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Ponte dei Sospiri: Bridging Art and Aesthetics in Organizational Memories
Introduction by Pierre Guillet de Monthoux and Antonio Strati

Do you know when you see it, or do you see it only when you know it? Is it a matter of intention or is it something in the eye of the beholder? Is it a phenomenon or is it a perspective? How, then, do you express it, or how do you represent it? These are just some of the questions requiring an answer when ‘aesthetics’ enters the realm of social science. The themed papers section of this issue of Aesthesis is aesthetics and the construction and re-construction of memories of organizational life – such considerations seemed omnipresent to the researchers who gathered in the little village of Gattières, southern France, for the Third EIASM Workshop on ‘Art, Aesthetics and Organization’ in July 2007. On this occasion, as in the past, the common ‘call for papers’ was intended to emphasise the dialectics that give strength to the ongoing configuration of an aesthetic discourse on organization. Art and aesthetics, in fact, are not understood in the same way by both of us.

Pierre Guillet de Monthoux (2004) has a clear predilection for the arts as an arena and laboratory for aesthetic experiments. The arts have an important role as showcases of aesthetic practices threatened and marginalized by bureaucracy and corporate managerialism. Pierre is thus particularly keen to understand and enhance the aesthetics of the organization through artistic intervention.

Antonio Strati (1999) emphasises aesthetics as a central but forgotten dimension of ‘organizational life’. He focuses on sensible knowledge and aesthetic judgment in everyday organizational practices, and is particularly keen to highlight that the negotiation of organizational aesthetics gives form to the organization and also shapes power relations in organizational cultures.

These two diverse emphases regarding art and aesthetics in the study of organizations have also configured two different approaches – among others – in organizational aesthetics research: namely, the artistic approach (Guillet de Monthoux et.al., 2007) and the aesthetic approach (Strati, 2008). The artists, art critics, and organizational scholars who responded to our common call for papers for these three workshops – the first held in Siena in 2000, the second in Gattières in 2003, and the third again in Gattières, in 2007 – were in various ways catering to each convener’s special interests. Their participation, however, did not give rise to a clear separation between the two research styles. On the contrary, participants and organizers shared the conviction that both performing art and aesthetic comprehension must be part of our understanding of the social processes of organizing action. This conviction was shared both by participating organizational and managerial scholars and such prominent guests from art world and industrial design such as Alberto Alessi, Michelangelo Pistoletto, Hans-Ulrich Obrist, Maria Finders and Daniel Birnbaum. Symbolic of this interaction is the Human Relations special issue on ‘Organizing Aesthetics’, featuring the script of a performance (Steyeart and Hjorth, 2002) inspired by the first workshop held in Siena. This was a novelty in an organization studies publication. But even though it appeared in such a prestigious journal, it did not engender much of a hybridization of art and aesthetics in organizational research and writing. The two approaches did not merge together. Rather, they continued to propose, each on the basis of its distinctive characteristics, a common ground for transgressive and novel forms of conducting and representing field research and the theoretical study of organization. In a word, what they had in common was simply a genuine and profound desire for ... aesthetics!

This issue of Aesthesis reminds us of this desire for aesthetics in our knowledge of organizations. When Alberto Zanutto writes that the task of research is to ‘valorize aesthetics’, he articulates an almost programmatic aspiration -- aesthetics as an escape from a one-dimensional idea of reality. Zanutto’s long experience as a researcher on a variety of projects seems to have shown how aesthetics can be ‘smuggled’ into traditional organizational inquiries. What memories can one represent, firstly to the researcher him/herself, secondly to colleagues involved in the same research, and thirdly to organizational students and scholars, and to the
organizational actors themselves? Zanutto's article can be read as an ongoing fragmented aesthetic memoir. It also stands as a quest for a deeper understanding of aesthetics in organizational field research, which polemicizes functionalism's basic assumptions in order to open the way for aesthetic experience itself. How can traditional, rather 'square' research, be turned into a multidimensional inquiry -- thus providing an aesthetic research team with techniques for an aesthetic research process that will constructively confuse the binary boredom of an aesthetic reading of organization dynamics! Like most freedom fighters, however, Zanutto somewhat over-simplifies matters. It is difficult to argue that reality is life whilst rationalism is death; for both are part of our desire for freedom. However, his contribution is a viable first step towards transforming the representation of the outcomes of social science research into forms of aesthetic organizational memory.

Mikael Scherdin's argument stands in sharp contrast to Zanutto's strong belief that aesthetic organizational research and the researcher's personal aesthetic comprehension of organizational phenomena should be grounded in negotiation with colleagues. Scherdin's contribution evokes a tension between an almost romantic belief in subjectivity for subjectivity's sake on the one hand, and on the other a view of aesthetics as a social phenomenon that constantly puts the idea of a given subject in constant danger. We ourselves recognize this tension in our own editorial divergences: Pierre Guillet de Monthoux's interests in art are viewed with some scepticism by Antonio Strati on account that art might well obstruct our analysis of aesthetics out there in the field. However, this issue's references to art critic and curator Nicolas Bourriaud's understanding of contemporary art as performing a 'relational aesthetics' (Bourriaud, 1998), and Guillet de Monthoux's predilection for Joseph Bueys' definition of art as 'social sculpture', indicate that we are immersed in the intricacies of a controversy. Scherdin's rather radical position begs the question of whether organizational aesthetics can be adequately represented by adopting such an individualistic style in field research. Comparisons with Zanutto's article may thus help us grasp the delicate nuances of organizational research in practice, in ways that induce diverse states of aesthetic feeling in the researcher. Here we get a feel for how to 'legitimate' certain forms of aesthetic understanding through a process of negotiation in the context of a plurality of individual aesthetic understandings. This contrasts with the aesthetic 'self-legitimation' assumed by Scherdin's 'autoethnographic' re/construction of the aesthetics of his individual organizational memories. Moreover, both articles echo broader methodological controversies in social studies, and one can see emerging a process by which the study of the aesthetic is negotiating its own legitimacy in the context of mainstream methodologies. In a sense, this brings us back to the central issue in aesthetic organizational research, that of the epistemological controversy (Taylor and Hansen, 2005) -- but with a touch of novelty introduced by the specific characteristics of these two research experiences.

