

Founding out: an ANTi-History account of history and the establishment of Pan American Airways¹

CMS6 : Warwick University

Gabrielle Durepos, Saint Mary's University
Albert J. Mills, Saint Mary's University

“A story has not beginning or end: arbitrarily one chooses that moment of experience from which to look back or from which to look ahead.” (G. Green, 2004: 1)

Introduction

In this paper we attend to the dual challenge of addressing the call for ‘a historic turn,’ while developing an alternative approach to study of the past. Specifically, in an examination of the mnemonic nature of stories of ‘startup’s’ and ‘founders’, this paper uses a developing historiographical approach called ANTi-History (Durepos & Mills, 2008) and draws on a combination of extensive archival research at the Otto Richter Library in Miami, two independently funded histories (Bender & Altschul, 1982; Josephson, 1943a), one founder-funded history (Daley, 1980), and one ‘professional’ (Jenkins, 1995; White, 1985) history (W. P. Newton, 1978) to (re)assemble the ‘startup’ of Pan American Airways (PAA).

The paper draws on selected aspects of ANTi-history to pluralize history by problematizing ascribed ‘beginnings’ and ‘ends’ in history; illustrating the ‘bounding’ of history as a social construction, one that is an effect of interest driven actor-networks or historians. Thus, we pluralize PAA’s past by writing an alternative history of its ‘founding’. We historicize (by contextualizing and situating the story both spatially and temporally), and pluralize (through creating a (re)assembly of the past) the uniform tale of the ‘startup’ of PAA told in existing histories. Such tales are largely constructed around the life of Juan Trippe who is portrayed unquestionably as the founder of PAA. Specifically, this (re)assembly of the ‘startup’ of PAA seeks not only to provide an alternative account of Trippe as PAA’s founder but also problematizes the specific nature by which historians² ‘do’ history, whereby they ascribe, impose, and thus construct beginnings and ends to bind their tales. We show in this paper that the historian’s hand in ‘bounding’ a story works as a powerful instrument that can give the historian’s story a false appearance of naturalness. In other words, we illustrate the specific histories of PAA as socially constructed, and pluralize the startup of PAA by (re)assembling it.

The paper is structured in five parts. We begin with an overview of the historic turn in organization studies. This is followed by an explanation of ANTi-history as a multifaceted historiographic approach that includes an overview of the key facets of the approach. Third, we apply (or perform) ANTi-history to the study of PAA, through (i) an examination of the way in which the ‘founding’ of PAA is depicted in three popular histories of the airline (Bender & Altschul, 1982; Daley, 1980; Josephson, 1943a); (ii) other published accounts in which the

¹ Research funded by SSHRC grant # 410 2004 1551.

² We shall use the term historian to refer to professional historians, i.e., those who by training, full-time occupation, and status lay claim to the title historian.

'founding' of PAA is discussed (Fortune, 1936; Time Magazine, 1941); (iii) a (re)assembly of the 'founding' of PAA by 'following actors' in and out of the PAA archive (Latour, 2005). Fourth, we discuss the specific facets of ANTi-history most prominently used throughout this particular study. Fifth, and finally, we offer some concluding thoughts.

Overview of the Historic Turn in Organization Studies

In recent years, a number of studies have argued for analyses of organizations from an historical perspective (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Kieser, 1994; Rowlinson, 2004; Usdiken & Kieser, 2004). This movement – referred to as the 'historic turn' in organization studies -- has been motivated by a number of factors including observations that the study of organizations is: ahistorical (Rowlinson, 2004); decontextualized and dominated by natural scientific rhetoric (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004; Jacques, 2006; Usdiken & Kieser, 2004); plagued by research that is universalist and presentist (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006); and conducted and presented in a manner that tends to 'naturalize' organization conditions (Jacques, 1996).

Adherents of the 'historic turn' argue that there is the need to: conduct organizational research that embraces critical and ethical reflection (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006); challenge and disturb the 'naturalness' of organizations and organizational research by situating them as an effect of "culture-specific historical developments" (Kieser, 1994: 609); engage business history and theory (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Kieser, 1994); and, scholarship that renders transparent its ontological and epistemological roots (Lamond, 2008); acknowledges the existence of competing theories whilst assessing available alternatives (Jacques, 2006). For us the most relevant consequence of the historic turn in organization studies has been the stated need for the development of alternative historical styles and methods of writing (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Ermarth, 2007; Jacques, 2006). This led us to the development of what we call ANTi-history.

Overview of ANTi-history as a methodology

In brief, ANTi-history (Durepos & Mills, 2008) is an historiographical approach for constructing knowledge of the past that draws on insights from the sociology of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Kamenka, 1983; Mannheim, 1951–1985), postmodern historiography (A. Green & Troup, 1999; Gunn, 2006; Jenkins, 1991, 1995, 2003; Jenkins, Morgan, & Munslow, 2007; White, 1973, 1985), and actor-network theory (Callon, 1986; Latour, 2005; Latour & Woolgar, 1986; Law, 1992). The major contours of the approach are as follows: ANTi-history:

- Begins with an acknowledgment of the postmodern distinction between 'past' and 'history' (Jenkins, 1991, 2003), viewing the *past* as all that has occurred prior to a present condition; and *history* as a story or knowledge of that past.
- Incorporates insights from the sociology of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Mannheim, 1985) to understand the activity of knowledge creation of a past as communal, interest driven, socially constructed, political and situated.
- 'Does' history through tracing the numerous traces of the past by drawing on the method implied in actor-network theory (Latour, 2005). In the process ANTi-history assumes 'history' to an effect of situated (ideological, spatial and temporal) actor-networks. Embedded in our approach is the assumption that heterogeneous actors (Latour, 1993) are

active political agents who seek to enlist others onto their cause to render that cause more durable (Latour, 1991) and create networks (Law, 1992). Actors do this by capturing each others interests through conducting interest work, translating the interests of those actors to that of their own and through this, enrolling the actor onto a cause to build networks that will strengthen the pursuing of that cause (Callon & Law, 1982).

- Is informed by amodern (postrealist) ontological assumptions and social constructionist (antipositivist) epistemological assumptions.
- Is dedicated to a ‘relational’, ‘textual’, and ‘contextual’ performance (as opposed to a description) of the constitution of ‘truth(s)’ and ‘facts.’ This is to show how the social context in which a textual trace is embedded influences the ‘ordering’ of many traces into a flavored ‘telling’ of history (Durepos, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2008). Thus, ANTi-history (re)assembles the constitution of the socio-historical past by tracing the many associations that act to ‘hold that socio-historical past together.’
- Is not guided by apriori assumptions concerning the constitution of a given socio-past (Latour, 2005). ANTi-history does not begin by assuming as given what it wishes for he analysis to show. Thus, ANTi-history does not begin a (re)assembly of the constitution of a socio-past by starting off with the assumption that certain ions ‘that act to hold the socio-past together’ exist. Instead it encourages following the series of actors around as they engage in political acts, negotiations, enrolments and translations, as they seek to form networks.
- Draws on actor-network theory (Latour, 2005) to assume ‘history’ as an effect of situated (ideological, spatial and temporal) actor-networks – and encourages the researcher who is using ANTi-history to map out the series of performativities of socio-past actors as they engage in network formation.
- Assumes that heterogeneous actors (Latour, 1993) are active political agents who seek to enlist others onto their cause to render that cause more durable (Latour, 1991) and create networks (Law, 1992). Thus, following ANT, we view a network as comprised of extremely aligned actors that in the process can in itself be understood as an *actor* due to its ability to act as one (Law, 1992). This apparent ‘unity,’ in turn, serves not only to conceal the series of negotiations and political tactics that enabled various actors to act as one (Callon & Law, 1982) but also to be taken for granted as a concretized, fixed entity. ANT scholars have referred to these seemingly unitary entities as ‘black boxes’ or ‘punctuations,’ which consist of individual elements and processes that have become hidden through their unification (Latour, 1987). ANTi-history suggests that ‘history,’ or the construction of knowledge of the past, can be understood through this process of ‘black-boxing’ or ‘punctuation’. For example, the series of socio-politics that are active in the construction of a history text are concealed in the writing and publication of the text.

Facets of ANTi-history that are highlighted in the (re)assembly of the ‘startup’ of PAA

For reasons of space and focus we have concentrated on certain facets of ANTi-history to perform analysis of the ‘founding’ of PAA. In particular we use ANTi-history to illustrate ‘history’ as social constructed knowledge of the ‘past’ intent being to disturb the ontological priority that is often unquestioningly associated with ‘history’. The empirical application of ANTi-history serves to highlight a certain view of change in history, one that subject to a process of folding as opposed to a progressive explanation. What this means is that ANTi-history

necessitates that a researchers' view of a socio-past condition assumes that this condition envelopes all previous conditions which have become 'folded into it'; thus, the new envelops the old, and stands on its behalf. Noteworthy is ANTi-history's relational approach to history, emphasizing the need to problematize 'beginnings' and 'ends' in history as social constructions of interest driven actor-networks/historians. ANTi-history is used in this paper to address and problematize the concepts of 'past' and 'history'.

This empirical application draws on ANTi-history's emphasis on symmetry in research, in that all the traces and actors followed, be it books, PAA actors, historians or otherwise are viewed with the same initial curiosity. When following traces, we argue that using ANTi-history, the researcher should not let their apriori assumptions govern the actors she follows, nor let her theoretical knowledge give a premature certainty to her analysis. This means that the researcher does not use her theoretical insights unproblematically to decide which actors to follow, and how to order the action followed into a story. She does not impose a preordered plot on the (re)assembly but instead (re)assembles the past into history, by following the actors around and tracing their numerous associations. While doing history, the researcher using ANTi-history should acknowledge her situatedness (spatial, temporal and ideological) as well as seeing herself as an effect of an actor-network. The latter two points are understood as preconditions for reflexivity in historical constructions, which is stressed through ANTi-history. Finally, and of foremost importance for this application is ANTi-history's emphasis on pluralizing history. We now turn to the empirical performance of ANTi-history.

Using ANTi-history to pluralize history and problematize 'beginnings' & 'ends' in history

This section is ordered into three parts. We begin with a discussion of three popular histories of PAA with a focus on how each depicts the organizations founding (Bender & Altschul, 1982; Daley, 1980; Josephson, 1943a). We then illustrate alternative published accounts of the founding of PAA (Fortune, 1936; Time Magazine, 1941). Finally, we perform ANTi-history through a (re)assembly of the story the founding of PAA by following the actors in and out of the PAA archive.

