

**The auto-colectivo: innovating mobility technology from below (Buenos Aires, 1928-1938).**

**Dhan Zunino Singh**, CONICET, Centre of Intellectual History, University of Quilmes, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

**Introduction**

Within Argentinean popular culture the *colectivo* always appears as one of the top five local inventions. Epitomized by models like the Mercedes Benz 1114, by its particular decoration and internal ornamentation, the *colectivo* was originally (1928) a taxi used for collective transport. By 1930 the car's form began to change to become, first, enlarged to carry 9 seated passengers, and then, by 1933, it had begun to use a short truck chassis covered with a rounded shell. After the 1940s, the greater the demand, the bigger the size. Today, there is no difference between a *colectivo* and a bus and it has lost its decorative distinctiveness. Helped by the preference for motor-transport from the 1930s, it became the main mode of public transport of the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area.

How a transport technology like this has become an important popular myth is a question that I will discuss from the perspective of a cultural history of mobility, exploring the way in which a new transport system that emerged from below changed everyday mobility in the city through the uses and transformations of a technological artifact like the car. On the basis mainly of the press (newspapers, popular magazines, journals) but also of public debates, literature, and secondary sources, I will focus on the emergence of the *colectivo* in 1928 until its first material modifications in 1930 and 1933.

I will organize the discussion by presenting, first, the most diffused story of the *colectivo* showing the characteristics that have turned it into a national myth. I will then describe its material and managerial aspects so as to discuss the question of its origins and originality. Finally, I will compare the experiences of travel on Buenos Aires' public transport to highlight the way in which the *colectivo* became a symbol of convenience, speed and comfort as much as a new space of sociability.

**Origin and originality: the myth of a national invention.**

The way in which the *colectivo* became a national myth is closely related to the narratives about its emergence. The history of the *colectivo* has been diffused mostly by enthusiastic historians rather than academic scholars. While the former tell us about the "story" and focus on the technical features, for urban historians the *colectivo* is analyzed as an agent of urban expansion, while public and private questions have been the main focus for economic and political historians. Yet, a cultural or technological perspective of mobility is scarce.

In this context, discussion of the emergence of the *colectivo* has remained among enthusiasts, although even amongst themselves, the themes of origins and originality have been questioned.<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, it was recognized that there were similar experiences in other cities before 1928, such as American cities (the “jitney”), Lima, and Brazil. The latter is mentioned as a possible direct influence. On the other, originality was not mainly based on the type of service (the use of the car for collective transport), but rather the material form that had been acquired by 1933.

According to the most widely disseminated story,<sup>2</sup> the *colectivo* was the creation of a small group of taxi owners who, meeting in a western suburban bar in a context of economic crisis in their sector, decided to use their vehicles to transport five or six passengers for a few cents by following the same routes as tramways and buses. On September 24, dozens of taxis started, without municipal authorization, carrying passengers from the metro station Primera Junta toward the western suburbs.

Historians have tried to assign the invention to one individual (the pioneer), but looking at the primary sources, one can see that the question of origins is controversial. When the *colectivo* first appeared, the press described a group of taxi drivers as the “leaders”. Some names, such as Manuel Pazos, were repeated in different newspapers. However, the official story seems influenced by the identity narrative of the *colectivo* federation which launched its periodical, *El Auto Colectivo*, in 1933. There, the name of Sandalio Fernández appears as the first chauffeur who launched the service on September 24. The story emphasizes the Creole origin and cleverness (“*astucia*”) of these taxi drivers, yet anarchist historians have tried to demonstrate the anarchist origin of the *colectivo*. Part of the chauffeurs union was anarchist but there are stories which claim that the idea was given by the editor of the anarchist periodical *La Protesta*, Diego Abad de Santillán, to a member of the workers union.<sup>3</sup> Although the story is based on Abad de Santillán’s memoir, *La Protesta* of 1928 makes no claim about the anarchist origins of the *colectivo* and the service is mentioned as a surprise. Moreover, according to García, the origin was a consequence of a long debate: an authorized dealer of Studebaker cars, Mr. Flint, said in 1928 that taxi drivers were discussing the idea in his shop; a couple of weeks after the inauguration of the service the City Council discussed permission for “ultra-rapid service” (1500 taxis for collective transport), given in August by the Mayor.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 For the most diffused story see Horacio Casal, *Historia del colectivo* (Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, 1971). For a more critical approach: Carlos Achával, “El colectivo. ¿Un invento argentino?”, *Todo es Historia* 338 (Sept 1955), Alejandro Scartaccini, “Las cosas en claro (el colectivo no es un invento argentino)”, *BusArg* (2010) available online at [http://www.busarg.com.ar/all\\_frm.htm](http://www.busarg.com.ar/all_frm.htm) (accessed 12/08/2014).