These methodological reflections can be understood in a new light through Timon Beyes' detailed account of Jacques Rancière's aesthetic philosophy. When organizing the 2007 Gattières workshop, we recommended this French philosopher to the participants. His booklet *Le Partage du sensible* (2000), as well other works such as *Malaise dans l'esthétique* (2004), raises issues that are not strictly bound to the art world but encompass the way in which our world offers itself to be shared and divided up in our daily perception of it. This philosophical aesthetics has recently gained fame in art schools and amongst young artists. French theory, however, has a very special way of elucidating how aesthetics is a fundamental approach to social philosophizing, and it signalled for us exactly what the title of this introduction indicates: bridging art to aesthetics (and back).

Beyes' article provides a 'crash course' in this aesthetic philosophy. Rancière sees the formation of new arenas, the emergence of new collectives, and the voicing of new desires, and this new activity is fundamentally aesthetic. It is up to aesthetic intuition to give form to, to organize if you prefer, otherwise silenced and suppressed phenomena. Rancière's aesthetic perspective opens up what might be called a political analysis, and it is, as Beyes makes clear, 'critical' in the sense of relying on the self-organizing force of aesthetic intuition. The researcher is not a judge nor an expert once s/he has opted for an aesthetic approach. S/he develops a sensitivity to aesthetic forces that are profoundly liberating because they creatively generate their own trajectories, rather than simply voicing dialectic criticism or staging violent revolts.

While illustrating Rancière's aesthetics, Beyes alludes to possible implications for the study of organizing processes. Beyes also claims that Rancière's organizational aesthetics has emerged as a philosophical alternative to the implicit authoritarianism of aesthetically engaged sociologies, like that of Pierre Bourdieu. Hence his article raises an issue similar to that encountered in the tension between Zanutto's and Scherdin's articles: the tension between an aesthetics implicitly imposing something that 'ought to be' and an aesthetics that only reveals the organizational control of the sensible in order to defy and escape it – as in Strati’s aesthetics (1999) or Gagliardi’s empathological approach (2006). The question of who is most prone to open up organizational life – a sociological researcher or an
aesthetic philosopher – still remains. Terry Brown and Kathy Mack provide a concrete example that might appeal to Rancière. They show that aesthetic research forces us to assume a new stance as social scientists. As they reflect on common organizational memories, Brown and Mack are compelled to give form to everyday artifacts in order to invoke the aesthetic dimension of collective memory. Zanutto insists that aesthetic research consists of encounters within a team of researchers, while Scherdin develops arguments to defend the sphere of subjective action for individual interpretations of an experience. For both of them the outcome of the aesthetic research process is unclear, although one surmises that it would be some kind of organizational awareness of aesthetic processes in Zanutto’s case and some sort of art-like product (cut off from its context) in Scherdin’s. Brown and Mack, however, illustrate how they used multimedia techniques to make a product that was then fed back into the field in order to bring forth an aesthetic dimension common to both researchers and researched: research thus consists in crafting a piece of art necessary to bring forth forgotten aesthetic memories in organization.

Niina Koivunen analyses this process by exploring the making of an artistic artefact: a recording of contemporary classical music. Her contribution implicitly supports Brown and Mack’s account. They simply had to make a product to bring forth an aesthetic process; for Koivunen it was the other way round. There was a process – the listening to contemporary music by aficionados with set values and with a set context of classical connoisseurs – into which products (the recordings made by the skilled producers observed by Koivunen) were constantly fed. Rather than a process triggered by a product, the product was created by the process, and in ways that, according to Koivunen, seemed almost automatic and system-conditioned. Koivunen accordingly helps us understand the difference between what we usually call an artwork and what we consider a tool to bring forth the aesthetics of ‘non-art’ organizational life.

Klaus Harju’s article tackles the ontological status of this dimension itself. It propounds the extreme idea that the aesthetic of organization is nostalgic for a never-existing past. This does not involve a beautiful utopia to come; nor an ideal of some sort of perfection to be reached. It is a ‘saudade’ for the always bygone retrospects, which is not the same as simple nostalgia for an origin. If this is what aesthetics is about, then we are again confronted by the fact that art and research are separated only by a very fine line. For how can we seriously claim that there is a difference between fact and fiction if Harju’s point is taken seriously? Mind you, this kind of fiction is not an ideal, a universal dream, or a claim to transcendent reality. It is a poietical fiction tainted by singularity, which can only be reshaped in a Nietzschean process of eternal return.

In editing this themed section of Aesthesis, however, we have not been able to maintain that artistic and aesthetic approaches are distinct and counterposed phenomena in organizational research. On the contrary, we have found ourselves affirming – with Rancière – that a crucial issue in both the aesthetic and artistic approaches to the study of organizational life is the changeover to a post-aesthetic discourse on organization. This involves a sensitivity, an awareness, and a taste that shapes organizational aesthetic research on the re/construction of organizational memories, as the capacity for aesthetic pathos in the understanding of organizational life is the changeover to a post-aesthetic discourse on organization. This involves a sensitivity, an awareness, and a taste that shapes organizational aesthetic research on the re/construction of organizational memories, as the capacity for aesthetic pathos in the understanding of organizational life.
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REFERENCES
Our present time in history can be characterised by two simultaneous organisational developments, both of which involve the dissolution of ‘preconditioning’ ethics. First of all, conventional institutional centres of power are losing their dominance. Sovereign powers -- the government, the church, and the king -- are no longer able to control their subjects as before. Secondly, contemporary culture is experiencing a transfusion of conventions regarding everyday work and life. Previous easily definable settings such as home, family, work/leisure, office, and factory, are difficult to locate and place both in time and space.

With the lack of a given centre of knowledge, together with continuously changing codes of conduct, individuals/collectives have ethics superjected above them, in such a manner that we are basically free to organise ourselves, as if according to the frescoes that have been painted above our milieux as mementoes of potentialities. The only thing that exists in the centre is the melancholy of a bossa nova. There no longer is the singular par excellence creation of the uomo universale as in The Sistine Chapel. (Wo)man now has the divine potential to paint her own heavens, as ‘God’ is dead. One might refer to Vinícius de Moraes’ words ‘tristeza não tem fim felicidade sim’, but this is not a Greek drama -- this is reality, as tragically as we live it.

The now, as ‘the social’ is constantly in motion, to put it boldly, is beyond a neatly served set. The state of the art of the contemporary is not being - it is maybe(ing). In social reality there are no such things as secure stable walls beyond pataphysics.

