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**ABSTRACT**

This article is concerned with antenarrative understanding and representation of organizational texts. Antenarrative captures an attempt to work with multiple pasts, multiple presents and multiple futures. This attempt is caught in the notion of sideshadowing. Antenarrative thus counters the widespread linear approach to organizational research characterized as Western narrative obsessed with beginnings, middles and ends, e.g. foreshadowing. Instead, antenarrative emphasizes living story where texts are conceptualized as dialogical, fragmented, plural, spontaneous and emergent. Living story restores presentness to the present in emphasizing the here and now. The research process is described as a storytelling practice in which multiple possibilities are conveyed simultaneously in constructing, understanding and representing organizational texts. It is argued that genealogical analysis can be seen as one example of storytelling and the principles of genealogical analysis are presented and discussed. Finally, it is discussed what living story requires in terms of writing.

## INTRODUCTION

Antenarrative is defined as non-linear, incoherent, collective, unplotted and prenarrative speculation, a bet a proper narrative can be constituted (Boje 2001, 2008). Antenarrative analysis is the analysis of stories “…that are too unconstructed and fragmented to be analyzed in traditional approaches” (Boje 2001, p. 1). Story is before – “ante” - narrative. To emphasize story instead of narrative means to uphold the unfinished and open character of interpretations.

Antenarrative captures the attempt to free stories from linear beginning middle and end narratives (BME) (Boje and Durant 2006). It implies working with open time through a process of what Morson calls *sideshadowing* defined as way of understanding and representing a plurality of possibilities (Morson 1994, p. 117). Sideshadowing thus implies working with story that are constantly living and becoming in the here and now. Further it implies perceiving research practice as a complex storytelling practice in which the major challenge is to understand and represent multiple possibilities.

The concept of living story is used to denote that the character of interpretations and experiences are always open, polyphonic, equivocal, dialogical, unfinished and unresolved. Living story is used to make two points about the research process. The first is that living stories and their manifestation in organizational texts are seen as the results of complex chains of interactions, negotiations and struggles between many different actors, groups, organizations, institutions and so on.

What characterizes the research text is not unity but multiplicity. As such the research process should be focused on mapping (e.g. Elden 2001) how these different forces interactively created these texts thus creating an *alternative memory of the text* (e.g. Foucault 1984; Jørgensen 2007). Foucault’s power analysis genealogy is proposed as a method for deconstructing these texts. Genealogy thus allows the researcher to create new stories of the world by allowing her to interrogate into what J. Hillis Miller (2004) call ghosts, and parasitical presences of language as noted later in the paper.

The second point is that while organizational texts are the results of complex storytelling processes, the research process is itself a storytelling process in which the researchers voice is always present: in the choice of theoretical and methodological texts, in the co-construction of organizational texts and in the interpretation and representation of these texts.

Sideshadowing, in other words, represents a major challenge to how research is organized and represented. An approach is advocated whereby the validity of storytelling - in terms of co-constructing, interpreting and representation - is always called into question (e.g. Creswell & Miller 2008, p. 126) by confronting dominant voices with inconsistencies, nuances, variations, contradictions and other voices. Intentions are to disturb, shake and possibly overthrow narrative BME voices with alternative interpretations of past, present and future.

The paper is organized as follows. Firstly the characteristics of living story compared to narrative are discussed. Secondly, the problem of exploring living stories is discussed and genealogical analysis is presented as a method for exploring living stories. Third the challenges of writing as storytelling are discussed.

## LIVING STORY AND NARRATIVE

“Foreshadowing robs its present of its presentness,” Morson argues, ”… by lifting the veil on a predetermined future” (Morson 1994, p. 117). In foreshadowing, the sequence of events is already given as the specific outcome of a linear sequence of events or in other words as a part of a BME narrative.

Instead, Morson proposes sideshadowing as a way of working with multiple futures. Sideshadowing seeks to restore presentness to the present. We are not at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a story. Arendt notes for example (1998, p. 177) that to act means taking an initiative, to begin and to set things into motion. Actions, in other words, imply new beginnings. Simultaneously we are always also in the middle of things. But we are never at the end in the sense that only one future or one event is possible.