Popular histories and their depiction of the founding of PAA

The popular version of the 'founding' of PAA, as it is told in at least three histories (Bender & Altschul, 1982; Daley, 1980; Josephson, 1943a) differs only slightly. In summary, PAA is described by the three popular histories as founded in the US during the summer of 1927. Aviation in the US, in the 1920's, was in its infancy. Aerial ventures were heavily reliant on financial backing from successful 'capitalists' as well as the awarding of US government airmail contracts initiated in 1925 with the Kelly Act. Aviation ventures were viewed with skepticism and investing in such ventures was commonly understood as unviable or risky. Aviation technology was in its developmental stages, the development of aviation technology was expensive, and a fear of flying plagued the general public. As the following histories of PAA will show, the communal sentiment concerning aviation in the 1920's made for a turbulent environment in which aviation companies were just as quickly established as they were bankrupt.

PAA is described in all three histories as an organization that was formed through the consolidation of three organizations (Bender & Altschul, 1982; Daley, 1980; Josephson, 1943a). These histories state that in the summer of 1927, Pan American Airways (PAA), Florida Airways (which folded and soon re-emerged as Atlantic, Gulf and Caribbean Airways, Inc.) and Aviation

Corporation of the America (which included Juan Trippe) were involved in negotiating for a US government airmail contract from Key West (Florida) to Havana (Cuba). Forced to merge their operations in order for the airmail contract to be awarded, the emergent organization retained the name of Pan American Airways. Juan Trippe, who is treated as the founder of PAA, was not part of the initial Pan American Airways (which we will refer to as Pan American Airways incorporated, or PAAI) but entered the negotiations on behalf of Aviation Corporation of the America (ACoA). He went on to assume the position of general manager of the newly formed PAA through the merger.

To discuss the specific way in which the ‘founding’ of PAA is depicted, we begin by focusing on the socio-politics inherent in the specific histories to provide clues concerning the situatedness of the author and their text’s conditions of creation. We then describe the actual story of the founding of PAA as it is told in the three named PAA histories. Following this is a discussion concerning how the historian bounds their story of PAA, with a focus on how each author has constructed the ‘beginning’ of the history of PAA.

The socio-politics inherent in the popular histories of PAA

Important differences that set apart the three popular histories of PAA include their respective dates of publication and the nature of their financing. Josephson’s history of PAA was published in 1943, Daley’s in 1980, and Bender & Altschul’s in 1982. Part of Josephson’s (1943a) history appeared as a series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post, from August 14 to September 21, 1943 (see Josephson, 1943b) prior to its publication as a book. In terms of financing, Daley’s (1980) history was funded directly by PAA, whereas Josephson’s (1943a) and Bender & Altschul’s (1982) were independently financed.

Juan Trippe is said to have detested Josephson’s “unauthentic” history of PAA (Bender & Altschul, 1982: 526). This may in large part be due to Josephson’s known leftist leanings (Belfrage, 1973; Chomsky, 1997; Lyons, 1941; Wald, 1994; Wechler, 1954; Zinn, 1990, 1997, 1999), which undoubtedly flavored the nature of his history. Nonetheless, Trippe’s response to Josephson’s history is a little surprising given that Josephson (1943a: vii) notes that he is “indebted to Mr. Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American Airways System, for his kindness in according me numerous and lengthy interviews and his patience in answering many questions”. The intimate details concerning the conditions of creation of Josephson’s (1943a) history of PAA are not known. But, clues as to the formation of Josephson’s (1943a: vii) history can be found in the text’s prologue where it was stated that his history was constructed through relying on hundreds of “participants and eyewitnesses” of all walks of life. Though Josephson states that many actors were involved in the construction of his history, following these actors has been rather difficult due to the lack of references or endnotes in Josephson’s text. Thus, it is impossible to know exactly which historical traces Josephson relied upon to construct his book as well as the ordering logic of the historical traces.

In contrast to the dearth of traces concerning the socio-politics inherent in Josephson’s (1943a) history is the wealth of traces of Daley’s history (Durepos et al., 2008). The craft of what eventually became known as Robert Daley’s (1980) history of PAA began in 1957, when the famed aviator Charles Lindbergh (by then a technical advisor of PAA) convinced Trippe of the importance and viability of a founder-funded history. A professional writer by the name of Wolfgang Langewiesche was enrolled to craft the history but in 1969, after much time and funding had elapsed, Langewiesche left the project citing Trippe’s continual lack of cooperation as the reason (Langewiesche, 1969a, 1969b, 1969c). John Leslie, a retired VP of PAA then took

on the task of writing the history in 1970 (John Leslie, 1970a), gathered materials and beginning to write draft manuscripts. After at least one unsuccessful attempt at publishing Leslie's manuscript (Muller, 1972) and numerous attempts at enrolling a professional writer (John Leslie, 1973f; MacLeish, 1971; Martin, 1976), Robert Daley was enrolled to write the founder-funded history of PAA (Daley, 1976). The history was published in 1980 and Daley was said to have full editorial control of the manuscript.

The historical materials gathered by Langewiesche and [redacted] during the period 1957 to 1980 were made available to Daley for his history and publically available for research purposes following the publication of Daley's history (Bender & Altschul, 1982). Bender & Altschul (1982) relied on the PAA materials to verify their own materials which "confirmed and, in regard to a few matters, amplified" their independent research (Bender & Altschul, 1982: 528). Their independent research also drew on the papers of General Henry Hap Arnold in the Library of Congress, the personal papers of Charles A. Lindbergh, as well as military and diplomatic records of the US government. What is noteworthy is that Bender and Altschul also relied on numerous interviews with Juan Trippe, Elizabeth Stettinius Trippe (Juan Trippe's wife) as well as Trippe's sister, Louise Trippe Bradlee, and his daughter Betsy Trippe Wainwright. Bender & Altschul (1982) commented that Trippe was responsive to questioning but that his recollections were often at odds with official documentation.

The story of the founding of PAA as it is told in the popular histories of PAA

The stories told in the three popular histories of PAA are similar in regard to their focus on and description of the pioneering activities of Juan Trippe. For example, they all mention Trippe's Long Island Airways, which folded in 1925, and point out that until the Kelly Air Mail Act of 1925, private aviation organization relied on meager private funding. The passing of The Kelly Air Mail act of 1925 authorized the Post Office to award contracts to private companies for the transport of airmail. This spurred much activity [redacted] aviation circles, including the formation of Eastern Air Transport -- comprised of John Hambleton, Sonny Whitney, Bill Vanderbilt and Juan Trippe -- which competed for a Boston-New-York airmail contract. Competing for the same airmail contract was a group from Boston called Colonial Airways. The two organizations subsequently merged to form Colonial Air Transport. Shortly thereafter, Trippe was fired from his role as vice president and general manager of Colonial Air Transport, a post he had assumed through the merger. Though the details of Trippe's numerous aviation activities leading up to the founding of PAA are depicted consistently in the popular histories, the actual tale told of the 'founding' of PAA differs. Noteworthy is that Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul's (1982) histories are more similar [redacted] their description of the startup of PAA than Josephson's (1943a) account.

Josephson (1943a) describes Trippe, Hambleton and Whitney as forming Aviation Corporation of the Americas (ACoAs) after leaving Colonial Air Transport. In 1927, the US government advertised an airmail contract to transport mail from Key West to Havana, prompting interest on behalf of ACoAs. Josephson (1943a) notes that during the negotiations for the Key-West to Havana airmail contract, Trippe and Hambleton [redacted] a trip to Havana and secured exclusive Cuban landing rights from General Machado. According to Josephson (1943a), other aviation organizations competing for the Key-West to Havana airmail contract included Florida Airways (organized by Reed Chambers, [redacted] Rickenbacker, and financed by individuals such as Richard F. Hoyt) and Pan American Airways Incorporated (PAAI was organized by Richard Bevier and Grant Mason). These two organizations had neither the proper

equipment, nor the financing to secure the airmail contract. What is stressed in Josephson's account is that once the PAAI group discovered that Trippe had procured exclusive landing rights in Cuba from the Cuban President, they sold out to ACoAs (Trippe's group). Thus, Florida Airways, PAAI and ACoAs merged under the holding company of ACoAs, whose subsidiary called Pan American Airways (PAA) was headed by Trippe. In July of 1927, the ACoA subsidiary - PAA - was awarded the Key West to Havana airmail contract.

Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul's (1982) histories of PAA are remarkably similar in content, but they differ from Josephson's (1943a) account. The former historical accounts suggest (Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul, 1982) that after Trippe, Hambleton and Whitney left Colonial Air Transport, they formed Aviation Corporation of the Americas (ACoA) on June 2nd, 1927. The first priority of ACoA was to bid for the upcoming Key-West to Havana airmail contract soon to be advertised by the US government (Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul 1982). As noted by Josephson (1943a), other aviation operations such as Florida Airways (later called Atlantic, Gulf and Caribbean Airways, Inc) as well as PAAI showed interest in securing the soon to be advertised contract. The way in which Josephson's (1943a) account differs from that of Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul (1982), is the explicit details which that the two latter histories include concerning the initial formation of PAAI (of which Trippe played no part).

According to Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul (1982) military officer Major Henry (Hap) Arnold formed PAAI as a reaction to reading intelligence reports about Sociedad Colombo-Alemana de Transportes Aéreos (SCADTA). SCADTA was a recently established German-owned and operated (pilots, mechanics and personnel) airline in Columbia. Headed by Peter von Bauer, plans had been voiced to extend the airline across the Panama Canal and into the US in hopes of competing for US airmail contracts. Alarmed by the threat posed to the Panama Canal by a German operated airline, Arnold enlisted Major Carl Spaatz, Major Jack Jouett, John Montgomery, Richard D. Bevier, and George Grant Mason into PAAI. PAAI was incorporated in March of 1927 (Bender & Altschul 1982) to bid for the soon to be announced Key West to Havana US airmail contract. Following this, Montgomery petitioned the US post office to advertise the Key West to Havana route, which PAAI secured on July 16th, 1927 (Daley, 1980). The contract stated the commencement of airmail for October 19th, 1927, but this proved to be difficult for PAAI to realize given that they owned no planes.

Due to the lack of resources of the three organizations bidding for the airmail contract, the US Postmaster forced PAAI, Florida Airways (which Daley (1980) refers to as Atlantic, Gulf and Caribbean Airways, Inc.) and ACoA to merge (Bender & Altschul 1982). ACoA was said to hold exclusive landing rights in Cuba (Bender & Altschul 1982) and swallowed Florida Airways (Daley, 1980). PAAI held the airmail contract granted by the US government but owned no planes and no landing rights in Cuba. ACoA retained control of the merged organizations and Trippe was elected president and managing editor of its subsidiary, PAA (Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul 1982).