The rhythm of the contemporary is the Wesen of the bossa nova. It is joyful and sad in the same moment. It enjoys searching, but it knows how much suffering that takes. It is joyful in nature in the tragic sense of humanity. It embraces a longing for the unattainable. Homesickness or saudade lies at its core. Being at home with the tragic involves being at home with problematisation. The problematic is the nature of the world. Health may come from being at home without a home, id est saudade port salut.

SAÚDE POR SAUDADE
Ah saudade minha, luz divinal
Frei Agostinho da Cruz

Babylonian society was pyramidal. The king was the apex, and the broad base rested upon a foundation of slaves. Social control was mediated from class to class. Caste and status are embedded in the code. In precise tariffs human values are set forth. This system served the political and economical needs of the time. ...The economic activity of Babylonia was stimulated by individual ownership and the careful definition and protection of property rights. The code makes one see vividly the dominance of economic interests. One can fancy the pressure by which countless conflicts were consolidated into this body of laws. If the code was well enforced, Babylon must have been popular with men of wealth. Yet there is always danger that protection for property will be pushed to the point where the industrially weak will be impoverished, discouraged, made less productive, or driven into revolt. The code of Hammurabi guards against this tendency by several provisions designed to protect the poor and unfortunate. Justice from the standpoint of social control is the psychological means of reconciling the individual to his status and stirring him to his social tasks. The code of Hammurabi gropes toward a justice which shall stimulate the accumulation of wealth without impairing the stability or diminishing the productive power...

Vincent (1904: 753) emphasis added.
NO WOMAN NO CRY
Wailing about Babylon with Bob Marley and the Wailers seems as useless as some contemporary organising practices, such as the way strategic soft human resource management has taken modern society to a similar place as the above quotation, where classical class struggles are no longer the essential problem in society today. What the contemporary calls for is a dealing with new kinds of becomings, in-betweeness, which might be grasped by finding an aesthetic sense that could encompass territorializations of the shapes of things to come.

Life in the twenty-first century is now more than ever before, in the history of human suffering, marked by a constant interbeingness – being stuck in the middle – as in an everlasting intermezzo (following Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari). Rather than solving the problems of our time in a linear fashion, we tend to project ourselves, jumping from problem to problem. Our topography is marked by ongoing overlapping projects, transgressions between work and non-work, dissolutions of thoughts of (pre)determined space and time. Although the petit-bourgeoisie, now perhaps more eagerly than before, seeks walls and a roof on top of a home, it is time to understand that the shelter of the fortress (or the Burg) already started to crumble in the middle ages, with capitalism its decoding. We wander in the ruins of those walls like vagabonds. And what perhaps has to be sought for is the heart of the vagabond – coração vagabundo.

The myth of servile modern capitalism has to be broken. Definitions of the ‘liberal’ society are closely linked to ordered structures of home, family, factory/office-work, leisure... that are starting to be history in today’s society in its becoming.

Organising is the rhythm of the contemporary and at its core lies the saudade of the bossa nova. The active and reactive will and care of saudade determines its nature.

...intermezzo saudade...
...is the oscillation between here and there...
Ortega y Gasset

IN SEARCH OF THE AESTHETIC SENSE
While searching for saudade, this essay moves by first taking a trip from madness to the empty space. The second movement is travelling from the empty space to the window, in order to fill the void with a relational perspective. The third morphosis in this journey is the changing of the window into a door and a doorway. The fourth movement is about including the will and care into the process. The fifth trip is finding a passport. Eventually the project is attracted towards constant motion through finding a home in homelessness in saudade itself. This is the legitimate authorization, and identity of the aesthetic sense. It is the matter of being. It is what the aesthetic sense is made of, obviously to different degrees in different environments. Saudade is the sign of our times. It is being at home with today.

In search of an aesthetic sense, one can dive into oceans of locations for answers. A sensible starting point would be to look through different lenses upon the art of organising itself. There is a vast array of views upon the basic architecture of this work of art. Ideally there is no difference between organising oneself and organising art. It is basically about representing oneself in different contexts. The origins of the oeuvre have been scrutinised both by literary theorists, for example Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, and Philippe Sollers. Especially in the 1960s there was a wide discussion regarding relations between subject and object and text. As a harsh generalization one could say that there was a post-structuralist shift from realist/psycho-individualistic views towards more socially contingent perspectives, where the individual subject was less interesting than the contextual locations of subjects/objects/texts, especially when it comes to the question of authenticity and authority. Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, among others, were exceptions in the ‘post’-movement. Foucault was, according to Deleuze (1988), and in a poetic sense, more modern than the modernists. In juxtaposition, Foucault (1970/1998: 343) noted that ‘perhaps, one day this century (the 20th century) will be known as Deleuzian’. Maybe he was right. Perhaps he just erred regarding the centennial. Both thinkers went beyond the problem of the subjected subject and historicity -- basically trailing paths set up by Friedrich Nietzsche.

The subject has also been a topic of interest for ‘less passionate’ thinkers; ‘creativity scholars’ such as Edward de Bono, or novelists like Leo Tolstoi, and the colourful group of delinquent scientists called ‘organisation scholars’. To take such a heavy burden calls for some madness. Perhaps it has to do with the myth of Sisypheus.

...intermezzo saudade...
...is a “situation of the subject in which it is abandoned by the object”...
Ramon Piñeiro in Para unha filosofía de Saudade

MADNESS
There are a few views upon the origins of art that have found widespread acclaim in societies at large. Perhaps the most common view is that ‘art’ is linked with madness. Foucault (1972/1983) addresses this issue convincingly by stating that what is art cannot belong completely to
the realm of insanity, since the world of the ‘not sane’ is outside the real (which includes the common social sense of art). Georges Bataille has said that he writes in order not to go insane. In order to prove that individuals and collectives alike belong to what is commonly referred to as ‘the world’, then we have to constantly re-orchestrate, re-identify, and re-legitimise ourselves. In other words, we are constantly re-organising our lives through different forms of reassessment. This is what organising is today.