Sideshadowing conveys the sense that actual events might not have happened. There are always alternatives to what happened. What exists need not have existed. There were other possibilities. Sideshadowing is used to create a sense of that something else. It is called sideshadowing to denote that “…instead of casting a foreshadow from the future, it casts a shadow from the side, that is from the other possibilities. Along with an event, we see its alternatives; with each present, another possible present” (Morson 1994, p. 118).

To break the linear relationship of foreshadowing and work with the multiple possibilities of sideshadowing, we need to reconsider the dominating chronotope in the organizational literature. Chronotope comes from Bakhtin’s work and is used to denote the connectedness of temporal and spatial relationship in understanding and representing organizational texts (e.g. Bakhtin 1981, pp. 84-85). Chronotopes are the centers for organizing events in the novel (e.g. Bakhtin 1994, p. 187).

Bakhtin actually describes it as organizing the fundamental narrative events here. As noted later I distinguish between narrative and storytelling as two very different ways of organizing events. For the time being, I will stay a little with narrative, because it is the dominating space/time relationship in the organizational literature. The narrative chronotope is consistent with foreshadowing. Ricoeur has argued that “…time becomes human to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode, and narrative attains its full meaning when it becomes a condition of human existence” (Ricoeur 1984, p. 52).

He explores the relations between time and narrative through what he calls three moments of *mimesis*. What brings these moments together is the power of configuration, which is the result of the intermediary position between the two operations, which Ricoeur calls mimesis1 (pre-understanding) and mimesis3 (after-understanding), and which constitutes the two sides of mimesis2 (plot and understanding).

Ricoeur thus conceptualizes the relations between time and narrative by showing the mediating role that emplotment has between the moment of practical experience, which goes before emplotment, and the moment of refiguration that follows it. We are following “…the destiny of a prefigured time that becomes a refigured time through the mediation of a configured time” (Ricoeur 1984, p. 54).

Thus, according to Ricoeur, human time is historical: there is a *before* and an *after* with intimate relations between them. Bruner follows Ricoeur and notes that narrative segments time “…by the unfolding of crucial events – at least into beginnings, middles and ends” (Bruner 1996, p. 136). The argument is that through narrative we place ourselves in time and create coherence, continuity and order through an integration of past, present and future (e.g. Clandinin and Connelly 2000).

The suggestion is in other words that self is (re)created as plot on the basis of pre-narrative structures and applied in words and actions. Self is intentional and transforms diverse events or incidents into a meaningful story. It draws together heterogeneous factors such as “… agents, goals, means, interactions, circumstances, unexpected results” (Ricoeur 1984, p. 65; Chappell, Rhodes, Solomon, Tennant and Yates 2003, p. 45).

The narrative chronotope is thus the construction of plot and order. Czarniawska (1997, p. 11) argues that narrative is a very handy concept, where the attraction lies in its pragmatism rather than any ideological premises. Further she notes that the narrative paradigm is based on narrative rationality where narrative replaces conventional models of formal rationality (Czarniawska 1997, p. 22).

Narrative chronotope is thus consistent with foreshadowing by emphasizing linear coherence, causal relationships between past, present and future, unity and order. For Derrida, narrative implies closure of the text. He makes a sharp distinction between narrative and story. For Derrida, narrative is linked to the idea of rational progress, objective truth and subsequently it portrays time as a linear process.

Derrida for example speaks of narrative as a demand for truth, which implies the perception that texts have beginnings, middles and ends, borders and boundaries. Narrative is an attempt to monopolize truth. Derrida argues that the demand for narrative is to tell exactly what happened (Derrida 2004, p. 72) and further that it demands an I capable of organizing a narrative sequence and telling the truth (2004, p. 81). By this token he argues that narrative is “…a violent instrument of torture” (2004, p. 78), which imprisons live in a linear sequence and in this ways excludes and marginalizes other voices.

It could be argued that the perception of narrative as a violent instrument of torture is too simple and negative. Following Hull it could be argued that it is embedded in Derrida’s philosophical skepticism, which seems to reduce hundreds of years of philosophy to a metaphorics of unicity – that is “…as variations of single troubling theme” (Hull 1994, p. 326). According to Hull, this is accomplished by “…reading such allegedly diverse thinkers as Plato, Aristotle, Kant and Heidegger as repeatedly suppressing the transgression of univocity language itself initiates but masks” (Hull, 1994, p. 326).