In summary, the popular histories of PAA discussed each emphasize the early aviation activities of Trippe, as well as his role in the formation PAA. Though two histories (Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul 1982) mention the role of Hap Arnold as well as the German owned and operated airline (SCADTA) as influencing the startup of PAA, they largely emphasize the role played by Trippe. An example of how the historians emphasize Trippe's founding role in PAA is discussed next, by illustrating how each historian 'bounds' their tale of the startup. Thus, we suggest that what each author of the popular history of PAA marks as the 'beginning' of

their story is a socio-construction that prematurely serves to highlight Trippe as the founder of PAA.

Where does the author each history begin their story of the history of PAA

Simply put, the three histories of PAA begin their histories with an explicit focus on Trippe's personal past. Josephson (1943a) begins his history of PAA by describing Trippe in his youth and his early interest in the viability of flying. Daley (1980) begins the story of the history of PAA by describing Wake Island as crucially located in the middle of the Pacific Ocean whereby early PAA Clippers (planes) touched down during the first transpacific flights. Daley (1980) then shifts his focus to Trippe, describing him in his youth, followed by his early aviation ventures in Colonial Air Transport. Bender & Altschul (1982) focus perhaps the most intensely on the life of Trippe as they begin their history of PAA. Following a discussion of the post World War II aviation regulation which features Trippe, Trippe's family is discussed going back three generations. In the second chapter of their history, Bender & Altschul (1982) describe Trippe's life at Yale followed by an illustration of the prospects of aviation in the US after World War I. As previously noted, the overt focus on Trippe by each historian in the beginning of their histories of PAA is surprising, especially given that both Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul (1982) explicitly acknowledge Hap Arnold as the founder of PAA through establishing PAAI. Throughout each of the popular histories, Trippe as the founding actor of PAA is highlighted. The popular histories consistently describe his heroic and pioneering acts.

Alternative published accounts of the founding of PAA

Alternative published accounts that describe the founding of PAA largely mirror the story told in the three histories. In summary, their description of the founding of PAA focuses on Trippe and portrays him unquestioningly as its founder.

One example of alternative published accounts that tell of the founding of PAA is a 1936 Fortune magazine article. What is first described in this article is the unsuccessful request made by von Bauer in 1925 to operate SCADTA planes across the Panama Canal. In a section entitled, "Mr. Trippe emerges", Trippe is illustrated as a "rich pilot" who devoted "his full time to the new airline", hence PAA (Fortune, 1936). In Matthew Josephson's series of articles published in the Saturday Evening Post (Josephson, 1943b), a close parallel to that which is published in Empire of the Air is described (Josephson, 1943a). Other histories dedicated to the life and activities of Charles A. Lindbergh (an early PAA technical advisor) unquestioningly assume that "Pan American had been formed by Juan Trippe" (Berg, 1998; Ross, 1968: 171). In Charles A. Lindbergh's 1977 autobiography, Trippe is noted as realizing "the first step of his goal to operate an overseas line by purchasing two companies and forming them into Pan American Airways, Incorporated" (Lindbergh, 1977: 107).

The only known popular reference that counters the accepted version of Trippe as the founder of PAA, is a story published in a magazine called *Aeroplane* in October of 1967. This account serves to pluralize the story of the founding of PAA. Entitled "How it all began", the article explains the founding of PAA by suggesting "Nobody is quite sure when Pan Am originated. On March 14, 1927, a company was formed with the name Pan American Airways, founder John Montgomery having been inspired by previous unsuccessful efforts of pioneer Paul von Bauer to open a mail service southward from Florida to Central America" (*Aeroplane*, 1967). Because ANTi-history suggests that an effective manner of pluralizing history is through

contextualizing it, we now turn to a (re)assembly of the actor-networks who were involved in constructing the story of founding of PAA told in Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul's texts.

(Re)assembling the founding of PAA

Our discussion concerning the founding of PAA has focused thus far, on the way in which the startup of PAA is described in the popular realm, including published histories of PAA, magazine articles, and books that feature related stories (Biographies of Lindbergh) but mention the founding of PAA. The previous sections illustrate the plurality of accounts of the founding of PAA. In this section, we continue to (re)assemble the story of the founding of PAA by following the socio-politics of actor-networks from the PAA archive, focusing on the years of 1969-1982. It should be stressed that these actors were directly involved in crafting what came to be known as Robert Daley's (1980) history of PAA, as well as indirectly involved in influencing Bender & Altschul's (1982) history. This is because the actor-networks followed in this section were active in the construction of many historical traces (manuscripts, imposing meaning on PAA documentation, etc.) used by Daley (1980) and made public after the publication his history. Bender & Altschul (1982) eventually drew upon the recently made public materials to construct their history. We now turn to a (re)assembly of the socio-politics of the actor-networks by following the actors around.

Following the actors and the lack of historical traces

We begin our (re)assembly of the founding of PAA by following what appeared as the earliest archival trace (Langewiesche, 1969b) of the story pertaining to the founding of PAA. What is curious of the archival trace is its relatively late date (1969) and its subject. The relatively late date (1969) is interesting given that popular histories of PAA consistently describe the startup of PAA in 1927. This illustrates that there is a lack of traces in the archive concerning the period of 1927 to 1969, pertaining to the startup of PAA. Interestingly, the subject of the historical trace is a letter from Langewiesche to Lindbergh, in which Langewiesche expresses his difficulties in locating materials pertaining to the earliest part of the company's history (Langewiesche, 1969b).

In 1969, Langewiesche (1969c) continually expressed his frustrations to Lindbergh, concerning writing the story of the founding of PAA. He stressed that for "the earliest years and Mr. Trippe's pre PanAm career – no sources exist. For others, Mr. Trippe was the only one who knew, or who acted, or who was present... There are some points in which independent sources contradicted Mr. Trippe's view" (Langewiesche, 1969c). Langewiesche (1969c) described to Lindbergh that his reliance on alternative sources, such as PAA's founders were also futile. In one instance, a PAA founder shared with Langewiesche that "Of course the true story can not be printed". Concerning the events of 1927, Trippe suggested that the story would "blow PanAm right out to the water" (Langewiesche, 1969c). Langewiesche (1969c) concluded in his letter to Lindbergh, by suggesting that there may be "dynamite around which even now I don't know about" and expressed his concern that a 'documented' history of PAA was impossible.

Though the dearth of historical traces in the PAA archive concerning the story of the founding of PAA was striking, in 1970, mention was made of a set of extant manuscripts "which reflects Mr. Trippe's personal account of some of the most critical points in the company's history, particularly in the pre-Pan Am and early Pan Am years" (John Leslie, 1970e). John Leslie who eventually took on the history project of PAA after the counter-enrollment of Langewiesche (John Leslie, 1970b), noted to Najeeb Halaby (PAA senior manager) that these

manuscripts concerned that which “Mr. Trippe and Mr. Leslie could never reach agreement” (John Leslie, 1970e). The whereabouts of these manuscripts is unknown.

Following the actors around

Leslie’s enrollment onto the PAA history project prompted us to follow him (as well as other relevant actors) around, in and out of the archive. In the years after his enrollment (1970) onto the cause of writing PAA’s history, Leslie engaged in numerous socio-politics (Durepos et al., 2008) to (re)assemble the history of PAA. Leslie wrote to many PAA actors asking for documentation from early years (1926-1931) of PAA (John Leslie, 1971s). He collaborated with actors such as Wesley Newton (John Leslie, 1971g) and Ione Wright (John Leslie, 1971a). In a letter from Ione Wright (history professor at the University of Miami and enrolled by Leslie onto the PAA history project) to Leslie in 1971, Wright spoke on behalf of one of her colleagues (Wesley Newton) and expressed gratitude for the earlier help from Lindbergh in clarifying “that part of Pan Am’s early history in which he [Lindbergh] played such an important role” (Wright, 1971b). Thus, it can be assumed that Newton (history professor at Auburn University with an interest in Latin American early aviation, of which the history of PAA is related), relied on insight from Lindbergh for his research (W. P. Newton, 1978).

Based on Lindbergh’s (1970) wartime journals published one year earlier, the extent of Lindbergh’s personal and intimate recollections of the startup of PAA is questionable. In an entry dated June 12th 1939, Lindbergh wrote of a conversation that he had shared with Hap Arnold and Spaatz where they told him “of some early Pan American Airways history with which I [Lindbergh] had not been previously acquainted” (Lindbergh, 1970: 212). Lindbergh described Arnold as alarmed after reading army intelligence reports of von Bauer plans to extend his German owned SCADTA airline to the Panama Canal and onwards into the US. Lindbergh (1970) writes that Arnold and Spaatz then organized PAAI based on advice from the postmaster General New to counter von Bauer’s efforts. Thus, it can be assumed that Lindbergh’s insights concerning the founding of PAA were entirely based on Arnold’s account.

Newton is enrolled: initiating the (re)assembly of the founding of PAA

In 1971, the correspondence between Leslie and Newton was frequent due to the actors’ mutual interest in the startup of PAA (John Leslie, 1971g). Upon reading manuscripts gathered for him by Ione Wright, Leslie probed Newton to clarify the meaning of a sentence taken from his dissertation (Wesley Newton, no date) which stated “United States Army Air Service effort failed, however, to promote an airline as the wedge for American aerial dominance around the Canal” (John Leslie, 1971g). In his letter to Newton, Leslie illustrated his awareness of the “reputed fact that “Hap” Arnold, Ira Eaker, Jack Jouett and Captain J. K. Montgomery were prompted by von Bauer efforts to study the formation of a U. S. –flag airline”, but specified that he had “never found it [this version of the startup of PAA] documented” (John Leslie, 1971g). With the intent to clarify this version of the founding of PAA, Leslie conversed with Trippe who “did not seem to be aware of the Arnold part of the story and could not shed any more light on it” (John Leslie, 1971k).