The post-war era had been a state of fairly stable development in a two-polar world. The knack of the 1960s was that empires, especially colonial powers, had started slowly to crumble. ‘I like Ike’ started to move towards ‘Nike – Just Do It’ and other similar victorious slogans. Subjects started simultaneously becoming individuals. The first handbook of Organization Studies was edited by James G. March in 1965. Less than three decades later the cold era of right versus wrong and ‘right or left’ was over. The communist manifesto no longer worked but individuals could not be hit by the hand of management either. In today’s society individuals and collectives alike are treated as organisations ‘as such’. Organisations have to constantly re-account for their doings.12

Organisational legitimisation takes place through ‘storytelling’, which according to different theorising is about ‘bringing order to chaos’ or ‘balancing between order and disorder’. Both views resemble trying to cope with insanity. (Wo)man needs structures. Through the covering make-up of walls one avoids uncertainty and the complex nature of life. Structures may be helpful tools, but they are abstractions. It is so hard to live. Structures provide imaginary shelters. In modern thinking, the potential always precedes and preconditions the real. Following Deleuzian thinking -- in the state of problematisation, neither the potential nor the real precede each other; they co-exist until the problematised moves from the realm of the ‘as perhaps’ to the realm of the ‘as such’.

Trying to cope with complex uncertainties is very natural but in actuality it is against life itself. It is non-life because it is in principle impossible to represent oneself outside the world; more precisely, outside the ambiguities of the real world. Being tends to feel empty without belonging somewhere, without a roadmap to peace with oneself. The craving for security calls paradoxically for abstraction. The problem with security is not merely its utopian sense.

Striving for security is what organising is about in its modern sense. This is actually absurd, because security is a non-place, a place without care (secura in Latin is derived from sine cura, which means without care or carefree, in other words, almost crazy). Yet organisation is longing for a world that is beyond reality. Cura, in opposition, was to Heidegger (1926/1962) what being is about. It lies at the core of being. Curial German is sorge, which has tragic connotations (sorrow). It is through care that we communicate with the world.

Modern organisation14 is not about caring. It is about taking care of something. Organisations today take care of individuals in a similar manner as the church and the state have done in the past. When something has been taken care of, it receives a polis -- a place and a position -- as in politics.15 Different instances are interested in subjecting people according to their particular interests. The politics of such organisation is to give a given identity, as in preconditioning ethics. Modern organisation tends to police action, reaction, and inaction. Going along with predetermined structures is against the nature of being-in-the-world. At least, it is against liberty, once again wondering, wandering amidst the ruins of bourgeois society.

...intermezzo saudade...
...the physical state of chaos and that chaos is all...
Fernando Pessoa

BEYOND IRON COLLARS
Orthodox institutions are ill at ease today with becoming. Institutions attempt to recode capitalism over and over and over again, which resembles conjugative redundancy, and... and ...and ...16 Preconditioning ethics means that organising receives an organisation according to ‘the four iron-collars of representation’.

Identity in the concept
Resemblance in perception
Opposition in the predicate
ANalogy in judgment
What the above signifies, is that when something is represented in a given way (as such), it obviously identifies the subject, which can be called an organisation. The representation/organisation is not only given an identity, it simultaneously is conceived as something legitimate, as it is being re-presented. Upon representation it attempts to resemble the perception thereof. Once it has been presented in a given way it predicates that exact re-presentation which commonly opposes any other potential definitions. This means that from a multitude of possibilities that are ideally attracted to the nth number, it subtracts itself to the One. This One organisation hereby becomes analogous to judgement of itself.

This is a servile way of servicing Organisation as if it were God itself. In this modern sense, following a code of conduct (ethics) is the only way to be ethical. But while coding takes place, that which is organised no longer quite belongs to the code. According to Foucault (1992/1997) however, ethics can be viewed as not preconditioning or defining, but rather as something that is thrown above us (superjected) as potentialities, possible codes of conduct. Superjected ethics...
are not conditions as given, fixed conditions. They act in principle as umbrellas into which one can cut fissures or paint heavens, whatever is at stake. It is a question of liberty. Iron-collars see nothing but repetition, which is attracted towards ignorance, emptiness.

...intermezzo saudade...
......is the sentiment to move towards the greatest presence...

THE EMPTY SPACE
But is the beginning the same as an empty space? The empty space is obviously an interesting idea in principle, because forgetting is the cornerstone of finding out, especially forgetting about history in the spirit of Nietzsche (for example, 1882/1987 and 1883-1888/1968). The empty space is virtuous when it entails non-knowledge as its tectonic base. This reasoning comes close to the Aristotelian view on potentiality. Agamben (1999: 177-184) states that according to Aristotle, human potentiality lies in the abyss of human impotentiality. Agamben’s perspective lies basically in human potentiality vis-à-vis her choice of using or not using her potentiality. Along Nietzschean lines of thought, this could also include that which is not yet known. If one accepts that knowledge is basically an invention, as Foucault boldly interprets the first ‘less mad’ edition of Gay Science, knowing in becoming is of interest. In both senses though, knowledge ‘as perhaps’ as problematised - neither sane or insane – is of particular interest. In a similar vein it signifies that what is already known or obvious (such as a structure or a given code of conduct) is commonplace, or banal ‘finding out about’, and is thus more or less equal to nonsense.

The empty space or a pure start from scratch is basically an oxymoron since nothing can lead to anything else but nothing. Whatever is put into a void cannot avoid that it must come from somewhere (elsewhere). In this sense it is not a very fruitful ground for cultivating further research. The idea of nothing is closely related to the idea of chaos.

The concept of ‘emptiness as the beginning’ takes many shapes in the literature. The empty space is a particularly theatrical advance upon the origin of art. It bears many names of which the ‘tabula rasa’ is probably the most famous. As this project is following madness and Nietzsche, and in particular through Gilles Deleuze (as well as his work with Félix Guattari), our attempt here is not to look for beginnings and ends, but to stay in the middle by advancing from the middle. The interlude or the intermezzo is the most fruitful place to search. It involves yesterday, today and tomorrow interwoven together. The state of interbeingness involves a principle of infinite connectedness, and works out of the conjugation and... and...and. It also involves lines of flight.

...intermezzo saudade...
...especially in the 1960s bossa nova became known as lounge music or elevator music...
L. E. Vator

THE WINDOW
The window is perhaps a more vigorous artefact as a starting point, as a window is already something in contrast to the empty space by itself. The window naturally has a desire for relations. In representation of phenomena we need relations to the second and to the third in order to be able to create an identity. But the window itself is not this nor that. The window lies in-between this and can thus not belong to either realm. The window is a point of de-parture. It is a point of rupture in the same vein as aesthetics may be the point of rupture between metaphysics and the real, following Arthur Schopenhauer’s line of thinking. The canvas is the window for the painter as paper is the window the author needs to be able to express her/his relation to the world.

