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Abstract

In this chapter, we present two case studies to explore the ways fractals operate in relation to counter-narrative in order to accomplish cross-cultural change. It is our contention that the interplay between a dominant cultural narrative and the many less known counter narratives is played out at the level of the antenarrative pattern. An antenarrative has been widely studied as the beforeness of narrative coherence, and the many possible alternative bets on the future beyond just those of the narrative plot. Recently, the antenarrative concepts of beneath, between, and becoming have been suggested as working within the narrative and counternarrative dynamic. Our contribution lies in developing an understanding of the subterranean ‘fractal’ patterns between antenarratives out of which narrative and antenarratives interplay is affected. We develop a fractal analytic theory of and methods for understanding this dynamic interplay in its cross-cultural sociality. Fractals are iterating patterns that occur across different scalabilities, such as from micro to macro. The two cases we develop are firstly the cross-cultural aspects of a merger, and secondly, the cross-cultural dynamics of homeless and home-full in American society. The cultural of homelessness and its cross-cultural dynamics has not been studied previously from a counternarrative, fractal, or antenarrative perspectives.

Introduction

Fractal change management as originally developed by Henderson & Boje (2015) is an approach to managing organizing processes and cultural dynamics. By looking for and thematically identifying fractals patterns that emerge in storytelling, fractal changement management offers a theoretical framework that help managers to understand what fractal patterns are and how they influence on organizational change and development processes. The ambition is to develop a methodology for analysing and working with fractal change processes. The theoretical framework for fractal change management implies working with key concepts such as fractals, narratives, counter-narratives, living story, as well as the antenarrative sociomaterial organizing processes as an approach to understand organizational change and cultural dynamics.

We define 'storytelling' as the whole playing field, with three interweaving energies: 'living story webs' in space-time-materiality event-ness, with more abstract 'grand narratives', interconnected by quantum relationships of 'antenarrative.' Simply put, antenarrative is a bridge between living story webs and grand narratives (and counternarrative) by underlying antenarrative patterns. Two pathways between living story and grand narrative, the linear- and cyclic-antenarratives are from past predicted to recur in the future. This is known as retrospective sensemaking. The other two pathways, the spiral and the rhizome, move from the future to the past. In this chapter, we relate these two temporal pathways to Heidegger, Bakhtin, and Deleuze’s material ontologies, by Boje called
'quantum storytelling.' We want to look at the wider sociality of storytelling, at what is called the fractal patterns of its cross-cultural sociality.

There are patterns of interplay at the level of cultural ritual and other sociality behaviors that are fractal. "A fractal is defined here as a recurrence of self-similar and/or instability processes across scales: individual, unit, inter-unit, organization, inter-organization, regional, international, global" (Boje, 2015: 10, bold and italics in original). Our contribution is a fractal analytic theory and method to understand the dynamics of narrative and counter narratives.

Our purpose is to work out the patterns in cross-cultural storytelling dynamics, at the level of narrative-counternarrative, living stories, and the antenarrative threads of embodied intentionality that tie the storytelling field to its ritual and ceremonial practices. The contribution therefore is to go beyond the text and orality and get at the ritual practices, the tacit and prereflexive ones. In this way we endeavor to do something beyond retrospective sensemaking, and get at the subaltern aspects of the spatializing, temporizing, and mattering of the storytelling texture.

In the beginning of the chapter, we present a teaser to two case studies on cross-cultural dynamics. Then we proceed to unfold the fractal analytic storytelling theory and methodology for analyzing and understanding this cross-cultural dynamics. Finally, we discuss the cases by applying the theoretical and methodological framework and close the chapter by summarizing our research contributions and pointing out direction for further research.

**Teaser: The Cross-Cultural Merger Case**

The merger case presents a storytelling on a struggle between cross-cultural counternarratives and the antenarrative process towards the formation of a new dominating cultural narrative.

In 2008 and voted for with only a marginal majority, two competing agricultural consultancy non-profit associations (Alpha House and Beta/Delta House) decided to merge and form a new company. Due to the long history of intense competition and inherited hatred, the merger was strongly opposed by especially Alpha House, including a number of managers, employees, customers and owners. The Alpha opponents preferred to merge with another major competitor on the market called Zeta House as they already had some insight knowledge of this company through their network relations. In fact, this was attempted but as the merger proposal failed, the only rational option left was then to merge with Beta/Delta House.