Newton eventually answered Leslie in 1971 with two letters that spoke of some disagreements concerning the founding of PAA which he came across while conducting research at the Diplomatic Branch of the National Archives. Interestingly, Newton’s (1971b) letter to Leslie was based mostly on quotes from Arnold’s (1949) *Global Mission* as well as materials from the National Archives. Newton wrote that in the mid 1920’s, many European

aviation operations in Latin America were perceived as a menace to the Panama Canal, SCADTA included. In 1925 and 1926, von Bauer made several trips to the US to negotiate an airmail contract where he was interviewed by Arnold who perceived SCADTA as a threat. Arnold felt von Bauer's efforts to fly into the US should be blocked. Newton (1971b; 1971c) goes on in his letters to quote Arnold (1949) in support of the story that Arnold came up with a plan to counter that of von Bauer's, by organizing an aviation operation called PAAI to bid for an upcoming US airmail contract for service between Key West and Havana. PAAI was chartered in March of 1927; it was organized by military men Hap Arnold, Jack Jouett and Montgomery and financed by R. B. Bevier, Montgomery, and Grant Mason. PAAI secured the airmail contract in July of 1927. In the summer of 1927, Arnold, Spaatz and Montgomery contemplated leaving the military to dedicate their full attention to PAAI. But in July of 1927, PAAI was forced to make "concessions to the rival airlines", in terms merging their operations if they wished to keep the Key-West to Havana airmail contract (Newton, 1971c). Newton (1971c) suggests that Florida Airways, and Juan Trippe's group consisted of the rival airlines. Newton (1971c) goes on to write that that Arnold, Spaatz as well as Jouett got embroiled in the 'Billy Mitchell affair and because they could not leave the military respectfully, pulled out of PAAI. Newton (1967) had written an article in 1967 explaining General Will ("Billy") Mitchell's court-martial in 1925 due to, among other things, his accusations of criminal negligence waged against the US War Department. Mitchell had warned the US War Department of the threat posed by foreign airlines situated in Latin America operating close to the Panama Canal, of which he apparently referred specifically to SCADTA.

Now aware of the relevant pages in Arnold's (1949) *Global Mission*, Leslie (John Leslie, 1971h) showed the pages to Trippe who confirmed "that they coincide with his [Trippe's] general recollection". But Leslie expressed that he was still unsatisfied with his "knowledge concerning the "three Groups" which were brought together to form the Aviation Corp. of the Americas" (Leslie, 1971h) and, due to this Leslie's socio-politics ensued. Throughout the 1970's until 1976, Leslie continued to play a vital role in developing a founder funded history of PAA.

Hap Arnold establishes PAA as a reaction to SCADTA

In Hap Arnold's personal papers located in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, it is stated that Arnold "Obtained air mail charter from the postmaster general and organized Pan American Airways [Incorporated] with Carl Spaatz, Jack Jouett, and John Montgomery" (Library of Congress, 1999). The papers coincide with Arnold's (1949) *Global Mission* as well as Newton's interpretation with the story of the founding of PAA. Interestingly, Arnold (1949: 115) acknowledges the existence of alternative popular stories concerning the founding of PAA: "It is not generally realized that that great international air line, Pan American Airways, was not started by any rich and powerful business combine but actually was founded by three young army officers and one ex-Navy officer without a dime between them. In a sense, the formation of Pan American Airways turned out to be the first countermeasure the United States ever took against Nazi Germany". Hap Arnold goes on to stress that PAAI was established because the Postmaster General New would have otherwise been forced to award the Key-West-Havana airmail contract to von Bauer and SCADTA. Arnold (1949: 201) stresses that when "Von Bauer arrived in Washington, he could not get the air-mail contract, and (after our paper Pan American Airways had forestalled him), gave the idea". Arnold's (1949: 201) mention of "our paper Pan American Airways" refers to his own and his Military colleagues initiative to set up PAAI to counter von Bauer's efforts.

van Dusen is enrolled: continuing the (re)assembly of the founding of PAA

In the late summer of 1971, Leslie hired PAA's retired publicity officer, William van Dusen to conduct research on Captain John K. Montgomery (John Leslie, 1971j). Montgomery's name had provoked Leslie's curiosity due to its frequent mention in Leslie and Newton's correspondence. van Dusen assured Leslie that the "details on his [Montgomery] personal life background are sketchy at best" but that he remembered an early trip made by Montgomery's to New York to promote "a Pan American Airways" (van Dusen, 1971b). Nonetheless, in the summer of 1972 van Dusen produced a document explaining Montgomery's role in the founding of PAAI (van Dusen, 1972c). van Dusen (1972c) largely reiterated the story told in Arnold's (1949) *Global Mission*. He stressed that "Captain John K. "Johnny" Montgomery was a principal in the cast of the original Pan American, Inc... Montgomery arrived just in time... "The Germans" (SCADTA) were offering to fly U.S. mail the Canal Zone and South America" (van Dusen, 1972c)

In the same summer, Leslie (1972l) wrote to the senior VP of Government Affairs (Hittle, 1972a) to gather more insight about Montgomery but stressed that he did not wish for his inquiry to "attract undue attention or revival of old skeletons". Leslie eventually received a letter from James D. Hittle at Government affairs suggesting that "information has been hard to come by" (Hittle, 1972b) but that his assistant had gathered some records. Though Montgomery was suggested as "having been in Pan American Airways 1927-1928" (Cresswell, 1972), other searches at the National Personnel Records Center were "unable to find any record at Captain Montgomery, wether [sic] in Official Army Registers, in the publication, U.S. Naval Aviation, 1910-1970, or in the index to our Air Force Library Collection" (Ryan, 1972). For reasons unknown, Leslie (1972m) eventually terminated his search for details concerning Montgomery's role in the founding of PAAI.

The socio-politics of Newton and Leslie

One reason explaining Newton's extensive correspondence with Leslie's throughout 1971-1972 was the insight it offered to Newton, who was engaged in writing a manuscript on aviation in Latin America (Newton, 1978). In the summer of 1972, Newton (1972c) sent six copied pages of the manuscript to Leslie for verification. Research for the manuscript relied on many sources, including but not limited to, correspondence with Leslie, Josephson's (1943a) history, and the H.H. Arnold papers in the Library of Congress. The founding of PAA described by Newton in the draft pages is similar to the story of PAA's founding mentioned in the previous correspondence of these actors. Nonetheless, Leslie was asked by Newton (1972c) to verify the accuracy of a specific detail concerning the founding of PAA whereby Trippe "played a trump" and "secured from the Machado government exclusive landing rights in Cuba". Newton (1972c) revealed that he had been "unable to locate in primary sources available to me confirmation or denial of the statement". As a response to Newton, Leslie (1972f) expressed that the specific question raised by Newton "continues to trouble me also". Leslie (1972f) continued by saying that he had not "been able to find any primary evidence that Mr. Trippe obtained exclusive landing rights in Cuba from General Machado". Newton (1972b) replied to Leslie in stating that his explanation that Trippe retained exclusive landing rights in Cuba, prior to the ACoA acquisition of PAA and Florida Airways, was based on Matthew Josephson's (1943a) *Empire of the Air*. Expressing his desire to clarify the story, and unable to do so by consulting Josephson's (1943a) unreferenced book, Newton (1972b) asked Leslie "to show Josephson's statement to Mr.

Trippe and ask him what exactly did occur". Newton (1 2b) suggested that "Mr. Trippe, of course, would be the best of all possible sources in this matter". It is unknown whether Leslie ever verified the events by consulting Trippe but Trippe's extreme dislike of Josephson's (1943a) *Empire of the Air* has since been noted (Bender & Altschul, 1982).

The socio-politics of van Dusen and Leslie

Persistently seeking to clarify the founding of PAA, Leslie continued his correspondence with van Dusen, Newton as well as other actors through 1972. In the latter part of 1972, van Dusen provided Leslie with insight concerning the nature of the start up of PAA as well as some reasons why there is little documentation in the corporate records at PAA pertaining to this period. Van Dusen suggested (John Leslie, 1972k) that "records weren't very important in those days" and stressed that in the early days at PAA, the [redacted] for documenting processes, and minutes of meetings were largely overshadowed by the [redacted] activities of the founders (van Dusen, 1972a). Van Dusen (1972a) explained that "there were times [redacted] we had hardly gotten the minutes of the last month's meeting composed to meet the needs of the upcoming session. Sometimes we had to invent: our cause depended more up [redacted] sympathetic understanding than it did on truth in the absolute".

In an interview with van Dusen by Leslie (1972k), the [redacted] of PAA was explained though it is unsure which sources van Dusen relied upo [redacted] to do so. According to van Dusen (Leslie, 1972k), Pan American Airways Incorporated (Hoyt, Arnold, Montgomery, Mason and Bevier) procured the Key-West to Havana airmail contract but had no financing, [redacted] did they own planes. Thus, the PAAI group began negotiating with the Trippe and Whitney group (ACoA) which had funding but no US airmail contract. Because Florida Airways (Chambers) also had capital and was interested in the Cuba contract, they were brought into the negotiations. Hoyt, of the original Pan American Airways Incorporated offered to split the airmail contract "three ways", a suggestion that would require each group to invest \$300,000. In the interview (Leslie, 1972k), van Dusen goes on to note that Trippe then showed the two groups his exclusive Cuban landing rights, granted to him by the [redacted] o government in 1925. When Leslie told van Dusen that he had no "record of any landing rights of traffic rights that he [Trippe] got in 1925", van Dusen answered that he thought he could "dig out that story". But van Dusen (Leslie, 1972k) continued in saying that he [redacted] done "a lot of digging at the time in order to get the facts straight in case something happened. The story you [Leslie] tell is the one that got told – I [van Dusen] didn't tell it originally – but it sounded so good that we stuck with it. But it couldn't be farther from the facts". To confirm that Trippe's procurement of exclusive landing rights in Cuba from the Machado government was a fabricated story, Leslie (1972k) said to van Dusen: "There wasn't any such thing?" to which [redacted] Dusen replied: "no" but offered to "go and dig" for what really happened. Van Dusen finished the interview (Leslie, 1972k) with Leslie by offering some insight explaining Trippe's signature as president on the Annual Reports of the company from 1929, 1930 and 1931. van Dusen stated that there "was not Pan American Airways System and Juan was not president of anything! ...Apparently, the board and the chairman were apparently (sic) willing to have him publish the annual reports this way" (Leslie, 1972k).

Van Dusen eventually followed up in an effort to clarify the story concerning Trippe's acquisition of exclusive landing rights in Cuba in 1925. Calling the popular version a "early anecdote", van Dusen suggested that the story had "served a useful purpose at the time, didn't really hurt anybody, and we never bothered to set the record straight" (van Dusen, 1972b). van

Dusen (1972b) went on to offer a more complex story in which he suggested that what Trippe's group had arranged for in Cuba was the permission (though not exclusive) to use the Havana military airport, waivers of taxes, and, customs and immigration services (John Leslie, 1972b).