The Latin word for window, fenestra, has its roots in Greek phainô, which means to bring to light or and to appear. Phainô is also the root for the word phenomenon. Thus the window lies at the core of the phenomenology of aesthetics in a multiple sense. What is interesting about the word is its double (original Greek) significance, since bringing something into light means on the one hand having experienced/lived through hard work, which means taking a lot of time and effort. On the other hand, it signifies appearing as in ‘appearing all of a sudden’. This appearance is as if it happened almost by chance, giving significations which just might be dubious, seductive, or even false, since this is quite contrary to the ascetic nature of the first meaning.

Kirkeby (2000: 239-240) notes that meaning is not something that does not manifest itself but is epiphany. It is simultaneously something that appears at the surface and is something that one has to pay a heavy price for in terms of experience. More precisely phainô, in Greek (Latin adventus) means:

...to bring to daylight, appear, make visible, make audible, make acknowledgeable, but it also means to shine, and to happen, to call on, to be present. The word ‘phainô’ is the core in the word ‘phainomenon’: ‘phenomenon’.

Meaning breaks on us. This is the insight transferred by this many-sided word that invokes all senses, just like the happenings on the stage do, but primarily sight and hearing. A word that fuses all its facets into one centre of contingency.

Meaning as epiphany is simultaneously something thrown at us from the flow of time, and something summoning us on behalf of a necessity which only draws on a legitimacy that comes from the very fact that it exists. Thus it contains, contemporaneously, the possibilities of holiness, and deceit.

(op.cit: 240)
If we now return to our definition of organising as identification, performance is that through which it presents itself as an extended event – with the obvious parallel to theatre. In this connection, organising perhaps resembles Plato’s khôra from Timaeus. Khôra is the mother-event. It both is and is not, and it is both this and that, and neither. In a sense it is pure virtuality. Yet it does not really exist. Khôra is the receptacle of all becoming. From this viewpoint, organising is close to khôra, but not quite. Khôra precedes the event. Organising is the medium through which the event itself is actualised. It is of great relevance to understand the event in its actualised. It is in the event that organising takes off from the virtual sphere. This will/care is synonymous with will/care of organising, matters. This is where the intensity, its active or reactive quality of the will/care of organising, depends on what kind of forces are prevailing upon its actualisation. It is in the event of actualisation. It is in the event that organising starts unfolding. The saudade of given loci determine what is projected upon production. What Deleuze refers to as a ‘screen’ (below) could be equally viewed as the window. Chaos does not exist; it is an abstraction because it is inseparable from a screen that makes something – something rather than nothing – emerge from it. Chaos would be a pure Many, a purely disjunctive diversity, while the something is a One, not a pregiven unity, but instead the indefinite article that designates a certain singularity.

Deleuze (1988/1993: 76) [Italics in the original].

### PROJECTION OF PRODUCTION

What is produced in the event is thus the actualisation of organising. The saudade of given loci determine what is projected upon production. It is in the event that organising takes off from the virtual sphere. When something is being actualised it must be seen in relation to its interbeingness and the local milieux. More precisely the how and what is being produced is:

- Bringing before a collective, which can be seen as ‘the people’, ‘the government’, ‘the critic’ or ‘the judge’.
- It is what is acted or presented or performed or re-presented.
- The above means also that when one produces, one exposes something ‘for sale’.
- This also signifies that one places something before another.
- When accepting the interbeing it also means to draw or stretch out, prolonging and extending. This extension also implies that production goes on.
- Nevertheless it also signifies bringing something to a place, which could also be a grave.
- Simultaneously, still related to the concept of interbeingness, one brings along other ‘productions’. One also leads as well as brings away.
- In a similar vein one brings to light or discloses or exposes.
- Which on the other hand signifies that one brings forth. One brings into the world as in a-letheia. It is bearing and begetting as well as bringing forth to trial.
- Now that implies also to make something to grow, to advance and to promote.
- Actualising can also be seen as merely lengthening or prolonging.
- Production is in a sense just to lead.
- In that sense it is a question of bringing up as well as educating.
- It is a question of planting and cultivating.
- Eventually one can bring the traditional meaning of production into play namely that of making, devising, producing, and bringing into use.

Now it is not just as simple as that. When something is actualised, the production, and becoming of ‘that something’ entails simultaneous productions of
- ethics
- politics
- knowledge
- culture
- identities

The list is endless. But the point is exactly to understand this multitude as One as n – 1. In cognitive capitalism today, once something new regarding collectives is observed, it is immediately subjected to attempts to make it accountable. As such, or as if, id est almost as such...

To produce is basically to lead forward. What is lead forward is primarily determined by the saudade in the milieux in a particular place. What people perhaps understand, but do not explicitly have a saudade for, is what organising in all its connotations implies, as not-quite-organised,
as virtual and real. Because although we have statements desiring stalemates, being has nothing to do with a preconditioning set of rules, and boards with given pieces, with their preconditioning actions. Computers may beat grand masters in chess with artificial intelligence, but social action is not written as on three pages of rules. People nevertheless worry about this ‘artificial intelligence’. Art is craftsmanship: once it loses its saudade for creation, novelty and difference, it is no longer art. It becomes a commodity. The virtuous virtuality of the virtuoso cannot be replicated. The one who already knows and does not have the saudade of searching over and over again is chained to the impotence of the status quo.

...intermezzo saudade...

...a feeling which is born from separation, certainly, but which evokes delight...
Dom Duarte

By turning the head away from homesickness by heading home, one cannot achieve very much. Saudade calls for the will to know, and caring about it. It signifies the movement from problem to problem, rather than professing knowledge/skills one already possesses.

...intermezzo saudade...

...The famous saudade of the Portuguese is a vague and constant desire for something that does not and probably cannot exist for something other than the present, a turning towards the past or towards the future; not an active discontent or poignant sadness but an indolent dreamy wistfulness...
A. F. G. Bell

THE PASSPORT
The arrival and resting at a port for good, permanently, is like being one of the cave-dwellers in Socrates’ metaphor in Plato’s (1992) Republic. The men in the cave incidentally have chains around their necks, like the four iron-collars of representation. Socrates is relating ‘our nature in its education and want of education’ to the cave. In short the men know of the world only through shadows on the wall, like a screen between a fire on higher ground and the prisoners. If one of the men could leave and then return and tell about reality outside, the other prisoners would not believe him, since the cave is all that they know about the world.