As a result of a previous merger, Beta/Delta House is composed by the two houses, Beta and Delta, each located in two different cities, and run from the headquarter of Beta House. Alpha House is located in a third city. After the merger, the headquarter continues to be located at Beta House as the biggest of the three houses, measured in numbers of employees and the size of the city. The merged company employs about 200 employees and is owned by its customers.

The strategic and economic advantages of the merger were clear. Due to the merger, the company became the largest consultancy company in its main market area and the fifth largest at the national level. With a presence in the three main cities, it remained close to the local customers at the same time as it reinforced its market position. By merging, they eliminated their strong competition against each other on a very competitive market characterized by intense rivalry.
Also between the merging companies, severe conflicts arose and ended up endangering the survival of the company. In Alpha House, the merger was referred to as marrying their worst enemy; a storytelling that contributed to reproducing and confirming the Us-Them cross-cultural identity construction. Due to the fact that the headquarter was located in the home city of Beta House and that Beta House was a bigger company as regard the number of employees and branches, Alpha House feared that the merger would be an acquisition in disguise. To reinforce their position in the merger, Alpha maintained that they economically contributed much more to the merger than Beta/Delta that according to Alpha were performing below expectation. However, as the top management omitted to create an opening balance sheet, this dispute was never clarified and the balance was never settled. Thus the issue of who contributed the most was an ongoing dispute, inflaming the relationship, and further cementing the Us-Them narrative.

The fact that the headquarter was located in the home city of Beta House and that Beta House was a bigger company as regard the number of employees and branches, Alpha House feared that the merger in fact was an acquisition in disguise. To reinforce their position in the merger, Alpha maintained that they economically contributed much more to the merger than Beta/Delta that according to Alpha were performing below expectation. However, as the top management omitted to create an opening balance sheet, this dispute was never clarified and the balance was never settled. Thus the issue of who contributed the most was an ongoing dispute, inflaming the relationship, and further cementing the Us-Them narrative.

Due to the mutual hatred and the Alpha House resistance against the merger, the top management hesitated to do any attempts of integrating the merging companies. Thus the economic and synergetic advantages of the merger were lost, threatening the survival of the company.

In two and a half year, the organization thus experienced four different CEOs and a board of directors who discussed their disagreements in the public media. A drop in customer and employee satisfaction reflected the lack of trust in the company and the management. Not surprisingly, this development resulted in a growing deficit increasing from DDK 6 million in 2008 to 11.5 million in 2009.

This was the situation when the fourth CEO, Steven, was hired in September 2010 to turn around the company. Initiating cost reduction and taking steps towards a strategic and business development of the company, he succeeded in turning the deficit around to a surplus on 1.5 million in 2012 and on 3.5 million in the end of 2012. However, as the revenue continued to decrease from DDK 140 million in 2010 to 120 million in September 2012, the company still faced major economic challenges, and Steven still needed to prove that the strategic actions initiated to increase sales and to further develop the business would pay off. Meanwhile, resistance in some parts of Alpha House grew and resulted in a chock when a whole Alpha department chose to resign in order to work with Zeta, the other competitor. As the customers started to flee in order to follow the resigned employees, this event, once more, pushed the company towards the edge of survival.

**Teaser: The Homeless Veteran Theatre Case**

The second case involves homeless veterans in southern New Mexico. This case presents a storytelling between the dominant cultural narrative, in which the homeless are negatively stereotyped and the formation of an antenarrative as developed by the veterans through theater performance.
Veterans were identified at two locations in Las Cruces, New Mexico. The first was a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) apartment complex, designed specifically for veterans in transition. The second location was the Mesilla Valley Community of Hope (MVCH). The Community of Hope offers tent shelters, along with a number of social support services, all located in a single locality (MVCH, 2015). There is an overrepresentation of veterans in the homeless population, therefore MVCH offers services specific to the veteran population (Perl, 2014).