The significant point is however to highlight that narrative by emphasizing unity and coherence across time and space give a privileged position to particular voices in foreshadowing the future and representing the past. By emphasizing plot and coherence, narrative genres are always enclosed in a solid and unshakable monological framework, according to Bakthin (1973, p. 12). The dominating voice is the voice of the author, who draws on present day accounts to construct a reasonable and convincing narrative of what has happened and what will happen but in this process she excludes and marginalizes other voices.

The critique of narrative is not done in order to destroy narrative. Narrative genres are important for our culture and identity. The linear coherence of beginning, middle and end is widely embedded in management and leadership concepts and models. The logic of causality embedded in a linear model is an extremely important tool for management and leadership. But the critique of narrative is necessary in order to resituate the relationship between narrative and story and create the basis for a more democratic relationship between the many different voices in language.

Jørgensen and Boje (Jørgensen and Boje 2009) have argued that narrative have been hegemonic about story in business ethics and proposes a resituated relationship between the two where they are on more equal playing field. According to Jørgensen and Boje this creates reflexivity in terms of continually questioning ethics understood as the truth and morality claims embedded in the way we speak and act. In other words, a resituated relationship between the two terms paves the way for a more innovative language that breaks with the highly conservative and stylized language of narrative.

It is in the spirit of a resituated relationship that **living story** is proposed. It implies a very different chronotope than narrative. Contrary to narrative, living story implies restoring presentness to understanding events in organizations. Living stories are thus “local” (e.g. Jørgensen 2002) in the sense that these stories are independently and contextually understood. They are independent because they have an identity of their own. This does not imply that living stories emerge in a vacuum. On the contrary living stories are contingent on what came before and condition what comes after but they become in interaction between many different forces present in any situation.

As such the relationship between events is not linear. Instead any living story is just one of many possible occurrences in the moment and it moves in unpredictable directions. Stories are never finished, not necessarily whole, and are still alive in the here and now. As noted by Boje (2001, p. 18) stories float in a soup of bits and pieces of story fragments. They are never alone but live and breathe in a web of other stories and self-deconstruct with each telling.

The term living story is inspired by Derrida who argues that story has no borderlines. It is at once larger and smaller than itself. It is entangled in a play with other stories, is part of the other, makes the other part of itself etc. and it remains utterly different from what Derrida calls its homonym, narrative (Derrida 2004, p. 82).

Living story implies an emphasis on pluralism. For Bakhtin this pluralism is present in any utterance. He argues that there fundamentally are two different forces of language. The *centripetal forces of language* (1981, p. 270) are forces that according to Bakhtin seek to overcome *heteroglossia* – the condition that the word uttered in that place and that time will have a different meaning than under other conditions (Bakhtin 1981, p. 263 and p. 428).

The centripetal forces seek to unite and bring order but they operate in the midst of heteroglossia (Bakhtin 1981, pp. 271-272) – that is in “a language” that is stratified into a multiplicity of languages; languages of social groups, professional languages, generic languages, languages of generations etc.

Heteroglossia is what ensures the dynamics and development of language. There are always *centrifugal forces* that ensure processes of decentralization and disunification alongside the verbal-ideological centralization and unification (Bakhtin 1981, p. 272). According to Bakhtin, these centripetal and centrifugal forces intersect in the utterance. Order and disorder are in other words are countervailing forces of language, which always exist side by side.

Plurality and many different voices are as such always embedded in living stories. They are affected by innumerable, conflicting wills and intentions, and this is actually why action according to Arendt almost never achieves its purpose. In other words, nobody is the author or producer of her own life story. Stories reveal an agent, but this agent is never the sole author or producer (Arendt 1998, pp. 184-185).

In short living story operates with a much more complex notion of how temporal and spatial relationships are connected. Living story emerges interactively and spontaneously in everyday life setting. Life thus becomes more indeterminate, where serendipity, chance, and unfinalizability are prominent features of everyday life.

Next, I will describe a research process, genealogy, which works with living story chronotope and thus sideshadowing in order to explore, understand and represent organizational texts.

## EXPLORING LIVING STORIES

As noted the concept of story implies the suspension of beginning, middles and ends. Story is always before (ante) narrative and implies undecidability, unfinalizability and non-linearity. This implies that the organizational text and the interpretation of the text are always antenarrative.