More socio-politics from Newton and Leslie

In mid December of 1972, Leslie (1972b) relayed van Dusen's insights to Newton. Newton and Leslie's correspondence persisted throughout 1973, in which Newton (1973) sent a second set of drafts of his *Perilous Sky* manuscript for Leslie's verification. Relying largely on the story of the startup of PAA conveyed to him through his correspondence with Leslie, the story told in Newton's manuscripts was consistent with that of Leslie and van Dusen. Thus, Newton's story of the startup of PAA which was eventually published in 1978 in *The Perilous Sky*, relied on correspondence with Leslie (1973a, 1973b), materials from the H. Arnold papers, and Matthew Josephson's (1943a) "unauthorized" (Bender & Altschul, 1982: 526) history of PAA.

In *The Perilous Sky*, Newton offers a nuanced explanation of PAA's startup by contextualizing the role of foreign aviation groups operating in Latin America and the resulting fear caused in the US Military. The issue was always that foreigners would be allowed to operate over the Canal Zone. Newton (1978) stresses SCADTA as one of many aviation operations in Latin America. In summary, Newton's (1978) *The Perilous Sky* offers a more detailed (though it is consistent with Daley 1980, which relied on Leslie's socio-politics) explanation of the founding of PAA, and describes the threat posed by von Bauer and Arnold's efforts to stop him by forming an airline which he called Pan American Airways [incorporated]. Newton (1978) discusses that the US postmaster's awarding of the Key-West to Havana airmail contract to PAAI but that this group was forced to merge operations with other interested groups, including the financially sound ACoA (Trippe's group) as Florida Airways. Also mentioned in Newton's (1978) account is the story concerning Trippe's acquisition of exclusive Cuban Landing rights in 1925. Newton (1978) suggests that Trippe used his possession of the exclusive landing rights for ACoA to retain control of the merged operations and secure his role as managing director of its subsidiary, PAA.

Leslie attempts to craft a history of PAA

In 1975, one year before Daley was enrolled to write the history of PAA, Leslie produced a lengthy manuscript of the history of PAA. Leslie's history (1975c) began with a section focused on Latin America but the draft manuscript proved to be difficult to follow due to missing pages and confusing storytelling. Nonetheless, Leslie (1975c: 2) tried to tell a story of how "the civil aviation pioneers, banded together under the Pan American house flag, who dreamed of conquering a sea which would unite mankind rather than divide it as the waters for so long had done – a sea of air." Leslie (1975c) emphasizes the roles played by Juan Trippe of ACoA and what he calls 'Hoyt's group', thus the original Pan American Airways Incorporated, of which no mention is made of Hap Arnold. He describes the story of the merger of ACoA, Pan American Airways Incorporated and Florida Airways consistently with Newton's account but does not mention the role of SCADTA, von Bauer and the threat posed on the Panama Canal by the foreign airlines stationed in Latin America. Though Leslie's (1975c) manuscript was not published, it was used by Robert Daley when he took over the history project in 1976.

The 'bounding' and 'punctuation' of popular histories of PAA

In summary, Robert Daley took over the history project from John Leslie in 1976 (Daley, 1976) and eventually published a founder-funded history of PAA in 1980 (Daley, 1980). As has been noted, Bender & Altschul (1982) relied on the same research used to craft Daley's history, after it was made public following Daley's 1980 publication. Perhaps it is of no surprise that the two histories are largely similar in terms of the story told concerning the founding of PAA. Nonetheless, following the socio-politics of the actors directly involved in the construction of Daley's (1980) history, as well as indirectly involved in the craft of Bender & Altschul's (1982) history has allowed us to (re)assemble the constitution of the two histories. Also, it has allowed us to contextualize the conditions of creation of the histories. It has shed light on the process by which the three histories punctuated, thus, the process in which the actors' involved in the craft of each history were able to align their interests through numerous socio-politics, and form a network that was able to act as 'one'. The punctuation of history usually leads to the concealment of the many socio-politics that gave rise to that history. (Re)assembling the socio-politics of the popular histories of focus has allowed us to illustrate their socio-political conditions of creation, and has allowed us to illustrate them as socio-constructions.

Though the details revealed concerning the founding of PAA in Josephson's (1943a) history of PAA are somewhat at odds with Daley's (1980) and Bender & Altschul's (1982) histories, the three histories are 'bounded' similarly. In each history Trippe's personal past is of focus, each author constructs and marks it as the beginning of the airline's history. Following the actors around has illustrated the 'bounding' of each history as the historians active, interest driven construction. What this means is that the historian actively decided where to impose a beginning onto a story (begin with Trippe's past) based on the nature of the tale which they had sought out to tell (Trippe is the founder).

Discussion of ANTi-History themes highlighted through the exemplar of PAA

The empirical application of ANTi-history previously performed has drawn on certain facets of ANTi-history more prominently than others. In the next section, a segregated discussion of the most prominently used facets of ANTi-history is conducted to theorize the (re)assembly of the founding of PAA.

Disturbing the ontological priority of 'realist' history

The amodern ontological assumptions that inform ANTi-history have many implications for the way in which the approach can be used to craft histories. One notable implication for our purposes involves disturbing the ontological priority unquestioningly associated with history. It has been noted that in the modernist condition, realism as an ontological approach has been prominently used to craft history, and the consequence has been the assumption that the 'social world' exists in hard tangible form and independently of mental appreciation of it (Crotty, 2005; Jenkins, 1995). The related claim has been that it exists in a singular form, thus there is one social world. Thus, the task of the historian in modernist condition has been to accurately represent that social world, to create knowledge of the past (history) that accurately mirrors the socio-past. The most problematic consequence of modernist renditions of history has been the historian's tendency to conflate 'history' and 'past', and the two concepts have been assumed as one and the same. These assumptions lead the modernist historians to create one history, which is said to represent the socio-past. The creation of one account of the past and the unquestioned acceptance of that account as accurate leads the researcher to privilege one account of history.

ANTI-history seeks not only to deprivilege dominant accounts of history but also seeks to question the realist ontological assumptions which allow for certain accounts to be privileged as 'truth'. The approach of ANTI-history is based on an amodern ontology which is anti-realist. The researcher using ANTI-history assumes that the social world exists largely through one's mental appreciation of it and that history is socially constructed through the socio-politics of actor-networks. What this suggests is that the various actors involved in the craft of history may have various conceptions of the socio-past, each having apprehended their conception of it at various points in time and situated in varying contexts. As actors engage in the craft of history, as they negotiate history, each illustrates their version of the past. Following the socio-politics of the actor-networks engaged in Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul's (1982) history of PAA has illustrated the socio-constructed nature of these histories. It has illustrated the histories as constructed through the socio-politics of actors, as seen through the negotiations of John Leslie with Wesley Newton, and John Leslie with van Dusen, as well as others. Through these actors' negotiations of their knowledge of the past, they constructed historical traces which were later used by Daley (1980) as well as Bender & Altschul (1982) to construct history. In summary, illustrating actor-networks mentioned as active in negotiating their past into story of the past (history), questions the viability of the socio-past as existing independently of an actor-networks conception of the past.

A simultaneous addressing and problematization of the 'past' and 'history'

Ascribing to amodern ontological assumptions, ANTI-history refutes ontological realism as viable to use to craft history. This means that the researcher who uses ANTI-history understands that aspiring to create knowledge of the past which accurately mirror the past, is untenable. As with postmodern scholars (Jenkins, 2003), ANTI-history seeks to disassociate the past from history, in which the past is assumed as all that has occurred prior to our present condition and history refers to our knowledge of the past. This distinction highlights that since the past is gone, all we have is our knowledge of the past. Furthermore since our knowledge of the past is just that: knowledge of the past that is constructed according to the socio-politics of actor-networks, we can not assume it as standing in for 'the past'. As has been stressed, conflating 'knowledge of the past' and 'the past' denies the role of the historian who is actively involved and influences the construction of knowledge of the past. It denies that the historian interprets orders and (re)assembles traces of the past based on her situated conventions to give the reader an interpretation of the past.

The distinction between 'past' and 'history' is illustrated through the many socio-politics of the actor-networks engaged in crafting the history of PAA. No actor, including Trippe, Langewiesche, Lindbergh, Arnold, Leslie, Newton, van Dusen, Daley or Bender & Altschul could offer 'the past' because the past is already gone. What each offered were recollections of the past based on, in some instances historical traces and in other instances memory. Thus, each actor offered their knowledge of the past which was collectively assembled into history. For example, Lindbergh suggested that his knowledge of the early past of PAA was based on a conversation he had with Arnold, and Newton's knowledge of the early past of PAA was by Lindbergh and the Arnold papers. Leslie's knowledge of the early past of PAA was informed by Newton and van Dusen who each based their insights on Arnold. In a related vein, all of the stories told concerning 'Trippe's acquisition of exclusive Cuban landing rights' are based on Josephson's (1943a) history of PAA, which van Dusen suggested as a fabrication. The point to be stressed is that all of these stories concerning the early past of PAA represent our knowledge of the past, which

can never be assumed as standing in for the past, since the past is gone. The question thus becomes, is it viable to privilege one version of knowledge of the past, and if so, based on what criteria?

Folding as opposed to progressive explanation of history

Also a consequence of the ANTi-historian adopting an amodern ontological approach is an understanding of the changing nature of the socio-past through a process of folding. Understanding changes in the socio-past through a process of folding is best explained through comparison of progressive notions of history. Progressive notions of history assume that the socio-past goes through a series of transformations, each state better than the previous, towards an ultimate better end state. Progressive views of history see one state as arising out of the previous state but understand each successive social state as separate from one and other, as separate entities that can be depicted in a linear fashion. Progressive explanations of history are problematized by ANTi-history which views past social changes through a process of folding. Using ANTi-history, the constitution of the socio-past is understood as enveloping all of its prior conditions. Thus, the new envelops the old, the old gets folded into the new. For the researcher using ANTi-history, the period of time of interest and under question is understood as an effect of all previous periods, it is understood as enveloping all previous periods.

Through using ANTi-history and drawing on this theorization of changes in the socio-past, the representation of the ‘beginning’, or ‘founding’ or ‘startup’ of PAA as a *naturalized* and taken for granted aspect of this organization’s history is problematized. Each of the three popular histories (Josephson, 1943a; Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul, 1982) of PAA discussed told a story of the ‘founding’ or the ‘startup’ of PAA. Thus, in each of these popular histories is a marked beginning of PAA which in some senses denies the contextual preconditions that were in place and allowed for this specific ‘founding’ of PAA. Crafting history that acknowledges changes in the socio-past through a process of folding, denaturalizes ‘beginnings’ and ‘ends’ in history by suggesting that the ‘founding’ of PAA is one instance of the socio-past which envelops all of its pervious instances. Thus, creating knowledge of the past by understanding changes in the socio-past through a process of folding questions the demarcation of ‘beginnings’ and ‘ends’ and illustrates them as socially constructed.