2 Casal, *Historia del Colectivo*.

3 Juan Manuel Ferrairo, “Los anarquistas y la invención del colectivo” (mimeo); Vicente Gesualdo, “La historia del colectivo”, *Todo es Historia* (June 1988), p. 54-61.

4 Ulises García, *El colectivo: apuntes para una historia del transporte en la República Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Cámara Gremial del Transporte Automotor de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, 1978)

Although this was a private enterprise, some taxi drivers claimed that the permission could be considered as a precedent legalizing the new service.<sup>5</sup>

What was original, and most controversial, was the type of service being offered by the *colectivo* since, it was an automobile (a taxi) used for public transport. The municipal Director of Traffic questioned two aspects of the new use: the fixed fare and journey. The latter refers to the fact that a taxi's journey is random, changing according to the client's destination, and as a result fare is variable. The *taxi-colectivo* offered fixed routes and fixed fares established by the driver. Large numbers of taxi drivers left their previous activity to work on the collective service, either by joining an established line or creating a new one. Although there were rules from the beginning, rivalry also appeared between *colectivos*, such controversies sometimes being resolved violently.<sup>6</sup> Along with the service innovation, the taxi drivers had shown signs of cooperativism – a high level of political awareness created by their experiences in the chauffeurs union. The *colectivo* service had proliferated as an organization of small owners associated by “lines” that merged into a large federation. Contrary to the image of illegality and anarchy created by its opponents, the drivers had sought from the beginning to create forms of self-regulation – organizing both service and administration.

The national origin of the *colectivo* stressed by the official story was also emphasized by *colectivo* drivers, politicians, and the press since this unregulated service eroded the interests of the Anglo-Argentine Tramway Company (AATC), the largest transport company in Buenos Aires (controlling tramways, underground and omnibus). The rivalry between the tram and the motor vehicle, similar to other cases like the jitney in the USA, was interpreted here in terms of imperialism and nationalism within a historical context in which debates about national identity shaped nationalisms from both right and left.<sup>7</sup> The political battle against the AACT had begun by the mid-1920s when the City Council, with a majority of socialists and democrats, prevented the rise of fare demanded by the Anglo-Argentine company as a condition of completing the underground network. The ‘monopoly’, as the AATC was called, symbolized British control over Buenos Aires’ public transport while the automobile symbolized a sort of “national liberation” – despite the fact it was also a symbol of American capitalism.

While the most traditional newspapers maintained a certain distance with respect to the new service, the modern and popular newspapers and magazines embraced it with enthusiasm as a pragmatic solution to public transport and traffic. The rapid expansion of new lines and their immediate acceptance by the public was registered by the whole press. That the *colectivo* signified a threat to established public transport was demonstrated by the reaction that the AATC and other transport companies. They

---

5 *Crítica*, October 4, 1928, p. 7

6 Carlos Achával “Colectivos: 75 años de la primera ‘Rojo y Negro sobre Ruedas’”, en *Todo es Historia* 434 (2003), p. 28-36

7 Although Argentina was an independent republic, its economic dependency on the British Empire triggered anti-imperialist discourses and Anglo-phobia.

questioned its legal competence, criticized its alleged virtues, and pushed the local and national authorities to control it. The early reaction of the Municipality was ambiguous: it stated that the service would have to be subject to legislation but left it to expand without serious control. The first norms were applied in 1932, regulating routes and the service but not impeding its expansion. The AATC lobby had success when they managed to get the National Congress to approve the creation of the Buenos Aires Transport Corporation (1938), something which implied the end of the horizontal management of the *colectivos*. The political fight fed the rivalry between the national and the foreigner since the law was seen as direct consequence of the economic agreement between the British Empire and Argentina (the Roca-Runciman pact) whereby British companies in Argentina obtained benefits. Although the strike of September 1936, which received popular support, was a hallmark of *colectivo* drivers' resistance to the creation of the Corporation, it could not prevent the expropriation of vehicles. What had seemed to be a victory for the tramways changed after 1940, however, with new nationalistic governments: the Corporation privileged the motor public transport over tramways.