Homeless individuals are often negatively stereotyped by dominant culture in a number of ways. Knecht and Martinez (2009) suggest that widely labelling the homeless as alcoholics, drug abusers or mentally ill, most likely occurs due to infrequent intergroup contact between those who are homeless and those who are not. Participating in service projects to aid the homeless has been shown to transform previously held negative stereotypes (Hunt, 2007; Knecht & Martinez, 2009). Veteran’s Theater was developed in an attempt to counteract negative stereotypes of the homeless. Interestingly, this project may have a more unique means of dispelling myths in that this method includes storytelling by homeless veterans to the public, rather than the public offering assistance to homeless veterans.

Veterans for this project held a performance on the New Mexico State University campus in April of 2015. The play consisted of five separate acts, each with a theme designed to convey the lived experiences of homeless veterans in the region. The first act involved a monologue by a retired female 1st Sargent of the U.S. Army. She shared the story of how she and her husband came to be homeless (Boje, Svane & Gergerich, in review).

The second act was held as an unrehearsed meeting involving residents of Camp Hope. These meetings take place at MVCH on a weekly basis, wherein residents discuss concerns and jointly decide upon rules to govern the Camp (Boje et al., in review). A topic of regular concern is the distribution of the drug “Spice,” outside of the Camp and efforts by the residents to prevent the spread of its use.

The third act illustrates the ability of drug representatives to meet with doctors at will. They work to persuade doctors to prescribe medications from the large pharmaceutical companies for whom they work. During this portion of the play, veterans experience a long wait to be seen at the clinic, while the doctor is being wooed by a drug representative with gifts and a complimentary meal.

In act four, veterans continue to experience difficulty in being seen in a timely manner by the doctors at the Veteran’s Administration (VA). One veteran who is quite sick is turned away, with an appointment to be seen a month later. The actor takes a moment to offer a monologue, letting the audience know that this part of the performance is based upon an actual set of events in which he became deathly ill while waiting for his appointment.

Act five works to highlight the potential for more attentive treatment by the VA staff, towards homeless veterans. In this act, a homeless veteran has had his medication stolen at a shelter and is unable to obtain a refill. The social worker maneuvers around agency policy and administrators, in an effort to provide the veteran with the care that he desperately needs.

In this chapter, the proposed fractal analytic theory contributes by providing a framework for understanding the cross-cultural storytelling dynamics as it occurs in the interplay between dominant narratives and cross-cultural counternarratives played out at the level of antenarrative processes in the
two cases. To comprehend the dynamics of the two cross-cultural cases, we need to develop the fractal storytelling framework.

**Antenarrative Fractal Theory and Methodology**

The ‘quantum storytelling field’ theory has been worked out in several books (Boje, 2014; Boje & Henderson, 2014; Henderson & Boje, 2015) and articles (Boje & Haley, 2014; Boje, Rosile, Saylors, and Saylors 2015; Boje, Haley, & Saylors, 2015; Svane & Boje, 2015; Boje, Svane, Henderson & Strevel in press), and is the topic of the annual Quantum Storytelling Conference ([http://quantumstorytelling.org](http://quantumstorytelling.org)). The quantum storytelling field is defined here as relation of grand narratives and living story webs, with antenarrative threads playing important pre-reflexive transformative relationships in *spacetimemattering*. Spacetimemattering is the inseparability of spatializing, temporalizing, and mattering in the ontological situation. This storytelling ontology is to be unfolded in the following.

![Figure 1: The Quantum Storytelling Field](image)
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The quantum storytelling field is visualized in figure 1, illustrating the interweaving of grand narratives, living story web and the antenarrative relation in-between.

The dominant narratives and counternarratives follow the linear storytelling structure from the beginning to the middle (plot) and to the end (BME). Time and space is already defined in the movement from the past (beginning) to the end (the future) through a middle part (the means for changing and developing the organization). The narrative assumes a coherent pattern according to which the patterns of the past are projected on and repeated in the future. The narratives may branch into several fragmented narratives that may differ from each other or even be contradictory and conflicting. This is further explained in the chapter in the section on branching narratives. We understand
the counter-narrative as those narratives that are arising in opposition to the narrative by taking a conflicting position. Both the fragmented narratives and the counternarratives form together the cluster of narratives as illustrated in the figure to the right in figure 1.