Organization theory knows this story best through Gareth Morgan (1986). He explains that a way of seeing becomes a way of thinking, and vice versa. That is a part of Socrates’ point, but if one has the ‘want of education’ to read a few pages further, the story unfolds in accordance with Nietzsche’s ‘will to power’. In ancient Greece, truth and truthfulness, aletheia, meant coming into the open, into light, appearance. The image of the dark cave versus the light outside is thus a suitable metaphor. According to Heidegger, the ascent towards the light was a painful exercise that meant a lot of care.24 After the journey, the freed prisoner would find joy in the change and feel pity for the others. Such continuous will/care is what saudade is or is not about.

‘...education is not what certain of its professors declare it to be. They say, if you remember, that they put knowledge in the soul where no knowledge has been, as if men put sight into blind eyes.’
‘Yes, they do’, he said.

‘But our present argument,’ I said, ‘shows that there resides in each man’s soul this faculty and this instrument wherewith he learns, and that it is just as if the eye could not turn from darkness to light unless the whole body turned with it; so this faculty and this instrument must be wheeled round together with the whole soul

away from that which is becoming, until it is able to look upon and endure being and the brightest blaze of being...’
Plato.

What this entails is that saudade calls for the will and the care, which implies a great deal of learning and experience. It signifies that one is able to jump into Aristotle’s abyss of impotentiality, or has the courage to climb over an enormous mountain of ignorance. The ascetic, the petit-bourgeois, the cave-dweller, is at home with asceticism along the lines spoken by Nietzsche (1882/1987). The ascetic wants as little pain as possible and lives accordingly. What s/he thus misses, is the joy of finding out even the tiniest piece of knowledge. That joy can only be found if one truly submits oneself to the enterprise. It calls for devotion, courage, patience, and perhaps a little bit of madness. To the ascetic or slave, the abyss, or its inverse, the mountain, is a ‘no’, whereas the one who cares and wants to know looks at them stating: Yes!

Institutions of diverging kinds attempt to make account of that which is already on the move. They stamp passports as if they would put travellers on hold, although a passport is merely a legitimisation to go through doors – contrary to being held captive in abstract ports or camps. Capturing representation per se is of course a Doors-like adventure, along the lines of ‘Break on through to the other side’.25

...intermezzo saudade...
...is an all encompassing situation, lived and tested by the totality of being’...
Sabell in La Saudade por dentro

MOVEMENT BEYOND MANIFESTOS26
Saudade is to be in society today where a multitude, as milieux, as simultaneous mediums/environments, whose in principle infinite interconnectedness, in their inbetweeness, brings with them processes as durations. Memory
works out of the durations, like an inverse saudade or another form of belonging. Depending on the nature of the will/care of saudade, different kinds of organising will occur.

If one longs for security, one is reactive towards saudade. In such cases one wants to go home: one longs for a place one already knows, or one attempts to make the situation definable and accountable. This is reactive slave’s logic. Even worse is, of course, just saying no for no’s sake. This logic looks for preconditioning.

Conforming to such thinking, and not even questioning, is what Nietzsche (1882/1987: 17) would have called despicable (especially as in life there are so many things happening). Being an active follower of the yes, as in ‘yeah’, can also mean that one has no will or care beyond ignorance and apathy, at one level or another. In some senses this is what some organisations are (against knowledge) attempting to create. This logic is slave’s logic – repetition and imitation. Here, will/care is at home with preconditioning. What this amounts to is that every ‘no’ is beyond reality. In such a case one can only operate within the already established good, ‘yes’, part.

The one who lives at home with saudade says actively “Yes” to the potential force of saudade. This logic is excited and receives stimuli from saudade. The active person has the ability of forgetting and moving. The one who has a vulgar morale as a principle defines as little as possible in advance, thus attempts to avoid preconditioning. This implies that one says yes to reality and potentiality, including both every yes and every no. The vulgar morale is at home with the problematic of saudade. It is attracted to ‘as perhaps’ rather than to this or that ‘as such’.

In looking for a sublime aesthetic sense, it might be found in the one who is reactive to saudade in the sense that reactive forces are acted. The reactive master is the one who wants to destroy in order to create.

‘And whoever wants to be a creator in good and evil, must first be an annihilator and break values. Thus the highest evil belongs to the greatest goodness: but this is – being creative.’
Nietzsche (1888/1989: 327)

The collective force of this world in becoming is that in it the potential is equal with the real. This is the case with problematisation, which is the sole potential virtue of saudade. This means that it is both real and virtual. Questioning from the will/care of questioning for the ‘yes’, is why the maybe or as perhaps lies at the active core of saudade. When the as perhaps becomes ‘as such’ or even ‘as if’, it is no longer of interest, since it can now be orchestrated towards banality. When something is questioned, it is both potential and real at the very same time. Neither one precedes each other, whereas in the world of sovereign or commonplace ethics, the potential always preconditions reality. Life as problematised is being amidst milieux of problems vis-à-vis a world that looks for origins and ends. Once one sees in line with Aristotelian thought, that the potentiality of man lies in the abyss of human impotentiality, one has to understand that secure ports and homes are beyond the active saudade. The enormous mountain one has to climb is not a conventional ‘oh no’ – the infinite roads-not-taken are a challenging Yes! Saying yes to saudade in this seemingly infinite universe makes people their own creators, artists, virtuosos.

Saudade is linked to the Age of Discoveries. It is time to understand that every age, every day, and each moment, is linked to saudade. Carpe Diem.

chega de saudade27
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Portuguese ass.

Only 14% of the population would identify themselves Portuguese in origin. Portuguese and Italians alike, 15 million Spaniards as well as 12 million Germans as and 38.5 million of multiracial origin, the rest being of European origin: 25 million today is around 175 million. It has about 700,000 inhabitants of Aboriginal origin, one million slaves of African origin had been brought to the country. Brazil's population European settlers and only 100,000 indigenous Brazilians whereas about 3.5 of 5 million indigenous Brazilians at the time. By 1900 there were about 6 million country after it had been discovered by Cabral in 1500. There were an estimate from the motherland of the Portuguese settlers that commenced taking over the another former Portuguese colony, Brazil.