Finally, a distinctive feature of the *colectivo* that fed the idea of a national invention was its material shape. The *auto-colectivo* was originally a car (most of them American brands). By 1930, due to the demand, it started to be modified by enlarging the chassis to carry 9 passengers. In 1932 the Municipality passed an ordinance which impacted, among other things, upon the physical form of the *colectivo*. The norms did not specify a particular form but rather the dimensions: the vehicle had to carry up to 10 passengers plus the driver; it had to be a maximum of 5.3m long (excluding bumpers), 2m wide and 2.5m high. Following these measures, the national car-body manufacturers shaped a sort of mini-bus over truck chassis. In the first models the truck chassis was easily identifiable but later this was covered up by the body. Although this was no longer a car, some characteristics such as the shape of the windows remained. Models varied according to the manufacturer and a distinctive mark was the decoration based on a popular culture styling: the *fileteado* (gilded edge).

Achával, Scartinni, and others agreed that the originality of the *colectivo* lies in its material shape rather than the type of service offered, which can be traced back before 1928 in other cities – although there is not yet clear evidence whether those experiences have influenced the emergence of the *colectivo*. The singular form was the result of the local skills that car-body manufacturers developed during the 1920s under the increasing influence of the North American car industry in Argentina. I state that such local skills responded creatively to municipal requirements, which gave the *colectivo* a standard. In short, what made the *colectivo* singular during its first decade was its hybrid character (between a car and a bus), a result of both creativity and self-organization and the influence of car industry and political conflicts.

### **The novelty**

When it emerged in 1928, the *colectivo* was received as a complete novelty: there was no mention of precedents from other cities. According to the chronicles and testimonies from September 1928, the use of a taxi for mass transport was a pragmatic and creative solution that taxi drivers found to overcome the crisis of the sector. Although it generated controversies, the greater part of public opinion and the politicians agreed that the *auto-colectivo* resolved transport and traffic problems and that it was a success due to the public acceptance.

The multiple names given to the service demonstrates its novel character: *auto-colectivo*, *taxi-obus*, *taxi-bus* or the most formal “rental automobile for collective transport”. Newspapers like *Crítica* tried to find a name that described not only its usage but its speed (comparing it with a revolver) or the fact that it was an economical service (comparing it with a purse: *taxi-monedero*) -similar to the name “jitney” as both refer to coins needed for a journey. Nonetheless, the *colectivo* fare was controversial.<sup>8</sup> It was argued, by socialist councilors for example, that the new service signified a democratization of the car since it gave workers the opportunity to use a form of transport that was usually too expensive for them.<sup>9</sup> Although paying 10, 20, and 40 cents was much cheaper than a taxi journey, the *colectivo* fare could be more expensive than other modes, all of which had a fixed fare of 10 cents. This issue was discussed by the City Council, which was the authority with responsibility for regulating traffic and transport in Buenos Aires.

The debate echoed the discussion which had occurred during the 1920s in which the socialists and their allies had impeded the increase in tram and underground fare demanded by the AATC, claiming that the growth in the permanent population (due to immigration) and, as a result, in the number of passengers was sufficient to maintain the transport companies’ profits without the need to increase the fare. But when the socialists supported the *colectivo*’s fare, a conservative councilor claimed that if workers could pay 20 cents, it was not the fare that was the real question but rather the socialists’ Anglophobia. A communist councilor responded saying that not every worker could pay the *colectivo* fare which was why tramways and omnibuses continued working and the “worker tramway of 5 cents” was still in demand.<sup>10</sup>

The discussion is interesting in terms of whether the reason for paying a higher fare was only economic or there were other motives. I argue that an explanation cannot be based on a single cause and that choosing the *colectivo* could have been shaped as much by practical reasons as by cultural ones. How much did the pleasure of traveling by car play a significant role? And, how important was the feeling of having access to such an

---

8 *Crítica*, October 2, 1928, p. 6.

9 *La Vanguardia*, October 2, 1928, p. 4.