Texts are where people’s realities are recorded in time and space. History is manifested in the continuous construction, reconstruction and modification of texts. Derrida argues that “*There is nothing outside of the text*” (there is no outside-text; *il n’y a pas de hors-texte*) (Derrida 1997, p. 158), where text means something much broader than the pages of a book and includes the politics and ethics of action, material conditions etc. (Boje 2001, p. 22).

These texts may have the character of language, words, concepts, documents, monuments, use objects, art works or musicals, sculptures, choreographies, architectures etc. (Arendt 1998, p. 184; Derrida 1997, p. 9). That there is nothing outside of the text means simply that there is no essential referent or transcendental signified. Texts (representations) refer to other texts, which refer to other texts etc.

The living story chronotope implies that the relationship between texts is not a linear one but on the contrary that there are multiple possibilities and outcomes when text deconstruct and reconstruct into other texts. This is one of the founding principles of genealogy. Foucault for example argues that genealogy “…entertains the claims to attention of local, discontinuous, disqualified and illegitimate knowledges…” (Foucault 1980, p. 83). In contrast to totalitarian sciences genealogy is called "...an insurrection of subjugated knowledges" (Foucault 1980, p. 81).

Two kinds of knowledge are resurrected. The first is historical contents that have been buried and disguised in coherence or formal systemisation (Foucault 1980, pp. 81-82) of what is called BME narratives – that impose an abstract and unitary order on material that is otherwise fragmented and distorted. This means that instead of looking at text with the unifying order of such a BME narrative, we should look at the text as the result of many small forces with their own history and identity and existing in their own specific context.

The second is about reviving directly disqualified knowledges (Foucault 1980, p. 82) – stories that are deemed illegitimate and barred or excluded from analysis. These are the marginalized voices: the losers in the game – the stories that lost the battle and thereafter almost completely disappeared from the scene. These are the darker sides of history.

It is through the revival of such stories – that Foucault wishes to give us a more appropriate picture of the conditions and circumstances in which texts emerged, how they evolved into other texts and still other texts etc. This process is neither logically coherent, nor is it the result of a rational process. Rather it means that the text is the result of interactions between different people, circumstances and chance.

Genealogy was Nietzsche’s way of writing *critical history* that was acting counter to our time, thereby acting on our time and hopefully for the time to come (Nietzsche 1997, p. 60; Elden 2001, pp. 111-112). It later became an indispensable part of Foucault’s studies of the relations between power and knowledge (Gordon 1980) where it was employed in writing the history of the present (Foucault 1979, p. 31).

Foucault distinguishes between three uses of history: the *parodic*, *dissociative* and *sacrificial* uses of history (Foucault 1984, pp. 91-95; Bauer 1999, p. 62; Jørgensen 2007, pp. 71-74). These three uses of history are examples of sideshadowing that confront dominant narratives of the present. Each use of history looks at these narratives as masks that, in privileging dominant voices, conceal or filter what occurred.

Genealogy – through these three uses of history – is designed to construct an alternative memory of what happened. Genealogy thereby shakes, disturbs and possibly overthrows dominant and linear interpretations of the relations between events by offering more detailed complex and nuanced accounts of the circumstances in which events happened thereby revealing new relationships between emerging texts.

The parodic use is directed against reality in opposing “…the theme of history as reminiscence or recognition” (Bauer 1999, p. 61). It is concerned with getting “behind” history and seeks to avoid being seduced by the web of narratives that conceal the emergence of texts in imagined truths and morality claims.

These imagined truths and morality claims are embedded in narratives of heroes and scoundrels, rational explanations, romanticism, images and so on. Genealogical analysis seeks to tear off such masks and map actual events in their correct chronological order, in the proper context, and with a proper description of who is involved, and what part they play.

The dissociative use is directed against identity in opposing history as continuity or representative of tradition. The dissociative use of history thus contrasts identity as the sense of self (Harré & Gillett 1994, pp. 103-104) expressed in people’s narratives (Spfard and Prusak 2005; Chappell, Rhodes, Solomon, Tennant and Yates 2003). Instead of a linear identity, the dissociative use of history demonstrates the complexities, the contradictions and the paradoxes in relation to who people are and how they have become who they are in a way in which, we are not allowed to forget the darker sides of our history.