As a contrast to the structured and closed (counter) narrative patterns, the living story web is open-ended and dynamically changing all the time. We understand the living story web as the ongoing development of simultaneous, polyphonic, fragmented storylines. These storylines are constituted from the lived experiences that are exchanged and challenged in open-ended dialogue, not yet collapsed into the narrative coherence but developing from the middle as a rhizome (explained later in the chapter). The storylines of the living story web is illustrated in the figure to the left in figure 1.

The process of developing and organizing the storylines in the living story web is the focus on the antenarrative dimension of the storytelling field. The antenarrative contributes with a theoretical framework for understanding the processes that occurs in the meeting between the living stories and the (counter) narratives.

Beneath these three dimensions of the storytelling field is unfolded.

The main dominating narrative give rise to the production of not necessarily just one counter-narrative as a reaction but to a series, an assemblage of counter-narratives that play out an interweaving (Henderson, Boje 2015). The main narrative and the surrounding counter-narratives form a narrative cluster characterized by the tensed interplay between the different, competing, centripetal narrative discourses. As the counter-narrative is a counter-reaction to the dominating narrative, they create their own ‘fractal narrative’ patterns. “Fractal narrative” is defined as “a narrative that finds its best accomplished form in the Web” in hyperlink networks (Durate, 2014: 284; Boje, 2015). The Web need not be the Internet, rather it can be constituted by a web of communicative praxis in discourse and in ritual relationships.

One way to think of the counternarrative fractal is that it is a patterning called a ‘branching fractal’ splitting into more and more counter narratives, until the founding narrative is morphed in some new directionality and dissolubility of new facets (Heidegger, 1962). The branching fractal may occur in a multidimensional way as illustrated in the figure below.
The branching fractal illustrates an organizational change and development process that occurs through a branching process; that is, a growth that is splitting in more and more directions. For instance, an organization may grow through the development of new branches such as new subunits, new sub-specialties and so forth. Some of these branches grow stronger than the others, as they are allocated with a growing number of people and other resources to nourish its further growth.

The branching fractal carries some similarity to the tree metaphor used by Deleuze & Guattari (1987). The tree metaphor illustrates that despite growth, the development and changes do not deviate from the linear structure of hierarchical growing. A tree can only grow in one direction from beginning to end. As such, the branching process follows a fractal narrative pattern of coherency and self-similarity. This is referred to as a narrative fractal pattern. The fractal pattern is repeated over and over again, permeating all the branches in accordance with the narrative root. Hence, an assemblage or cluster of fractal narrative self-similar patterns emerges. This is for instance the case when the organization keeps on recruiting similar others. As the narratives belong to the same narrative root, there are no counter-narrative positions. This is illustrated in the figure to the left.

The figure to the right illustrates a branching fractal process that is more open to diversity as the root fractals splits into a multidimensional number of branches from none at all to any number of branches (Henderson, Boje 2015). This type of branching process leads to diversified or conflicting fractal patterns. In our terminology, we refer to these fractal patterns as counternarratives.

Another much more dynamical patterning is the rhizome fractal where parts are self-organizing, reterritorializing and deterrioritralizing lines of flight, generating non-hierarchical fractal patterns of multiplicity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). As illustrated in the figure below, "rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo" (1987: 25).
In a rhizome, the development and changes do not form a linear structure from beginning to end, from point to point, from position to position, but “it grows between”, in the middle, along the lines of becoming (Deleuze, Guattari 1987: 19, 21, Ingold 2011). They contrast the narrative by being a short-term memory or even anti-memory, as it works by variation, expansion, conquest and off-shoots (Deleuze, Guattari 1987: 21). Consequently, the movement is not controlled by the past-oriented sensemaking and collective memory of the organization.

In line with the definition of a rhizome, Deleuze and Guattari define an assemblage as the “increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it expands its connections. There are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or root. There are only lines” (1987: 8).

The assemblage consists of a multitude of rhizomatic antenarratives that moves from present to future-shaping (Boje 2011: 9). Each of them is open and connectable, reversible and susceptible to constant modification and reworking, and still has a multiple of entryways and exits, or lines of flight (Deleuze, Guattari 1987: 12, 21).