10 Versiones Taquigráficas Concejo Deliberante (City Council records), session October 2, 1928, p. 1832-36.

appreciated commodity for only a few cents? The idea of democratization indicates mass access to something that used to be exclusive.

### **New experiences**

In order to understand the demand for the *colectivo* it is important to remember that the 1920s was a decade of economic stability in Argentina that allowed the incorporation of a growing population into the labor market. More specialized jobs were required in industry, administration and commerce and they were occupied by more skilled and educated workers – something made possible by public education. The employee (in both private and public sectors) symbolized the typical commuter of Buenos Aires, a primarily commercial and administrative city. Nonetheless, it was also the main industrial area of the country and the industrial worker was also a typical commuter. In any case, there were people able to pay 20 or 40 cents for a journey and they probably did so because of the conveniences of the *colectivo*: more frequent and faster than trams and omnibuses, it could stop where the passenger indicated, and the *colectivo* lines started to cover new suburban areas. But, again, are those aspects, usually associated with “instrumental reason”, the only ones which can explain the success of this public service?

I argue that the acceptance of the service was also closely related to negative perceptions of the daily experience of public transport, particularly in trams and omnibuses, and the expectations that the car culture brought - both the pleasure of driving and social status. As a passenger said in 1928, until the emergence of the *colectivo* “there was no alternative than to get used to the discomfort” of the omnibus, but now “we find that the taxi, which used to be a luxury [...] transports passengers in all directions and over long distances, permitting enjoyment of the comfort of the automobile for a negligible sum.”<sup>11</sup>

Initial findings show the significance of considering commuting as a meaningful experience: showing, on the one hand, how such an experience was shaped by the ideas of comfort, speed and safety as values of modern transport technology; on the other, how travel experiences are social.

Those travel experiences were built upon a culture fascinated by the technical features of the car: the representation of the *auto-colectivo* as faster was based on the versatility of the car, particularly its ability to weave its way through traffic. Another advantage was that the *colectivo* owner did not need to invest in infrastructure. This made it much easier for the *colectivo* to create new routes in the suburbs where there were no tramways or bus lines. Nonetheless, before expanding within the suburbs, the first lines started by covering busy routes, those already established by trams and omnibuses (trying to capture their clients) and those which connected the main points of the city.

---

11 *Crítica*, September 29, 1928, p. 7.

For that reason it is important to understand the early success of the *colectivo* by comparing the onboard experiences of different modes of transport.

Along with speed, comfort was the most highlighted feature of the new service. As another passenger mentioned in 1928: “there is no comparison”, “one goes comfortably sitting, although the car is full, there are no more than five passengers. If one wishes, one can smoke [...] Also, it must be mentioned as an advantage no longer hearing the galling “move along” [...] And people keep boarding although they are piled up together.”<sup>12</sup> This passenger also complained about the omnibus’s smell (petrol, kerosene and oil) that produces nausea and its unbearable noise (breaks and gear cage).

“Waiting” a lot of time for a tram or bus was a common complaint. Even when the frequency of trams and omnibuses were acceptable, they often passed full, making impossible to board. The “*completo*” (the sign that indicated that the tram was full) is one of the most common commuting complaints in Buenos Aires during the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (and even today). Despite the large tramway network (800km) the city had in 1928, in addition to several omnibus lines, one underground line and five railway lines, the public transport network could not meet the demand of a population that grew permanently and showed a high rate of daily journeys.<sup>13</sup> In 1909 the Chief of the Public Works Department said, regarding the need for an underground railway network, that “the constant increase of passengers has led a growth of rolling stock; nevertheless, number of means of transport turns out to be insufficient at certain hours, and groups of people can be seen waiting at the corner for their trams, which pass full of passengers.”<sup>14</sup> Waiting a long time for a tram was a reason why the League for Women’s and Children’s Rights demanded women-only tram cars in 1912.<sup>15</sup>

But the discourses about the *colectivo*’s comfort, as shown above, also referred to the fact of traveling in a vehicle with only a few people instead of sharing it with a multitude. Being seated contrasted with another typical image of discomfort: traveling hanging onto the handrails of buses or trams - symbolized by the metaphor of the “human bunch”. In December 1912, for example, the abovementioned League obtained permission for women to travel on the tramcar platform – a practice previously denied to them because it was perceived as dangerous.