The Portuguese Empire was at the peak of its might after the papal bull of 1493 divided between Portugal and Spain in such a way that Portugal got almost all of Portugal fought to maintain its sovereignity in Góa (lost to India in 1961), Guinea Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique, all which became independent following the ‘Carnation revolution’, the latter two gaining their independence in 1975. The Portuguese Empire was at the peak of its might after the papal bull of 1493 and the Treaty of Tordesillas the following year. The world outside Europe was divided between Portugal and Spain in such a way that Portugal got almost all of Africa and Asia while Spain got almost all of the Americas. Saudade is also related to the nostalgia of those heydays of Portugal.

To the Portuguese the melancholy of the fado is linked to ‘the Portuguese being’ if one is allowed to propose such an arrogant definition. It is certainly through music that saudade is primarily known outside Portugal. The roots are to be traced to another former Portuguese colony, Brazil.

Brazilian saudade is said to be inherent in the culture because of the distancing from the motherland of the Portuguese settlers that commenced taking over the country after it had been discovered by Cabral in 1500. There were an estimate of 5 million indigenous Brazilians at the time. By 1900 there were about 6 million European settlers and only 100,000 indigenous Brazilians whereas about 3.5 million slaves of African origin had been brought to the country. Brazil's population today is around 175 million. It has about 700,000 inhabitants of Aboriginal origin, 1.5 million of Japanese origin, 10 million of Arab origin, 11 million of African origin, and 38.5 million of multiracial origin, the rest being of European origin: 25 million Portuguese and Italians alike, 15 million Spaniards as well as 12 million Germans as the largest groups.29 Only 14% of the population would identify themselves Portuguese in origin. Being Portuguese is not of particular merit in Brazil today. There is, for instance, the common curse of “burro portugues”, meaning Portuguese ass. Brazilians are extremely proud of their own country, while generally admitting to its huge problems. Brazil has vast natural resources yet it is for some practically a ‘third world’ country. This potentiality – versus immense problems, such as a population growth from approximately 20 million a century ago to 175 million today, of which an increase of 75 million has occurred over the past 30 years, including 9 million street children in urban areas – is part of saudade in the country today.

Saudade is, however, best known to us through the worldwide popularity of the bossa nova, which is basically a fusion of samba and jazz, and first became popular in the 1960s. The fusion of jazz and samba means that the rhythm has predominantly African roots. The first well-known bossa is ‘Chega de Saudade’ written by Antonio Carlos Jobim in 1958. Through the film ‘Orfeu Negro’, directed by Marcel Camus with music by Jobim and Vinicius de Moraes, it received wide international attention: it won the ‘Palme D’or’ at the Cannes film festival in 1959 and then received an ‘Oscar’ for best foreign-language film in 1960. Other famous Brazilian artists connected to bossa nova include Astrud and João Gilberto, Carlos Lyra, Caetano Veloso and Elis Regina.

Some sources claim (although these things are very hard to verify) that Antonio Carlos Jobim is the most recorded modern composer after Lennon and McCartney. Songs like ‘Girl from Ipanema’, ‘Corcovado’, ‘One Note Samba’, ‘Wave’ and ‘Desafinado’ are popular, especially with jazz musicians. Artists like Stan Getz, Ella Fitzgerald, and Frank Sinatra made the genre popular around the world. It has had a renaissance in past years through, for instance, Bebel Gilberto and most recently with the collaboration of Sergio Mendes with ‘The Black Eyed Peas’, Stevie Wonder, and Justin Timberlake.

Saudade in bossa nova is mainly related to lack, desire and sadness regarding love. In one way or another it often includes passion. It also expresses homesickness and longing as in ‘Saudade de Bahia’. The tune is predominantly melancholic, but includes memories of happiness and joy. The theme of separation is common, but it is not purely sad; rather, it is hopefulness in a sad tune – problematic.

**APPENDIX**

Saudade

There is very little knowledge of how the concept of saudade has emerged. It is probably derived from Latin solitātus – solitude; but the term saudade exists only in Portuguese and Galician. Simple internet searches omitting the Portuguese language still gets almost 5 million entries, demonstrating the interest in the concept. Dom Duarte (1391-1438), who was the king of Portugal and Algarve 1431-1438, was the first one to define saudade, in either his Livro Da Ensinança De Bern Cavalgar Toda Sela (The Art of Riding on Every Saddle) or in Leal Conselheiro (Fidel Councellor). In the latter, he describes saudade as something that comes from the senses and not from reason.28

The term is generally associated with the Age of Discoveries. It is thought that saudade came from the longing of those who were out at sea, perhaps shipwrecked, perhaps never returning. The Portuguese Empire lasted longer than any other: it endured from 1415 to 1999, with the return of Macao to China; however it ended in practice with the overthrow of the Salazar dictatorship in 1974. While countries colonized by other nations were given independence, Portugal fought to maintain its sovereignity in Góa (lost to India in 1961), Guinea Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique, all which became independent following the ‘Carnation revolution’, the latter two gaining their independence in 1975.

The Portuguese Empire was at the peak of its might after the papal bull of 1493 and the Treaty of Tordesillas the following year. The world outside Europe was divided between Portugal and Spain in such a way that Portugal got almost all of Africa and Asia while Spain got almost all of the Americas. Saudade is also related to the nostalgia of those heydays of Portugal.

To the Portuguese the melancholy of the fado is linked to ‘the Portuguese being’ if one is allowed to propose such an arrogant definition. It is certainly through music that saudade is primarily known outside Portugal. The roots are to be traced to another former Portuguese colony, Brazil.

Brazilian saudade is said to be inherent in the culture because of the distancing from the motherland of the Portuguese settlers that commenced taking over the country after it had been discovered by Cabral in 1500. There were an estimate of 5 million indigenous Brazilians at the time. By 1900 there were about 6 million European settlers and only 100,000 indigenous Brazilians whereas about 3.5 million slaves of African origin had been brought to the country. Brazil's population today is around 175 million. It has about 700,000 inhabitants of Aboriginal origin, 1.5 million of Japanese origin, 10 million of Arab origin, 11 million of African origin, and 38.5 million of multiracial origin, the rest being of European origin: 25 million Portuguese and Italians alike, 15 million Spaniards as well as 12 million Germans as the largest groups.29

Only 14% of the population would identify themselves Portuguese in origin. Being Portuguese is not of particular merit in Brazil today. There is, for instance, the common curse of “burro portugues”, meaning Portuguese ass. Brazilians are extremely proud of their own country, while generally admitting to its huge problems. Brazil has vast natural resources yet it is for some practically a ‘third world’ country. This potentiality – versus immense problems, such as a population growth from approximately 20 million a century ago to 175 million today, of which an increase of 75 million has occurred over the past 30 years, including 9 million street children in urban areas – is part of saudade in the country today.