Relational approach – no beginning and no last instances, process of becoming

Related to a view of socio-past changes through a process of folding, is the emphasis in ANTi-history to foster a relational understanding of the socio-past. Thus, instead of focusing on the constitution of a ‘state’ such as a ‘beginning’ or and ‘end’, ANTi-history looks relationally to understand how one given ‘state’ was altered and transformed into the next. Thus, the researcher using ANTi-history focuses their attention on what occurs in between ‘states’ to understand how one becomes the other. Adopting a relational lens allows the ANTi-historian to further problematize the ‘beginnings’ and ‘endings’ in history as demarcations that are imposed by the historian to order a tale. ANTi-history as an approach assumes that the actor-networks that constitute a socio-past are never sewn up, unchanging, or immutable and immobile.

ANTi-history views history as relational, with no beginnings or last instances, which is at odds with how the popular histories of PAA discussed are constructed. In each popular history of PAA, the historian was active in imposing a ‘beginning’ in at least two ways. First, the historian was active in the choice of where to begin their story of PAA, but made no mention to the reader that the choice was entirely his own or influenced by he traces upon which he relied. For example, the three popular histories of PAA each began with an xplicit focus on Trippe’s personal life. The

decision of the historians to focus on Trippe was an active and interest driven choice, made in an effort to bound the story of PAA in a way that would highlight his role as the founder. Second, the historian was active in deciding how to tell the story of the ‘founding’ of PAA. Thus, each historian of question (Josephson, Daley, Bender & Altschul) was active in ordering the story by marking and flavoring one instance of the socio-past of PAA its ‘startup’. Depending on which historian one relies upon, the ‘startup’ of PAA differs. For example, Josephson (1943a) describes the startup of PAA without mention of actors Hap Arnold or SCADTA, whereas Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul (1982) mention the influence of these actors.

As researchers using ANTi-history, we must stress that the ordering of the performativities of the actor-networks into a history does not represent an end state. We must stress that we assess this (re)assembly of the socio-past as precarious, uncertain and at the risk of being (re)figured or (re)assembled by a reader who reads-in the history in a manner influenced by their interests.

Knowledge of the past as socially constructed

It has been mentioned that inherent within an ANTi-history approach is the assumption that history is socially constructed knowledge of the past. This means that our knowledge of the past (and our understanding of the past that is construed upon that knowledge) is reliant upon the activities and interactions of social actors as they navigate their social terrain. Thus, ANTi-history assumes that knowledge of the past grows out of a social context and thus cannot be understood as divorced from that social context. The PAA exemplar discussed above illustrates this point well in that the knowledge of the past that was eventually used by both Daley (1980) as well as Bender & Altschul (1982) to craft their histories of PAA was negotiated and constructed out of the collective efforts of social actors including Langewiesche, Lindbergh, Trippe, Leslie, Wright, Newton and van Dusen. When involved in the craft of knowledge of the past pertaining to the ‘three groups that merged to form ACoA and created the subsidiary called _____ Leslie consulted van Dusen and Newton. Newton, prior to being consulted by Leslie had sought alternative references such as the Arnold papers at the National Archive. What is of importance in an effort to stress the point that knowledge of the past of PAA is socially constructed is that these actors were not only active in constructing knowledge but were active in infusing it with meaning. These actors were active in reading documentation from PAA, interpreting those historical traces as well as making sense of them in light of alternative historical traces. Thus, it must be highlighted that these actors constructed meaning out of the historical traces, and _____ so as informed through their situated contextual background.

Activistic nature of historical knowledge

Related to the ANTi-history assumption that history as socially constructed knowledge of the past is the ANTi-history assumption that knowledge of the past is activistic. Thus, knowledge of the past or history according to ANTi-history is not something actors ‘have’ (it is not embrained) but is something actors ‘do’. Thus, history is infused with activism it is activistic and can not be divorced from the activities that gave rise to it. History, according to ANTi-history is subject to the socio-politics of actor-networks. ‘Knowing the socio-past’ is what actor-networks do through interest work, translating the interests of other actors, through enrolling actors to accept one interpretation of the past over another. Actor-networks negotiate their past through endless politicking and if successful in network building may eventually delegate their task to a material actor such as a ‘history text’. Leslie’s engagement with actors including van Dusen and Newton as well as Wright illustrate the activism inherent in knowledge construction. For example, Leslie and

Newton corresponded to flesh out the ‘founding’ of PAA. At one point, Newton asked Leslie if he could clarify the situation concerning ‘Trippe’s acquisition of exclusive Cuban landing rights’ which prompted Leslie to then consult van Dusen. Thus, these actors were active in constructing knowledge of the past of PAA. Furthermore, the PAA exemplar illustrates at least one instance where the activities of the actors involved were successful in network building in that Daley materially delegated the task of telling the history of PAA to a material actor.

Communal, distributed and partial nature of historical knowledge

ANTI-history assumes historical knowledge as ‘communal’, ‘distributed’ and ‘partial’. Related to the point of understanding history through a relational lens, communal historical knowledge implies that the act of ‘knowing the past’ can not be understood as cognitive or embrained within one individual mind. Instead, it must be understood as dispersed, distributed and shared throughout a collective of situated actors. Thus, distinct ways of ‘knowing’ the past are each understood through the collective activities of communities. Drawing on ANT, the ANTi-historian calls the collectives which give rise to specific manners of knowing the past ‘actor-networks’. The various actors engaged in ‘knowing their past’ and involved in network building from the PAA exemplar include Langewiesche, Lindbergh, Newton and Leslie to name a few. Each of these actors were engaged with another actor or each other to negotiate and construct the past of PAA. But it must be stressed that each of the listed actors’ knowledge of PAA was partial in that each ‘knew’ a part of the story of PAA but none knew the story in its ‘entirety’. For example, to (re)assemble the story of Trippe’s acquisition of exclusive landing rights’, Newton drew on Leslie who consulted van Dusen. Though each had heard of the story, van Dusen illustrated that he knew more of the details of this story than the other actors. Thus, part of the tale was known to each actor (each actor had partial knowledge) and knowledge of each tale was distributed across each actor.

Knowledge of the past as situated and positioned

ANTI-history stresses that all knowledge of the past is ‘situated’ and ‘positioned’. ‘Situated’ knowledge means that knowledge is influenced by its temporality (particular to a time) and spatiality (particular to a place or physical location). Thus, the ANTi-historian assumes that all ‘knowledge of the past’ is an effect of the socio-politics of actor-networks and the manner that the past comes to be known by an actor-network is influenced by the specific circumstances of its time and place. An example of this is given by contrasting Josephson’s (1943a) history of PAA with that of Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul (1982). As has noted, Josephson’s (1943a) description of the initial start up of PAA is at odds that of Daley (1980) and Bender & Altschul’s (1982) in that he does not mention the role of Hap Arnold and the threat of SCADTA to the Panama Canal. The two histories (viz. Daley, 1980 and Bender & Altschul, 1982) that stress Arnold and SCADTA’s role in influencing the start up of PAA were each dependent on Arnold’s 1949 *Global Mission* as well as his public papers at the National Archive, where Arnold’s role in PAA was rendered explicit. Though it is not known when Arnold’s papers were made public, it can be inferred that perhaps Josephson (1943a) made no mention of Arnold in his recollection of the founding of PAA due to the fact that Arnold’s 1949 *Global Mission* was not yet published. This is to illustrate that history, or knowledge of the past, is situated in that it is directly affected by the resources and alternative knowledge of a given time and place.

‘Positioned’ knowledge refers to the influence of historical, cultural and political factors influencing what comes to count as valued knowledge. the ANTi-historian assumes that

ways of knowing the past, which are effects of actor-networks, are influenced by historical, cultural and political factors. One example that illustrates all knowledge of the past as positioned can be illustrated through reference to Josephson's known 'leftist' leanings. Josephson's leftist leanings were publically known (Chomsky, 1997; Belfrage, 1973; Lyons, 1941, Zinn, 1990; 1997; 1999; Wald, 1994; Wechler, 1954), and it is suggested that his positioning influenced the manner in which he came to know the past of PAA as well as relay it in his text. Examples of Josephson's (1943a) choice of words that have suggestive connotations include his title *Empire of the Air*, in which 'empire' is used. Josephson (1943a: back jacket, my emphasis) describes Trippe as one of the twentieth century counterpart of the Vanderbilts, Hills and Harimans who built up – and *exploited* – the continental domain of the United States". The titles of Josephson's chapters six and eleven use the words "imperialist" and "barons" respectively, to Trippe's aviation activities. These words were specifically selected by Josephson (1943a) their connotations evoke a particular image of Trippe and PAA that are somewhat critical of ism and thus, Trippe's activities as an entrepreneur. Thus, it can be concluded that Josephson's (1943a) positioning influenced the flavoring of his history.

Symmetry – all accounts are given the same curiosity

As using ANTi-history means treating all accounts of a given socio-past with the same curiosity, thus all known historical traces pertaining to the 'founding' of PAA were followed and studied with the same curiosity. Historical traces followed and considered for use to (re)assemble the founding of PAA included popular published histories of PAA, archival materials, PAA house organs such as the Clipper, unpublished PAA manuscripts and the list continues. As we followed all of these actors, we observed each with the same initial curiosity, we considered the relevance of each trace equally prior to choosing which trace to include into my (re)assembly and which trace to continue following. This means that all 'manners of knowing' the founding of the PAA, as embedded within the various historical traces that we followed were endowed with equal initial curiosity.

Towards a historiographical approach that legitimates plural construction of history

ANTi-history as an approach to the study of the past legitimates the plural construction of history. A plural approach to history is legitimated ANTi-history in that inherent in the method is an instance on disassociating notions of the past from history and the emphasis on following the historical traces or the actors around. Dissociating the past from history means understanding the past as all that happened before our present condition and acknowledging the impossibility of bringing it back to the present. History, on the other hand, is our knowledge of the past, our interpretation of the past that, as has been mentioned is socially constructed, communal, situated and positioned. Thus, we can assume that there are many different 'histories' based on the nature of the actor-networks involved in constructing history. As researchers engaged in ANTi-history, our task is one of (re)assembling the past by following the socio-politics of actor-networks. But as researchers we follow all of the traces symmetrically and thus, understand that there is a possibility that the traces or the actors we follow will lead to invariably alternative accounts of what happened in the past.