Applied on organizational change and development processes, the rhizomatic lines of flight illustrate the organizing processes in the political subterranean of the organization. Management may not always be successful in suppressing the voices of resistance which may instead continue to influence the organizing processes from the shadow. In this chapter, the merger case is an example of such a process. Furthermore, taking a practice oriented perspective on organizing and strategizing processes, the rhizome may also illustrate how organizational development and change may occur in an open-ended process at the micro-practice level of the organization. As such the rhizome is made up from simultaneous, continuously changing, and fragmented storylines that differ, overlap, contradict or even conflict with each other. This is what we refer to as fractal stories. **When the stories collapses into one story, a rhizomatic narrative emerges.** We use the rhizome to illustrate their process of development.

Hence, the fractal branching narrative and counternarrative patterns are not the complete picture of the storytelling occurring. Dominant cultural narratives and counter-narrative fractal patterns are interactive with the living stories, those individual, lived-experiences. These form a different sort of fractality which Boje (2015: 38) calls the fractal story: "A’ fractal story’ is defined here as a web of fluid ‘living story ’ interrelationships between urban-chaos and fractal-cyber-order that is centrifugal, veering away from order, toward anarchism, discontinuity, and the erratic, violent urbanism.” The living story, unlike narrative (or counternarrative) is happening in the middle as a rhizome, and does not have the coherence of the narrative, which is always attempting to be monologic, to achieve generality and universality, be exorcising all its living stories. At the contrary, the centrifugal forces of the living story web foster the emergence of Little Wow Moments (LWM) that may lead to new storylines that break / rupture the narrative patterns.

Little wow moments refer to events where we experience a moment of disclosure. The dominant narrative tends to overshadow and mediate our experience and works as a veil or closure, making us repeat its fractal pattern. Little wow moments are thus those moments of greater clarity or insight that set the dominant narrative in relation to living stories and subsequently makes the narrative less oppressive and reduces its control over living stories (Boje, Helmuth & Saylors 2013). In the context of this chapter, we understand little wow moments as fractal exceptions to the expectations of
the fractal narrative patterns and rules. As such, the fractal story may rupture the fractal patterns (Svane, Boje 2015).

The little wow moments is a concept that contributes to our understanding of cultural dynamics. When organizational members achieve a moment of clarity, an insight into how they are caught by the stereotyping dominant counternarratives, they may be able to reach beyond this estranging and inauthentic (to be explained later in the chapter) way of relating to each other. Hence in the meeting between the living stories and the narrative, new rhizomatic directions may occur that ruptures the narrative self-repeating pattern.

The process of narrative and counternarrative relation to living story marginalization is worked out at the level of antenarrative. The before-bet-beneath-between-becoming antenarratives are in the lines in-between the living story web and the (grand) narrative clusters, which may change through the antenarrative processes of transformation. The narratives morph more slowly, almost imperceptibly so, as compared to the living story webs which are in the middle in an open-ended process of becoming. The antenarratives are not-yet, and barely if at all perceptible, yet are part of the swirl and flow of the narrative discourses and the living story dialogues, both social and material (socio-material). Hence, the overall pattern is the meeting between the narrative fractals and story fractals associated by and through antenarratives.

Storytelling is defined as grand narratives, living story webs, and the processes of their antenarrative connections which all come together in a dynamical storytelling assemblage. The storytelling assemblage, thus defined, has a pattern. It is not just random, and is not nothingness. Rather, there are patterns that can be studied, and changed. Small eddies of antenarratives produce big effects in living story webs and eventually in grander narratives. This is what the moving space of storytelling is all about.

The ongoing negotiation between production of grand narratives, the counternarrative reactivity, and the ongoing living story webs occurs at the subtle and prereflexive level of the antenarrative lines. The antenarrative ontology is derived from the work of primarily Heidegger, Bakhtin, Deleuze’s rhizome as well as Merleau-Ponty’s embodiment (which we can only review briefly due to space limitations).

The antenarrative 5Bs are worked out in relation to Heideggerian being-in-the-world ontology in his ‘fore’ notions and are entirely interrelated and entangled with one another, however, here they are separate for analytical purpose:

- **Antenarrative-Before** narrative coherence (fore-having); "Any assertion requires a fore-having of whatever has been disclosed; and this is what it points out by way of giving something a definite character" (Heidegger, 1962: #157).