The “full” not only implied the need to keep waiting or the risk of traveling hanging off but also other inconveniences such as being shoved, being stamped on, being crushed, quarrels, and a lack of manners that included harassment of women. In the underground railway, implemented in 1913 as the fastest, safest and most comfortable mode of transport, the company had to create in 1928 the “women-only car” so that women

---

12 *Ibid.*

13 For example, between 1903 and 1913 the population almost doubled (from 865,000 to 1.4 million) while tramway passenger-journeys tripled (from 133 million to 407 million).

14 Buenos Aires Census, 1910: 546.

15 “Las mujeres y el completo en los tranvías,” *Unión y Labor* 39-40 (December 1912-January 1913)

would not have to endure the bad manners of male passengers. The discussions between the guard and male passengers were also considered an offense to women (due to the language used) as well as being annoying. Some newspapers highlighted the good manners of the chauffeur in contrast to the tram guards and bus drivers. The newspaper *El Mundo* described the new experience as follows: “The chauffeur of the taxi-bus has thoroughly studied a treatise of urbanity and courtesy: he knows he has to be different from his workmate, the omnibus driver, and heaps good manners on his clients”. He opens the door while asking the passengers’ forgiveness, blushes when he receives the money as if his purpose was to transport people for free and “we, passengers largely mistreated by all the locomotion systems, keep quiet and admire him. And when we get off we are on the point of thinking that the chauffeur is a Russian prince fallen on hard times.”<sup>16</sup>

This new relationship between the driver and the passenger was seen as possible in a more intimate and smaller space like the car. Means of public transport offer a mixture of private-public space, and intimacy among strangers. But unlike the anonymity within the mass that one can experience in a tram, train or bus, inside an automobile with 6 people the social distance in a close bodily proximity seemed to be more difficult to maintain. For men, as discourses show, the car allowed new forms of approaching women.

If the automobile offered the comfort of traveling seated (although it is true that sometimes passengers had to travel squeezed together inside the car), sharing the seat with male strangers could be perceived as morally dangerous for women. In 1928 a *colectivo* line had introduced a special service, exclusive cars for female passengers only, in order to encourage women to use *colectivos*, although, as photos illustrate, women seemed to not mind sharing the car with men. That was a fear fed more by morality rather than practice. A popular magazine, *El Hogar*, claimed that a women-only service was not necessary since cordiality is inevitable in a *colectivo*. It commented with irony that maybe cordiality bothers the Transit Director who wants to regulate the service and the special service was a response to his pressure. For the magazine, “contrary to what happens in omnibuses and tramcars, where to address another passenger is indiscreet, in the *taxi-colectivo* to initiate a conversation would be right” because “the *taxi-colectivo* would establish human fraternity.”<sup>17</sup>

A new form of approaching seems to be associated to the singular spatial arrangement (two seats for three people each). As the writer Roberto Arlt stated in 1928, in his daily column in *El Mundo* newspaper: “Two people of a different sex that travel together in the same seat cannot see each other with the same indifference as in the omnibus. That is not possible.” He says that traveling with a young lady in a car was “something profoundly appealing” and now, “with the new system of rapid transit, one has the

---

16 *El Mundo*, October 10, 1928, p. 7

17 *El Hogar*, October 9, 1928, p. 4



chance of sitting beside nice girls” and, then, “the courtesy of a smile and three kind words prevail.”<sup>18</sup>

When the physical form of the *auto-colectivo* began to change in 1933, becoming a *colectivo* in the strict sense, a journalist recalled with nostalgia the benefits of the car based on his travel experience: “the classic urban *colectivo*” was “fresh and ventilated” but with the new norm, “under the pretext of evolution and progress”, it came to be a “reshaped *supercolectivo*, with nine or ten seats in an cage”, which is moreover “adorned with educational signs” such as “Be nice to the ladies”, “Do not smoke if there are women”, “Close the doors carefully”, “Pay with change”.<sup>19</sup> This feeling was based on the fact that, along with the conversation with other passengers (especially women), the *auto-colectivo* was perceived as an “unregulated space” (“*libre de trabas reglamentarias*”) in comparison to other modes of public transport.