Finally, the sacrificial use is directed against truth in opposing the traditional “objective” historian (Bauer 1999, p. 61). Power is an indispensable part of this development and the question of power is one reason why Nietzsche criticizes traditional historians of morality because the “… historical spirit itself is lacking in them …” (Nietzsche 1994, p. 12). This third use of history seeks to demonstrate how speech and actions originate and are driven from peoples’ intentions, interests, passions, feelings and will.

The text, therefore, is anything but neutral, objective or value free’. It is saturated with passions, interests and intentions and exists in a continuous struggle and confrontation with other’s passions, interests and intentions. Violence, blood, conflict, dominance and slavery are embedded in the production of texts – not liberty, equality or fraternity (see also Foucault 1984, p. 96).

As such, genealogy doesn’t see history as logical or directed to improvement and Enlightenment. On the contrary, because “…historical beginnings are lowly: not in the sense of modest or discreet steps of a dove, but derisive and ironic, capable of undoing every infatuation” (Foucault 1984, p. 79). Power should also be understood in this equally less glorious and more mundane manner. It does not derive from the king. The constitution of social life is instead derived from “…a complex set of petty and ignoble power relations” (Haugaard 1997, p. 43).

Power is the consequence of local strategies and is the overall effect of petty confrontations between actors fighting over what is true and what is just (see Haugaard 1997, pp. 68-69). As such genealogy seeks to show how these “storytelling games” developed, where they came from, how they evolved and changed, who were involved and in what circumstances these kinds of stories were produced. Genealogy recognizes that actors have *descended* from many different places (Foucault 1984, pp. 81-83; see also Jørgensen 2007, pp. 66-67). This implies that the self has numberless beginnings and is fragmented, differentiated and shaped by accidents (Foucault 1984, p. 81)

Furthermore, genealogy seeks to show how phenomena have *emerged* (Foucault 1984; see also Jørgensen 2007, pp. 67-68, on the notion of *emergence*) as a consequence of complex “storytelling games” involving many different actors in different positions and with different intentions. In the same way as descent is not to be considered as an undisturbed continuity, neither is emergence the final stage of historical development. Emergence is linked with force and the purpose of an analysis of emergence is to delineate the interaction between different forces (Foucault 1984, pp. 83-84)

Emergence is the result of a relation between forces. As a consequence, no one is responsible for emergence; “…no one can glory in it, since it always occurs in the interstice” (Foucault 1984, p. 85). As such the actions of people have to be viewed in interaction with particular material circumstances and other actors. Emergence is never finished and it does not lead in only one direction. Instead it may evolve in multiple directions.

Genealogy explores and represents research organized according to the living story chronotope. Genealogy searches for the non-identical by exploring dissensions, disparities and differences (Bauer 1999, p. 63). Genealogy in other words searches for stories and displaces what Bauer calls “…universalized accounts of history and create counter narratives that reject and subvert the ideological presuppositions of enlightenment” (Bauer 1999, p. 63).

Genealogy implies the attempt to suspend presumptions and prejudices about what happened. The argument is to approach events in their own terms– without narratively organizing them into a predetermined sequence of beginning, middle and end. Instead genealogy implies sideshadowing through the detailed analysis of how stories develop, evolve and change; that is how stories become part of other stories, make other stories part of themselves etc.

This requires a great collection of source material which might illuminate what takes place in different contexts and spaces and in different points in time: “Genealogy is gray, meticulous and patiently documentary” (Foucault 1984, p. 76). This source material should provide rich and varied accounts of the complex, non-linear and paradoxical course of history. This includes the collection of historical material or the archive (Foucault 1995; e.g. Jørgensen 2007, p. 56); that is for example minutes from meeting, reports, letters, diaries, log books, accounts, budgets and other historical material produced in specific historical circumstances.

These source may be supplemented by other research methods such as tape recordings (e.g. Silverman & Jones 1976), participant observation (e.g. Boje 1991) and more lately also video recordings of situations. In principle these methods record interactions as they occur in the moment and are as such consistent with living story chronotope. Genealogical analysis may also include qualitative interviews with actors even if these interviews are retrospective and have a tendency to post-rationalize the sequences of events.

The answer to this problem is pragmatic. Interviews with actors are still relevant, because they are invaluable sources of memory. Further it would be extremely difficult – and ethically problematic - to interpret interactions without asking the actors, who took part in these interactions.