Saudade is, however, best known to us through the worldwide popularity of the bossa nova, which is basically a fusion of samba and jazz, and first became popular in the 1960s. The fusion of jazz and samba means that the rhythm has predominantly African roots. The first well-known bossa is ‘Chega de Saudade’ written by Antonio Carlos Jobim in 1958. Through the film ‘Orfeu Negro’, directed by Marcel Camus with music by Jobim and Vinicius de Moraes, it received wide international attention: it won the ‘Palme D’or’ at the Cannes film festival in 1959 and then received an ‘Oscar’ for best foreign-language film in 1960. Other famous Brazilian artists connected to bossa nova include Astrud and João Gilberto, Carlos Lyra, Caetano Veloso and Elis Regina.

Some sources claim (although these things are very hard to verify) that Antonio Carlos Jobim is the most recorded modern composer after Lennon and McCartney. Songs like ‘Girl from Ipanema’, ‘Corcovado’, ‘One Note Samba’, ‘Wave’ and ‘Desafinado’ are popular, especially with jazz musicians. Artists like Stan Getz, Ella Fitzgerald, and Frank Sinatra made the genre popular around the world. It has had a renaissance in past years through, for instance, Bebel Gilberto and most recently with the collaboration of Sergio Mendes with ‘The Black Eyed Peas’, Stevie Wonder, and Justin Timberlake.

Saudade in bossa nova is mainly related to lack, desire and sadness regarding love. In one way or another it often includes passion. It also expresses homesickness and longing as in ‘Saudade de Bahia’. The tune is predominantly melancholic, but includes memories of happiness and joy. The theme of separation is common, but it is not purely sad; rather, it is hopefulness in a sad tune – problematic.
The verse that perhaps expresses the central mood of saudade is by Caetano Veloso in his beautiful ‘Coração Vagabundo’ (Heart of a Vagabond):

My heart does not tire  
Of having hope  
Of a day becoming  
Everything it desires  
My heart of a child  
Is not solely a memento  
Of a woman's happy appearance  
Which passed through a dream  
Without saying adieu  
Which made my eyes a crying  
Without an end  
My heart of a vagabond  
Wants to guard the world in me

NOTES
1 > ‘Saudade’ was voted the seventh most difficult word to translate in the world by a panel of one thousand translators set up by a translation company in Great Britain as informed by the BBC on June 23rd 2004. Various interpretations will be presented throughout this essay. The difficulty to define it can be described by the fact that an advanced search on the internet with the words ‘definition’ and ‘saudade’ in Portuguese only gives 689,000 entries in 0.13 seconds. http://www.google.be/search?as_q=de
2 > This article is based on and copy/pasted from Harju (2005).
3 > The new crack or style (translation by the author as well as all subsequent translations unless indicated otherwise).
4 > Sadness has no end, happiness yes.
5 > Cheers to saudade in Portuguese (A votre santé saudade/ Salut saudade.)
6 > Oh my saudade divine light.
7 > The struggles have been shipped to the Third World, which does not undermine the problem, but theorizing in a classical way regarding ‘them and us’ in our privileged societies is no longer the organisational, metaphysical or aesthetical issue at stake.
8 > This essay does not in any way attempt at a distinction between individual and collective organisation/organising. According to this enterprise such categorising is almost futile, as individuals should be viewed as organised collectives of the texts that have existed in their milieux.
9 > For a brief introduction to saudade see Appendix 1.
11 > See e.g. Camus (1942).
13 > The active and reactive types are elaborated from Deleuze’s (1962/1983) topology of Nietzsche’s will to power.
14 > Please note that static ‘organisation’ differs from dynamic ‘organising’.
15 > Politics comes from Greek polis which meant a city/state (place). Politics referred to the doings of the citizens in that particular place. The word police is also derived from the same root.
17 > ‘The four iron collars of representation’ is based on Gilles Deleuze (1968/1994: 262ff) and amended by the author. See also Klaus Harju (2004).
21 > Ascetic is derived from Greek askētikos. In Ancient Greece it meant something that takes a lot of work as in practicing a craft or sports. The ascetic of modern times is almost a contradiction something that will be discussed later. See p. 8-9.
23 > This section is based on a transfusion of different dictionaries. The main sources are the Greco-Roman dictionaries at www.perseus.tufts.edu and Pomay (1768).
24 > Nietzsche would have called it ‘will’. According to this project the will and the care are what saudade is about. It is however not a will/care to power. It is a question of willing or caring to do or not to do anything. It is beyond the realms of power.
25 > If the doors of perception were cleansed, every thing would appear to man as it is: infinite’. From William Blake’s poem ‘The Marriage of Heaven and Hell’, Plate 14 5th stanza (1790-1793).
26 > The authorities of this enterprise are somewhat sceptical towards this information because of the rareness in availability of these two works. According to Dictionnaire International de Termes Littéraires written by Inês Oseki-Dépré. Accessed July 15th 2007 at http://www.ditinfo.arttest/art3981.php there is only one copy of the latter book at Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.
27 > No more saudade or exactly enough of saudade, which was the name of the first popular bossa usually translated as ‘No more blues’.
28 > The term ‘as perhaps’ is taken from Jacques Derrida (2000). Anything that is stated ‘as such’ belongs to a realm that can be subjected to sovereign powers. As long as something belongs to the realm of ‘as perhaps’ (e.g. when something is problematised – still seeking a solution) it is free from subjection and is both potential and problematised – still seeking a solution). It is free from subjection and is both potential and thus not solely a memento. The word police is also derived.
30 > Samba is the most famous of the various forms of music arising from African roots in Brazil. The name samba most probably comes from the Angolan semba (mesemba) - a religious rhythm. Samba developed as a distinctive kind of music at the beginning of the 20th century in Rio de Janeiro (then the capital of Brazil) under the strong influence of immigrant black people from Bahia.
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