Shifting our focus to the PAA exemplar, the correspondence between van Dusen, Leslie and Newton illustrates the way in which history is invariably plural when the traces of actor-networks are followed. By following the traces, which in this were personal letters of correspondence between Leslie and Newton in 1972, a point of contestation concerning 'Trippe's exclusive Cuban

Landing rights' was voiced by Newton, who, other than he mention in Josephson (1943a), could not find the story supported by alternative documentation. Consulting Leslie only supported Newton's concern of the lack of documentation. By following the actors around, and analyzing traces symmetrically (looking at all the traces with the same researcher curiosity), an alternative version of this story emerged through correspondence with van Dusen. Specifically, van Dusen suggested the story of 'Trippe's exclusive Cuban Landing rights' as fabricated and reinforced that little written documentation of the story actually exists. By following the actors around, whilst acknowledging the necessary disconnect between notions of the 'past' and 'history', we can understand history as knowledge of the past which is plural. History is necessarily plural knowledge of the past because it is constructed as an of the socio-politics of actor-networks that have developed different ways of knowing the past and making sense of their past. Thus, Leslie and Newton had negotiated one way in which they understood the story concerning 'Trippe's exclusive Cuban Landing rights' but through consulting van Dusen (and by me following van Dusen's traces) an alternative story was voiced. It is the task of the researcher using ANTi-history to follow the actors symmetrically while giving those a voice. In this way, ANTi-history constructs plural histories.

Apriori - do not begin by assuming what you wish to explain / imposing the plot

ANTi-history as an approach to the study of the socio-past problematizes the apriori. What this means is that the researcher using ANTi-history is cautioned to not let her preconceptions of the past impose itself on the ordering of past traces for she is engaged. Related to this, the researcher using ANTi-history does not impose a pre-given plot to order the traces of the past nor does she begin her historical analysis by assuming as given that history will eventually show. Instead, the researcher engaged in ANTi-history follows the actor-networks as they engaged in socio-politics and lends her voice to the actors so that the actors' motives can be heard over that of her own. The consequence for doing history by not assuming as given what we wish for our historical analysis to show is that we do not assume the socio-past as having a particular ordering which we then engage in describing, instead we follow the actors and let them illustrate the associations of actors that act to hold the socio-past together. We follow the actors and let them illustrate the constitution of the socio-past.

This facet of ANTi-history is perhaps best explained through a focus on the discussion of the three popular histories of PAA. It is suggested that the three popular histories of PAA are guilty of not problematizing the apriori, in that they each construct a history of PAA by assuming as given what they wish for their historical analysis to show. Each of the three popular histories of PAA begin with a focus on the describing the personal life Trippe, they focus on his fascination with the viability of flying as a child (Josephson, 1943a; Bender & Altschul, 1982) and his experiences during his postsecondary education (Daley, 1980). The point is that personal life of Juan Trippe is emphasized and discussed prior to an illustration or a (re)assembly of past traces to show him as the founder. The three popular histories of PAA begin their stories the past of PAA by assuming as given (Trippe is the founder) what it is for their historical analysis to show (that Trippe was a key pioneer in the development of PAA). These histories in some senses confuse the story (how Trippe played a founding role) with the answer (Trippe is a key PAA pioneer).

One of the many consequences of begin a historical analysis by assuming as given what you wish for that historical analysis to show is the craft of a type of history that is extremely 'certaintist'. Certaintist histories are problematic that they present a story to a reader that is 'determined' and 'pre-resolved', which can give a history an air of naturalness. For example, the

three popular histories of PAA are certainist in that by marking the beginning of the history of PAA with an explicit focus on Trippe's personal past, the importance of Trippe as a PAA actor is stressed from the beginning. Thus, the reader is not surprised when Trippe is suggested as the founder of PAA, nor is the reader astonished by the mention of Hap Arnold's role in the founding of PAA in at least two histories (Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul, 1982). Though two popular histories describe Arnold as founding PAA, the author's focus on Trippe emphasizes his importance and deprivilege Arnold's role in PAA. It is suggested that the three popular histories of PAA impose a pre-ordered plot on the past traces of PAA to order it into history. Thus, if history is knowledge of the past that focuses on the constitution of the social past, we can not begin our histories by assuming the constitution of that socio-past as given.

The exclusive focus on Trippe's past personal life which is discussed in the beginning of the three popular histories points to the active hand of the interest driven historian in 'bounding' a tale. Thus, the interest driven historian, who sought to illustrate Trippe as the founder of PAA was active in 'bounding' his story, marking a 'beginning' and 'end' in a way that would support his claim of Trippe as the founder of PAA.

(Re)assembling / tracing the associations of the social past / emphasis on Performativity

Related to the above points concerning 'the problematization of the apriori' and 'not beginning an historical analysis by assuming as given what we wish for our historical analysis to explain' is the emphasis on constructing history through (re)assembling past traces. An implication for doing history using ANTi-history is an emphasis on performativity, this means doing history by (re)assembling the socio-past through tracing the associations of actor-networks. This is based on the assumption that the 'past' is already gone and since nothing ever repeats itself exactly, doing history means (re)assembling the constitution of the socio-past.

Instead of 'imposing a plot' on history, thus, instead of approaching a series of historical traces with a pre-given conception concerning how those traces should be ordered into history, ANTi-history suggests following the actors around and letting them guide the way. This is what was done in the above exemplar of PAA. Any actor from the archive that mentioned the founding of PAA was followed. The traces of these actors, their correspondence, books they referred to, their meaning making of the traces mentioned were followed and mapped. In essence, the socio-politics of these actors were mapped to see how the actor-networks 'performed' their past, in terms of how they made sense of it, how they spoke of it (through interviews) and how they wrote of it in their attempts to write histories (Newton, 1978; Leslie, 1977). As a specific example, we followed Newton and Leslie's 1971-1972 correspondences to see how they negotiated the early history of PAA. When the correspondence between the two actors broke off, we followed the actors through consulting their respective books. First, Newton's 1978 *The Perilous Sky* was read and the story it told concerning the start up of PAA was compared to that developed through Leslie and Newton's correspondence. Furthermore, Leslie's unpublished manuscript of the history of PAA was consulted, to also understand how this actor was shaped through correspondence with Newton. Thus, using ANTi-history means doing history through (re)assembling the socio-past traces by following the actor-networks around.

Situatedness of historian (spatial, temporal & ideological)

It is specified in ANTi-history that any researcher using this approach acknowledge their spatial, temporal and ideological situatedness. ANTi-history assumes that all researchers are positioned historically, culturally and ideologically, and that the historian is shaped by her

positioning. Furthermore, it is assumed through ANTi-history that the positioning of the historian necessarily influences and flavors the telling of the story. An example of the situatedness of the historian influencing the story told has been mentioned through a discussion of Josephson's (1943a) history of PAA in which his knowledge of the past was suggested as positioned. It is stressed that Josephson, as an historian is also positioned, historically, culturally and ideologically. Matthew Josephson was born on 1899 in the US and dedicated his efforts to writing on subjects including twentieth-century American economic history. Though not mentioned explicitly in his writings, Josephson's leftist ideological leanings have been commented on overtly. We can assume that Josephson, as an author was influenced by the time in which he wrote and that this influence flavored the specific way in which he wrote. Thus using ANTi-history, it is stressed that the historian and her craft can not be understood as distinct or decoupled from her lived time, place and ideology.

Historian as an effect of an actor-network

An implication of the researcher who using ANTi-history is engaged in (re)assembling the socio-past is that the historian be understood as an actor-network. Thus, the researcher using ANTi-history engages in political work on behalf of the cause of writing history, in that she seeks to build a network that will make that cause stronger. She engages in interest work, she follows the necessary actors around and seeks to align their interests to enable all the actors in her network to act as one. An example of this can be seen in Leslie's endless socio-political work. Leslie conducted interest work to capture the interest of actors such as Newton and van Dusen. Precariously aligning these interests, Leslie sought to build a network that could act as one. If we focus on Leslie as an actor, we can see him as an actor-network in that he stands as an effect of, on behalf of the series of past experiences, his trials and tribulations as a long time Vice President of PAA and dedicated actor to the PAA history project. Leslie is, himself an actor-network in that his specific constitution as an actor was shaped by the series of associations with other actors, as an effect of how he shaped alternative actors through associating with them and conversely was himself shaped through this associations with alternative actors.

The researcher engaged in an ANTi-history writes reflexively

ANTi-history stresses the need for reflexivity in historical analyses. Reflexivity refers to the capacity for a researcher to reflect on the socio-politics inherent in knowledge production and in a given interpretation of knowledge. Reflexivity in history means that the researcher is aware of their situatedness and illustrates it transparently. Because ANTi-history assumes that 'history' is a punctuated actor which conceals the socio-politics of its enabling actor-networks, such as the historian and her political efforts in writing the history, this paper began by illustrating the socio-politics inherent in the three most prominently discussed histories of PAA. In an effort to ensure reflexivity in using ANTi-history to (re)assemble the start up of PAA, the socio-politics of writing Josephson's (1943a), Daley's (1980) and Bender & Altschul's (1982) histories of PAA were discussed. The manner in which these histories were created was illustrated. Furthermore, the conditions inherent in writing this paper were illustrated as well. The location in which the traces were followed was illustrated and the specific way in which our hands as researchers ordered the traces was explicit.

Conclusions

In this paper, ANTi-history was applied empirically to (re)assemble the startup of PAA. We began the paper by stressing ANTi-history as a multifaceted approach to the construction of history, followed by an overview of the facets of the approach most prominently used in this paper. The empirical application of ANTi-history that followed focused on an examination of the depiction of the ‘founding’ of PAA in the three popular histories of the organization (Josephson, 1943a; Daley, 1980; Bender & Altschul, 1982), an illustration of alternative popular published accounts of PAA followed by a (re)assembly of ‘founding’ of PAA by following the actors around in and out of the archive. The most prominently used facets of ANTi-history were then discussed.

Above all, this empirical use of ANTi-history to (re)assemble the startup of PAA was conducted to stress the need to pluralize history through using approaches such as ANTi-history in which the pluralization of history is inherent. Furthermore, the (re)assembly of the startup of PAA was mapped to denaturalize ‘beginnings’ and ‘ends’ in history, by illustrating the ‘bounding’ of history as a socio-construction that is an effect of interest driven actor-networks/historians.

References

- Aeroplane. (1967). Pan Am: a Study in Management. *Vol. 114, No. 2922*(Collection 341, series 1, folder 13, box x), October 18th, 1967.
- Arnold, H. H. (1949). *Global Mission*. New York: Harper Brothers Publishers.
- Belfrage, C. (1973). *The American Inquisition*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Bender, M., & Altschul, S. (1982). *The chosen instrument: Pan Am, Juan Trippe, the rise and fall of an entrepreneur*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Berg, S. A. (1998). *Lindbergh*. New York: Penguin Putmn Inc.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality, A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Booth, C., & Rowlinson, M. (2006). Management and organizational history: Prospects. *Management & Organizational History, 1*(1).
- Callon, M. (1986). Some Elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fisherman of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (Vol. Sociological Review Monograph 32). London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Callon, M., & Law, J. (1982). On Interests and their T Enrollment and Counter-Enrollement. *Social Studies of Science, 12*, 615-625.
- Chomsky, N. (Ed.). (1997). *The Cold War and the university; towards an intellectual history of the postwar years*. New York: The New Press.