Foucault uses archaeological descriptions in the first phase of genealogy. Archaeology is characterized as a pure description of discursive events (Foucault 1995, p. 27). It is a method for organizing a description of such events. The simple organizing principles are chronology, actors and space (Jørgensen 2002; Jørgensen 2007, p. 57). Foucault defines archaeology as a *non-interpretative discipline* and as a *systematic rewriting of history* (Foucault 1995, pp. 138-140).

The purpose of this “non-interpretative” archaeological procedure is to open our eyes for a new and more complex and varied interpretations of history and to allow history to emerge “from below” so to speak. Genealogy is the tactics by which archaeological descriptions are brought into play (Foucault 1980, p. 85).

Genealogy is thus constructed from archaeological descriptions and it brings in interests, intentions and relations of power as key interpretive concepts for *mapping* out the political situation in a particular society or organization (e.g. Elden 2001): “…it (power) is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation…” (Foucault 1993, p. 334).

**WRITING AS STORYTELLING**

The genealogist suspends beginnings, middles and ends and open up for alternations readings and interpretations of organizational texts. None-the-less she creates her own account(s) from the bundles of text that constitute the research object. Even if the genealogist stays firmly within these texts and the different voices she observes in them, her interpretations rely on her own theory of the emergence of the text; for example narrative chronotope or living story chronotope.

In terms of writing, the researcher faces immense problems because her voice is multi-voiced and has been affected - consciously and unconsciously - by many different situations, actors, circumstances and chance during her life time. Her writing will always constitute violence because she will emphasize some things instead of others, she listen to some voices instead of others, she does choose to follow the inspiration from some authors instead of others, and she does choose to use certain methods instead of others etc.

The history of the production of the scientific text is no way different from the history of the phenomena, which constitute the research object. This text is also polyphonic, plural, dialogical, unfinished and unresolved. It also contains parasitical and ghostly presences of other voices, other interpretations, other texts etc. The power or voice of the author (Foucault 2002) is an essential and violent condition in research (see also Pritchard, Jones and Stablein 2004, p. 215).

In regard to the validity of storytelling, the approach has been to continually question validity. Traditionally however, this has been described in terms of questioning the author’s interpretations by clarifying from where the author speaks thereby creating transparency in terms of how the author’s text emerged.

In this framework, calling validity into question becomes a question of clarifying and describing the circumstances in which for example the research question was framed and evolved, how the choice of theoretical and methodological frameworks and procedures took place, who were involved in the process, how they were involved in this process and evaluating how it affected the researcher’s account (Creswell & Miller 2008).

This section here discusses questioning validity directly within the author’s writing itself. This kind of reflexive writing is called for by the living story chronotope. I suggest that we can get some inspiration from Benjamin’s storyteller and Morson’s work on sideshadowing in learning how to write reflexively thereby questioning validity of storytelling in another way.

To begin the discussion, Benjamin argues that the art of storytelling is coming to an end (Benjamin 1999, p. 83). “It is as if something that seemed inalienable to us, the securest among our possessions, were taken away from us: the ability to exchange experiences” (1999, p. 83). For Benjamin, storytelling is deeply rooted in experience. This is not written experience, and it is not experience based on rational thinking. Instead, storytelling is based on experience passed on from mouth to mouth (1999, p. 86).

Storytelling is not a job for the voice alone. Rather storytelling is derived naturally from practice in which word, soul, eye and hand are brought into connection (1999, pp. 105-106). Storytellers are oriented towards the practical interests of life (1999, p. 86). A story contains in this respect something useful that may consist in a moral advice, some practical advice or in a proverb or maxim. This is practical wisdom embedded in the fabric of real life. According to Benjamin, counsel “… woven into the fabric of real life is wisdom” (1999, p. 86).

The storyteller is as such a counterweight to the progression of modernity, which in Benjamin’s view is brutal and destructive of tradition, wisdom and thus storytelling. Instead of using stories to communicate, modernity’s mode of communication is characterized by something completely different, namely by what Benjamin denotes information (Benjamin 1999, p. 88). Information is consistent with Western narrative tradition in seeking to wring out the essence of stories (Jørgensen and Boje 2009).

Benjamin notes that every morning brings us the news from the globe but we are poor in noteworthy stories (p. 89). These are being killed in the process of being explained. “…no event any longer comes to us without already being shot through with explanation” (Benjamin 1999, p. 89). This represents a narrative taming, stiffening and deadening of a living story (Jørgensen and Boje 2009). Instead “...half the art of storytelling is to keep a story free from explanation as one reproduces it” (Benjamin 1999, p. 89).