- **Antenarrative-Beneath** narrative and living story web (fore-conception); "Anything understood which is held in our fore-having and towards which we set our sights 'foresightedly', becomes conceptualizable through the interpretation... it is grounded in *something the grasp in advance---in a fore-conception*" (Heidegger, 1962: #150).

- **Antenarrative-Between** narrative and living story (fore-structure); "All interpretation operates in the fore-structure, which we have already characterized" (Heidegger, 1962: #152).

- **Antenarrative-Bets** on the future potentialities that are a multiplicity of paths to choose among (fore-telling); Fore-seeing can be short-sighted (#316) or far-sighted in "the existential meaning of the hermeneutical/situation of a primordial analytic of Dasein" and once again "the authenticity of potentiality-for-Being-one's-Self" and the "*meaning of the Being of care*" Care and Selfhood ... (#316).

- **Antenarrative-Becoming** of care (& uncare) in the storytelling field itself (fore-care); the care-structure includes the phenomenon of Selfhood as "*the Ontological Meaning of Care*" (#323).
The five antenarrative practices happen in the pre-reflexive fabric of communicative practices out of which lived story and grander narratives are constructed. The entangled processes of the 5B antenarrative practices are fundamental to quantum storytelling.

Being-in-the-world is a being in a cultural, familiar and known world. Being-in-the-world is thus a container of cultural meaning frames of reference for understanding and interpreting life experiences and events. The container risks turning the spiral of understanding into a ‘circulus vitiosus’ (Heidegger 2008: 194) when it works as the legitimate pre-defined understanding that is repeated and repeated as a fractal rule governing retrospective sense-making. Contrary to the closure of the container, fore-caring of the future becoming is an inquiring, sensitive and caring mode of Being-in in being-in-the-world. Inquiring into and caring about the relation between being-in and being-in-the-world enables an open and disclosing spiral leading to the emerging of the authentic Self as distinguished from the cultural They Self. (Svane, Boje 2015, Boje 2012). This is referred to as the spiral of selfhood authenticity (Anton, 2001). As embodied, emotional and sentient beings at a pre-reflexive level, we become alert and respond to the vague unnoticed signs of changes, novelty, directions, of little wow moments of exceptions from the expectation of the grander narrative.

The fore-having of beforeness is a way of sociomaterial fore-having the future through performative actions before the narrative coherence of a world-already-in-place. By acting upon our pre-reflexive alertness, we are sense-shaping and sociomaterializing the future ahead-of-itself, paving the way for the arriving future by enacting its facticity. From possibility, it may turn into potentiality and finally into actuality. The mode of being is a potentiality-for Being; a now-ness potentiality. We enact the arriving future in the here and now. (Svane, Boje 2015, Boje 2012).

The beneathness reaches into the subtle, pre-reflexive antenarrative practices that go beyond living story and narrative-counternarratives as a subterranean level out of which living stories and narrative-counternarratives are produced. Anything understood in fore-having and seen foresightedly, becomes conceptualizable through interpretation (Heidegger 2008: 191). The process of fore-conceptualizing the fore-sighted future is grounded in the embodied, emotional, and pre-reflexive engagement with the world out of which new real life meanings emerge as part of an emerging new language practice. Sociomaterial lifeworlds merges through Bakhtinian dialogue, involving the body, feelings, moods and things. Through the heteroglossic, transgressing dialogue, different material lifeworlds of languages, cultures and histories merge and emerge. Not as the objectified, institutionalized and materialized “world of culture”, but as “the world of life” (Bakhtin 2010: 2). (Svane, Boje 2015, Boje 2012, Svane 2014).

The fore-structure of betweenness refers to the antenarrative as a bridge in between centrifugal living story and centripetal narrative-counternarrative. As all interpretations operate in the forestructure, the antenarrative mode is a way of Being-open in Being-with (Heidegger 2008) and is inseparable from the disclosing process of inquiry and care. The antenarrative process continuously connects and transforms the living stories and narratives-counternarratives. New relations, structures and ways of organizing emerge through the sociomaterial intra-activity as an ongoing, never ending process. We shift away from the nouns to the verbs of relating, structuring, systematizing, organizing, strategizing, leading, communicating and so forth. (Svane, Boje 2015, Boje 2012).