Clark, P., & Rowlinson, M. (2004). The Treatment of History in Organization Studies: Toward an “Historic Turn”? *Business History* 46(3), pp.331-352.

Cresswell, M. A. (1972). Letter from Mary Ann Cresswell to Mrs. Ann Williams. (Box 33, folder 12, collection 341), August, 21st 1972.

Crotty, M. (2005). *The Foundations of Social Research*. London: Sage.

Daley, R. (1976). Letter from Robert Daley. (box, x, folder, x, collection 341, series 1), December 2nd, 1976.

Daley, R. (1980). *An American Saga: Juan Trippe and his Pan Am Empire*: Random House.

Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2008). Was There Ever a Plot? Towards an ANTi-History, *Academy of Management*. Anaheim, California.

Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2008). Tales in the Manufacture of Knowledge: Writing a Business History of Pan American Airways. *Management & Organizational History*, 3(1), 63-80.

Ermarth, E. D. (2007). The closed space of choice A Manifesto on the future of history. In K. Jenkins, S. Morgan & A. Munslow (Eds.), *Manifestos for History* (pp. 50-66). New York: Routledge.

Fortune. (1936). (Collection 341 Series number 1, Box 63, Folder 4), April 1936.

Green, A., & Troup, K. (Eds.). (1999). *The Houses of History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Green, G. (2004). *The End of the Affair*. London: Vintage Books.

Gunn, S. (2006). *History and Cultural Theory*. Harlow: Pearson, Longman.

Hittle, J. D. (1972a). Letter from Don to John Leslie on James D. Hittle letterhead. (Box 33, folder 12, collection 341, series 1), June 15th, 1972.

Hittle, J. D. (1972b). Letter from ‘Don’ (James D. Hittle, Govt. Affairs) to Leslie. (Box 33, folder 12, collection 341, series 1).

Jacques, R. S. (1996). *Manufacturing the Employee: Management Knowledge From 19th to 21st Centuries*. London: Sage.

Jacques, R. S. (2006). History, historiography and organization studies: The challenge and the potential. *Management & Organizational History*, , 1(1), 31-49.

Jenkins, K. (1991). *Re-Thinking History*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (1995). *On 'What is history?': From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, K. (2003). *Refiguring History*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, K., Morgan, S., & Munslow, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Manifestos for History*. New York: Routledge.

Josephson, M. (1943a). *Empire of the air: Juan Trippe and the struggle for world airways*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Josephson, M. (1943b). Columbus of The Air. *Saturday Evening Post*, August 14th, 1943 - September 1911th 1943

Kamenka, E. (Ed.). (1983). *The Portable Karl Marx*. New York: Penguin Books.

Kieser, A. (1994). Why Organization Theory Needs Historical Analyses - And how this Should be Performed. *Organization Science*, 5(4), 608-620.

Lamond, D. (2008). Editorial. *Journal of Management History*, 14(4), 309-312.

Langewiesche, W. (1969a). Letter from Langewiesche to _____ as an attachment to a Letter from D.W.T to H. E. Gray; February 26th, 1969; . (box 9, folder 7, collection 341, series 1), January 30, 1969.

Langewiesche, W. (1969b). Letter from Langewiesche to _____ (Collection 341 Series II, Box SC 758, Folder 18), March 4th, 1969 pp.1961-1963.

Langewiesche, W. (1969c). Letter from Langewiesche to Lindbergh. (Collection 341 Series II, box SC 758, folder18), April 24th, 1969.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1991). Technology is society made durable. In J. Law (Ed.), *A Sociology of Monsters*. London: Routledge.

Latour, B. (1993). *We Have never been modern*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Law, J. (1992). Notes on the Theory of the ANT: Ordering, Strategy and Heterogeneity. *Systems Practice*, 5(4).

Leslie, J. (1970a). Memo from VP International Affairs John Leslie to N E Halaby. (Box 9, folder 7, collection 341, series 1).

Leslie, J. (1970b). Letter from Leslie to Langewiesche. (Collection 341 Series number 1, Box 9, Folder 8), August 21, 1970.

Leslie, J. (1970e). Letter from Leslie to Najeeb E. Ha (box 9, folder 11, collection 341, series 1), September 3rd, 1970 p.1973.

Leslie, J. (1971a). Letter from Leslie to Ione S. Wright. (box 31, folder 18, collection 341, series), June 3rd, 1971.

Leslie, J. (1971g). Letter from Leslie to Newton. (Box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), August 17th, 1971.

Leslie, J. (1971h). Letter from Leslie to Newton (box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), September 15th, 1971.

Leslie, J. (1971j). Letter from Leslie to van Dusen. (Box 31, folder 6, collection 341, series 1), August 16th, 1971.

Leslie, J. (1971k). Notes for the file by Leslie. (box 33, folder 12, collection 341, series 1), August 26th 1971

Leslie, J. (1971s). Letter from Leslie to Mr. H. Preston Morris. (Collection 341 Series number 1; Box 9, Folder 1), June 23, 1971.

Leslie, J. (1972b). Letter from John Leslie to Wesley (box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), December 14th 1972.

Leslie, J. (1972f). Letter from Leslie to Newton. (box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), July 25th, 1972.

Leslie, J. (1972k). Interview with William Van Dusen. x ?, folder?, collection 341, series 1), October 24th, 1972.

Leslie, J. (1972l). Letter from Leslie to Senior Vice President Government Affairs Washington. (BOX 33, folder 12, collection 341, series 1), June 8, 1972.

Leslie, J. (1972m). Letter from Leslie to James D. Hittle. (BOX 33/12, collection 341), August 18, 1972.

Leslie, J. (1973a). Letter from Leslie to Newton. (box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), January 31st, 1973.

Leslie, J. (1973b). Letter from Leslie to Newton. (Box 9 folder 10, collection 341, series 1), February 8th, 1973.

Leslie, J. (1973f). Draft contract between PAA, Leslie and Finis Farr. (Collection 341 Series number 1, Box 9, Folder 9), October 23rd, 1973.

Leslie, J. (1975c). Pan Am history project manuscript John Leslie. (Box 507, folder 8, collection 341, series 1), April 1975.

Library of Congress, M. D. (1999). Henry Harley Arnold: A register of his papers in the Library of Congress.

Lindbergh, C. (1970). *The Wartime Journals of Charles A. Lindbergh*. New York: : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC.

Lindbergh, C. (1977). *Charles A Lindbergh Autobiography of Values*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Lyons, E. (1941). *The Red Decade. The Stalinist Peretration of America*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

MacLeish, A. (1971). Letter from Archibald MacLeish to Juan Trippe. (box x, folder x, collection 341; series 1), December 9th, 1971.

Mannheim, K. (1953). Structural Analysis of Epistemology. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Mannheim, K. (1985). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Martin, A. (1976). Letter from Albro Martin to Leslie. (Collection 341, series 1), June 9th, 1976

Muller. (1972). Letter from Muller to Leslie. (box x folder x collection 341, series 1;), July 26th, 1972.

Newton, W. (1967). The Role of the Army Air Arm in Lat America, 1922-1931, *Airpower* (Vol. September-October 1967).

Newton, W. (1971b). Letter from Newton to Leslie. (Box 33, Folder 21, collection 341, series 1), September 3rd, 1971.

Newton, W. (1971c). Letter from Newton to Leslie. (Box 71, folder 10; collection 341, series 1), September 8th 1971.

Newton, W. (1972b). Letter from Newton to Leslie. (Box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), September 8th, 1972.

Newton, W. (1972c). Letter from Wesley Newton to John Leslie. (Box 3 folder 21, Collection 341), July 5th, 1972.

Newton, W. (1973). Letter from Wesley Newton to John Leslie. (box 33, folder 21, series 1, collection 341), January 3rd, 1973.

Newton, W. (no date). *Aviation in the Relations of the United States and Latin America, 1916-1929*. (Box 27, folder 35, series 1, collection 341), no date.

Newton, W. P. (1978). *The Perilous Sky: U.S. Aviation Diplomacy and Latin America, 1919-1931*. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press.

Ross, W. S. (1968). *The Last Hero: Charles Lindbergh*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Rowlinson, M. (2004). Historical Perspectives in Organization Studies: Factual, Narrative, and Archeo-Genealogical. . In D. E. Hodgson & C. Carter (Eds.), *Management Knowledge and The New Employee* (pp. 8-20). Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Ryan, G. D. (1972). Letter from Garry D. Ryan Chief Modern Military Branch to Joseph M. Herich, National Personnel Records Center. (Box 32, folder 12, collection 341, series 1), August 11th, 1972

Time Magazine. (1941). Sedta cuts the Rates. (not from the archive), January 27th, 1941.

Urdiken, B., & Kieser, A. (2004). Introduction: History in Organization Studies. *Business History*, 46(3), 321-330.

van Dusen, W. (1971b). Letter from William Van Dusen to John Leslie. (Box 31, folder 6, Collection 341, series 1), December 23rd, 1971.

van Dusen, W. (1972a). Letter from Van Dusen to Leslie. (Box 31, folder 6, collection 341, series 1; p.1), October 11th, 1972.

van Dusen, W. (1972b). Letter from Van Dusen to Leslie (box 33, folder 21, collection 341, series 1), November 15th, 1972.

van Dusen, W. (1972c). Captain John Kenyon Montgomery. (box 33, folder 12, collection 341, series 1), June 7th 1972.

Wald, A. M. (1994). *Writing From The Left. New Essays on Radical Culture and Politics*. London: Verso.

Wechler, J. A. (1954). *The Age of Suspicion*. London: Andre Deutsch.

White, H. (1973). *Metahistory The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

White, H. (1985). *The Tropics Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Wright, I. S. (1971b). Letter from Ione Wright to John Leslie. (Box 31, folder 18, collection 341, series 1), April 22nd, 1971.

Zinn, H. (1990). *The Politics of History* (Second Edition ed. ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Zinn, H. (1997). The Politics of History in The Era of the Cold War. In C. Noam (Ed.), *The Cold War & The University* (pp. 35-72). New York: The New Press.

Zinn, H. (1999). *A People's History of the United States. 1492-Present*. New York: Harper Collins.