This means that the connections between events in terms of cause effect linkages are not spelled out. It is left for the reader to interpret things the way she understands them. As such storytelling achieves amplitude that Western narrative lacks (Benjamin 1999, p. 89). Storytelling is in other words a way of working with the multiple possibilities of sideshadowing.

It does so in a natural way by simply letting be the ambiguities, complexities and paradoxes of language and contexts thus allowing for continuous negotiation and modification and refinement of the possible meanings of the text and its relationship to other texts. But storytelling does not try to explain the meaning of the text according to a particular theoretical principle or some logic of rationality.

To take the case of power as an example, Foucault has argued that power in his framework is an analytics of power and not a theory of power (Foucault 1978, p. 94). He suggests that we must understand power where power works in practice instead of being guided by a particular narrow conception of power; e.g. over power, covert power and the power to shape desires and beliefs (Lukes 1974; See also Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullyvan 1998). In contrast, Foucault offers an analytics of power, the genealogy, as a means of describing the multiple and subtle ways that power works and the multiple points at which power works.

It should be noted that storytelling by no means implies a return to non-interpretative archaeology from tactical interpretation of genealogy. The storytelling approach rather implies carefully organizing and relating texts to one another in order to give rich and varied accounts of what takes place in moments of becoming. Storytelling thus also implies selecting texts, giving priority to particular texts, relating texts to one another, guessing, imagining, use of metaphors, symbolic descriptions and comparisons etc.

Some examples of the stylistics of storytelling is given in Morson’s work on sideshadowing, particularly through an analysis of Dostoevsky’s novels. “Sideshadowing endows the novel with a sense of the unexpected and the mysterious. Other possibilities threaten to erupt at any moment and cast their shadow over everything that actually happens,” he notes (Morson 1994, p. 120).

The chronicler often tells us what could have happened instead of what happened. She gives the readers “too many facts” including a lot of seemingly irrelevant details without no clear explanation (Morson 1994, p. 121). The chronicler cannot decide on any single version of events even if she has talked to everyone. Morson notes that she instead reports rumors, doubts her best sources and offers alternative possibilities; ““…“Some say,” “others affirm,” “it is absurd to suppose,” “the papers were surely mistaken to say,” “now everyone at the club believed with the utmost certainty” (Morson 1994, p. 121).

The storyteller is the modern narrator’s nightmare. Instead of answers, she offers possibilities. Instead of certainty, she offers doubt. Instead of giving us truth, she offers tales, stories, rumors, jokes and gossip. Instead of giving us one single plot, she offers several plots of which some are offered with no clear explanation or ending (e.g. Morson 1994, pp. 126-127).

The art of storytelling is a balancing act in terms of keeping the readers on track while continually questioning this track and open for other possibilities. It is to tell the story while at the same time contradicting and resisting the story. Telling stories are to indicate beginnings, middles and ends while at the same questioning these beginnings, middles and ends thus opening up for other interpretations of pasts, presents and futures.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Antenarrative implies working with multiple pasts, presents and futures. It requires that we work with the notion of sideshadowing in doing research. This article has argued for the use of living story chronotope as a less conservative and more reflexive and innovative way of working with organizational texts compared to the narrative chronotope.

The article has argued that genealogical analysis can be seen as an example of a method that works with living story chronotope in its practice. Finally, the article has discussed how we can learn to write in a storytelling way where the validity of any narrative sequence of beginning, middle and end is continually questioned from within the construction of the author’s text itself.

It is important to remember that the article proposes a resituated relationship of narrative and story and not that the hegemony of the duality of narrative and story is turned upside down in favor of story. BME voices are important in society and organizational life. They are important in management and leadership concepts, economic models and in terms of our culture and identity.

What the living story chronotope is to open the field for alternative voices thereby questioning the validity of narratives in order that our language and narratives lose their self-sufficient and narcissistic character and we become able to see other possibilities. The art of storytelling seeks to do just that. Thereby, the resituated relationship of narrative and story is first and foremost a reflexive relationship, where the two terms, narrative and story, benefit from each other. They are not necessarily hostilely opposed to each other.
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