Simmons, Hunter, Hahner, Magalhaes, Pereira)[13]

In the Argentine case, differently from the ones who stressed the formation of the modern state or country-state (1862-80) during the period named National Organization (1862-80) (Botana, Oszlak); we have believed more relevant and diligently to analyze the later period, which was previous to the access of Radicalismo to power (1916-1930), that is to say to put emphasis in the period of degeneration or involution of the republican modern state or of the regressive production of order or oligarchic praetorianism (1874-90) specially in the modern state crisis, it means the long civil and military conflict with the consequent rupture of the military internal front. (1890-1912). In our study, centered in the case of Argentine's Roca period (1880-1906), differently from Perlmutter, we conceive not only the Roca Movement as oligarchic as well as essentially praetorian, of an explicit praetorianism, indirect and arbitrary and not merely potential; and this complex characterization we extend to the Quintana's second ministry during Luis Saenz Peña presidency (1893) and the successive presidencies of Roca (1880-86;1898-1904), Juarez Celman (1886-90), Pellegrini (1890-1892), Uriburu (1894-98), Quintana (1905.06), Figueroa Alcorta (1906-10) and Roque Saenz Peña (1910-12), to which we consider strongly gifted of a tacit or indirect praetorianism as well as a secularizing one.

In this sense, paradoxically Perlmutter contradicts himself, as from one side he sustains: "…that the so called oligarchic stage of praetorianism, was oligarchic but not praetorian".[12] And on the other side, nine pages forward, he ascertains specifically that Argentina "…developed in the period 1889-1898 a definite type of modern military praetorianism".[13] Aside from this contradiction, we refute the different thesis which sustain the existence of a supposed institutionality "stable and solid" between 1880 and 1930 (Rouquié); the one of those who remount the origin of the 1930´s crisis exclusively to Yrigoyen's last government (Potash, Gasió); and the other ones which reduce itself to the Prussian professional influx nourished through the foundation of the Colegio Superior de Guerra in 1901 (Rouquié).

Finally, it must be pointed out that this work is centered exclusively and to its intimate links with the political sphere within the modern authoritarian pattern known in one of its forms as praetorianism, and deals exceptionally with its links with players and institutions in the economic, social and religious or ecclesiastical fields or grounds and its respective logical structures.

D.- Methodology.

For this investigation, which is an extension of the electronic work entitled "An Historic Inconclusive Debate in Latin America" (http://www.er-saguier.org), we based ourselves in the scheme of the types of domination and Weber's elective affinities, Foucault's archeologial-genealogic method, the multipolar and centered of Deleuze and Guattari, the dense description of Geertz and Duch, the fractioning and coalition theories of Przeworski, the circumstancial proof of Ginzburg; the tipologies of the authority models of the ancient and modern states, de Dumézil, Kojeve, Huntington and Perlmutter, the continuous praetorian non-political of Magalhaes, the notion of Esposito's internal enemy; as well as also the primary documentary sources such as service files, summaries and processes, note copiers, the journal reports of the Port General Captain's office, the journal's daily orders, the session daily reports, the journal chronicles and editorials, the official biographies (Cutolo-Yaben); the cadets' listings (Figueroa, 1996); the collection of laws and military decrees (Domínguez); the bulletins, sheets and official registries; the historic cartography (Punzi, 1997); and the historic fotography (Alexander, Cuarterolo and Toyos, 2001).

We have also based ourselves in a documentary and selective spread out pyramid composed in its base by journalistic and weekly information coming from the different military units, in its plateau by monthly bulletins (Major Estate), all of which we found in the Army's General Archive (AGE): in the Historic Service of the Army; in the Libraries of the General Chief of Staff of the Army, the Círculo Militar and Jockey Club; in the Multiple Libraries of the Mitre Museum and the Tornquist, National and Congress Libraries, as well as in the National Academy of History, the Documentation and Research Center of the Leftist Cultures in Argentina (CEDINCI) and the Center of Historic and Information Studies Parque España (Rosario); in the Historic Patrimony Department of the Secretary of University Extension of the Military College, in the index of summaries of the Supreme Court of the Armed Forces; in the series corresponding to the Harbour General Office and to the Ministry of Interior existing in the Country's General Archives (AGN); and in the photographic collection of the Country's Graphic Archives.[14]

E.- Outline of the Work.

The work is divided in six (6) sections, and each of these in chapters, totalizing fifteen (15) chapters, and more than a hundred of sections and subheadings, where each of such a chapter is identified with its respective different notation. The work starts at its first section with a brief introduction, followed by the periodicity, interpretations, methodology and documentary sources analyzed.

In the second section we deal with a description of the meritocratic, predatory and scientifist orders in the bosom of a prebendary model, as well as the study of the persistence of the patrimonial traces between 1870 y 1890. Followingly continues in the third section, with a historic development of the civic-military revolutionary conspirationism; the anti-Acuerdismo and the military fracture, and the army non-participation and the military fracture; and the armed abstentionism and the insurrectional strategies and tactics, as well as of the veteran army engaged as enlisted, coming out from the Riccheri Law (1902). Later on, in the fourth section, the work proceeds with the military corporate in the transition to a praetorian burocratic order and its relationship with the ethic guide lines (discipline, honor, leadership, comradeship), the technological manipulation and the anti-mutinous punishment, and the forming of

consensus frontier order or "civilizing mission" (1890-1912). To conclude, the work embarks itself in a fifth section, consisting of the exogenous military as a conditioning of the neo-colonial praetorianism, in the endogenous structural segregationism as a praetorian neo-colonial as agent of the praetorian burocracy and in the construction of the internal enemy in the context of an Armed Peace. Each chapter should cultivate an independent analysis unit and each section should gather a number of unities which keep among themselves a great relative affinity.