If the *colectivo* signified hope of change for the daily experience of mobility in Buenos Aires, as an affordable and convenient service that brought more comfort, speed, connectivity and a new sociability, in terms of safety it did not escape from the quotidian tragedy of Buenos Aires traffic: accidents. Buenos Aires streets were perceived as a “public crushing place”.<sup>20</sup> With the implementation of the electric tramway in 1900, for example, the number of accidents had increased sharply due to the lack of skill in operating it. The omnibus was another common protagonist of accidents from the 1920s, triggering caricatures that showed it as a peril and the level crossing appeared as a trap for buses and cars. In this context, the *auto-colectivo* had appeared as a solution for traffic congestion but it was also hoped that accidents would be avoided thanks to the versatility of the car. Nonetheless, a few days after the inauguration of the service, an *auto-colectivo* and an omnibus crashed and the *auto-colectivo* driver was compared to the omnibus driver as the younger cousin. The driver’s lack of control over the speed of the car often resulted in the vehicle overturning or crashing into a shop window. The new photojournalism stressed the spectacular character of those accidents with photos in the “crime” section (*policiales*). Accidents became one of the main complaints against the *colectivo* and because of this the municipal norms of 1933 obliged the owners to have accident insurance. With the new hybrid model (the mini-bus), the vehicle was more unstable and it was necessary to incorporate double rear wheels in order to avoid overturning – this was a practical solution that then became a norm. Although these facts were a clear sign of a lack of security, they did not prevent the success of the *colectivo*.

### **Final considerations**

From the 19<sup>th</sup> century, technological innovation in Buenos Aires’ public transport was mostly implemented “from above”. Railways, tramways, underground railways and, to a lesser extent, omnibuses were projects, proposed by private or public actors, that were

---

18 *El Mundo*, October 9, 1928, p. 4.

19 *Crítica*, April 6, 1933, p. 6.

20 *PBT* December 13, 1913.

planned, largely debated, and legally authorized by the local or national government. In this sense, the *auto-colectivo* was implemented “from below” since there was no municipal authorization. It was not a publicly debated or legislated project. Although it was the result of an “internal” debate (among taxi chauffeurs) and there was certain degree of planning, it was implemented without previous notice and for that reason it was received as a surprise. The *auto-colectivo* burst into the life of Buenos Aires while other means of transport were imagined and largely expected, or even rejected before being implemented.

The regulation of the *colectivo* came after its appearance and, contrary to the idea of an anarchic system, regulation was applied early by its creators, who organized themselves as a sort of cooperative of small entrepreneurs, and sought to create a public transport system rather than merely taking passengers from trams and buses. Municipal regulations came later to limit the expansion of the system and avoid competition with trams and buses. This explains the creation of a transport corporation that eroded the *colectivo*'s organization.

The first decade (1928-1938) of the *colectivo* becomes an interesting period to analyze the technological innovation in urban mobility. Here the *colectivo* clearly shows how mobility is, following Urry and Cresswell,<sup>21</sup> an assemblage of movement, practices, meanings, technologies and power. The latter was related to the economic and political conflict with authorities and tramway companies and the way in which it was interpreted by contemporaries as an ideological conflict.

As an artifact, the *colectivo* was a technological “hybridation”, a mutation led by the use of the car and shaped by a horizontal social network integrated by drivers and manufactures. The distinctive form of the Argentinean *colectivo* is the result of the local body-workers who, although integrated into the car industry, maintained a degree of “freedom” for creation. As a socio-technological process, the singularity of the *colectivo* was the collective use of the car, modifying, on the one hand, the type of service (from “individual” taxi to a “shared taxi”), and, on the other, permitting mass the access to the automobile. The latter, finally, raises questions that need further investigation - most important for me is to re-think theories about the car culture (automobility) and the city in the early twenty century, since the focus has been mainly on the experience of driving. Recent ethnography of passengering, instead, might contribute to a cultural history of the *colectivo* since the focus is the sociability inside the vehicle.<sup>22</sup> As shown in this paper, the socio-material experience of sharing an automobile seems to be crucial to understanding the *colectivo* as novelty.

---

21 John Urry, *Mobilities*, (Cambridge: Polity, 2007); Tim Cresswell, “The Production of Mobilities,” in *The Cultural Geography Reader*, ed. Tim Oakes and Patricia Lynn Price (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 325–333.

22 Barry Brown et. al., “Driving and “passengering” : notes on the ordinary organization of car travel”, *Edinburgh Research Archive*, available online at <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/2299> (accessed August 12, 2014)