The summary, included at the beginning of the work, resumes a thematic composition displayed in fifteen chapters. Each one of those chapters, have at the same time their respective index, which dismember themselves in numerous headings, subheadings and items. From the collection of those index a general and detailed index was obtained from all the work, which is offered below, and from this last general index a repertoire was chosen of more than a hundred key-words, which will help the task of the web's searchers. Likewise, the work accounts with more than a thousand notes which refer to more than two hundred appendixes and listings, with a signature whose introduction code corresponds to the respective chapters of the text. Likewise, the work accounts for more than a thousand notes which refer to more than two hundred appendixes and listings, with a signature whose introductory codification corresponds to the respective chapters of the text, heuristic technique, which has allowed me to multiple disgregation, unfolding, castling and re-grouping of sections, chapters, paragraphs, appendixes, tables, listings, schemes and maps.

Notes of Introduction

1.- Over the conflict of illustrated absolutism and teocracy in the Restoration Spain (1814-1850), see Esdaile 2000.

2.-Ipola 1989,120; and Rozitchner, 1985,115.

3.-Rouquié, 1981,19.

4.- Rapaport, 1962,73.

5.- Meeks, 1981,172 and Windschuttle, 1997. Over Gibbon and the praetorianism, see Howard, 1994 and Leinweber, 2001. Over Samuel Pudendorf and the Four Stadium Theory in Hont, 1985. For a dialectic evolution theory of civilizations, empires and wars, see Eckhardt 1995. For an approximate evolution to the problem of period and world system history, see Modelski 2000. For the peripheric praetiorianism, see Kowalewski, 199l.

6.- Finer, 1962,86-87

7.- See Peruzzotti, 2004, 98.

8.- Keck, 2005,83.

9.- For a critic of the theory of the praetorism state of Perlmutter, see Welty (1998).

10.-See Irwin, 2001.

11.-See Borges, 1992; Forjaz, 1989 and Wirth, 1995.

12.-See Huntington, 1968, 198-237, quoted in Montúfar, 1999.

13.-For a New Brazilian military history, see Castro; Izecksohn; and Kraay, 2004.

14.-Perlmutter, 1982, 240.

15.-Perlmutter, 1982, 249.

16.-The Army's General Major State Bulletin has allowed me to photograph due to the generosity of my colleague Juan Mendez Avellaneda, who with his digital camera had the chance to reproduce the most ancient example of said precious documentary source, existing in the Chief of Staff´s Library. I also owe a valuable information from the Auditor Frigate Lieutenant José Daniel Lorenzo, from the Court Supreme Archives of the Armed Forces. The Service Sheet or personal file is a valuable documentary source, as it is very heterogenous and can be found in the same personal record, summaries, rulings, and high and low dealings, qualifications, promotions, sicknesses, incidents, trips, and retirements and pensions.

---

[1] Sobre el conflicto entre el absolutismo ilustrado y la teocracia en la España de la Restauración (1814-1850), ver Esdaile, 2000.

[2] Ipola, 1989, 120; y Rozitchner, 1985, 115.

[3] Rouquié, 1981, 19.

[4] Rapaport, 1962, 73.

[5] Meeks, 1981, 172; y Windschuttle, 1997. Sobre Gibbon y el pretorianismo, ver Howard, 1994, y Leinweber, 2001. Sobre Samuel Pufendorf y la Teoría de los Cuatro Estadios, en Hont, 1985. Para una teoría de la evolución dialéctica de civilizaciones, imperios y guerras, ver Eckhardt, 1995. Para una aproximación evolucionista al problema de la periodización y a la historia del sistema mundial, ver Modelski, 2000.. Para el pretorianismo periférico en una perspective cliométrica, ver Kowalewski, 1991.

[6] Finer, 1962, 86-87.

[7] Ver Peruzzotti, 2004, 98.

[8] Keck, 2005, 83.

[9] Para una crítica de la teoría del estado pretoriano de Perlmutter, ver Welty (1998).

[10] Ver Irwin, 2001.

[11] Ver Borges, 1992; Forjaz, 1989 y Wirth, 1995.

[12] Perlmutter, 1982, 240.

---

[13] Perlmutter, 1982, 249.

[14] El Boletín del Estado Mayor General del Ejército me fue permitido fotografiar merced a la generosidad de mi colega Juan Méndez Avellaneda, quien provisto de su cámara digital tuvo el acierto de reproducir el ejemplar más antiguo de dicha preciosa fuente documental, existente en la Biblioteca del Estado Mayor. También debo una valiosa información al Teniente de Fragata Auditor José Daniel Lorenzo, del Archivo del Consejo Supremo de las Fuerzas Armadas. La Foja de Servicios es una valiosísima fuente documental, por cuanto es muy heterogénea, pudiendo encontrarse en la misma antecedentes personales, sumarios, reglamentos, y trámites de altas y bajas, calificaciones, ascensos, enfermedades, incidentes, viajes, y retiros y pensiones.