The fore-telling relates to the antenarrative futural mode of being as Being-towards-possibilities. Being-open in an inquiring, caring way may disclose a horizon of endless possibilities of the world-in-its-becoming (Svane, Boje 2015, Boje 2012). Betting on which future to become may be an out-
come of a reflexive/reflective choice but it may also occur as an embodied, sentient, and spontaneous response to signals at a pre-reflexive level. Through various state-of-minds, we are already attuned towards the possible futures in different ways. As they are not equally attractive, we may be alerted, turning away, or attracted towards the different, emerging possibilities.

The entangled 5Bs of the antenarrative model bridge the living stories and narrative-counternarrative and constitute all together the quantum storytelling field.

In order to effect change in cross-cultural management, we propose to look at what Henderson and Boje (2015) call ‘fractal change management’. In line with this thinking, the model visualized in the figure below has been developed by Svane and Boje (2015).

**Figure 5: Fractal Change Management**
Source: Developed by Svane & Boje 2015

The model illustrates the five B antenarrative connection in-between fractal narrative and fractal stories; between the sociomaterial fractal patterns of the grand narrative expectations and the sociomaterial fractal ruptures produced by the little wow moments of exceptions that emerge in the living story web. The fractal patterns of self-sameness occur across different scalabilities ranging from the micro to the macro level; from the local to the global including the six surrounding dimensions of the political/ideological, economic/market, social/cultural, technological/knowledge, natu-
ral/physical, and legal/juridical. These dimensions is quite similar to the well know PESTEL dimensions. Subsequently, Fractal Change Management needs the ability to zoom in and out in order to identify the fractal patterns, to notice the fractal ruptures and to manage the tensed interplay out of which transformations occur (Svane, Boje 2015).

Not only does fractal change management look into the spatial scalability of sociomaterial sense-shaping, but also into the temporality of past, present, and future. The fractal narrative is conceived to reproduce itself in a temporal movement from past to present to future. In this retrospective reproduction, the little wow moments of ruptures tend to be silenced, ignored or remain unnoticed. This temporal pathway of retrospective, reproductive sensemaking is the linear and cyclic antenarratives that reproduce the past by predicting its reoccurrence in the future. Unlike this, the rhizomatic and spiral antenarratives take a different temporal pathway as they move from the future to the present to the past. This temporal pathway is the antenarrative, prospective sense-shaping of the future in an open-ended process of becoming. (Svane, Boje 2015).

In this open-ended process of becoming, fractal change management relate to the pre-reflexive level of embodied, emotional, and sentient beings alert to and responding at the vague signs of little wow moments indicating changes, novelty, and new directions. Hence, antenarrative fractal change management manages the entangled processes of spatializing across scales, temporizing, and mattering (the sociomateriality; the entangled processes of meaning and matter) in the quantum storytelling field (Svane, Boje 2015). Antenarrative managing is managing spacetimemattering in the ontological situation.

Theoretical Discussion of The Cross-Cultural Merger Case

The merger case story encompasses dominating cross-cultural narratives and counternarratives that emerge as a resistance throughout the process of merging and integrating the two companies. In the analysis of the case, it turns out that the narratives and counternarratives are produced, repeated and also transformed at the antenarrative level, as the antenarrative connects the centrifugal living story webs of lived experiences with the dominating narratives and counternarratives. The case is adopted from Svane (Svane in press) and Svane & Boje (2014).

In the following analysis of the case, we identify the dominant narratives and counternarratives. Thereafter we draw attention to the dialogical process through which the narratives and counternarratives transform at the antenarrative level in the interplay with the living story web.

The story of marrying the worst enemy constitutes a dominant fractal narrative discourse that is shared and repeated over and over again among the organizational members and their customers, especially in Alpha House. The fractal narrative is related not only to the fact that the two companies intensively competed against each other but also to an inherited hatred that dates long back in time. When inquired into, nobody seems to be able to remember the events causing the hatred except for an understanding that it was caused by some incidents that once happened at a farmer’s market for more than a half century ago. Passing on the stories of the hatred to newcomers and continuously maintaining the hatred by repeating the stories of the worst enemy, the narrative turns into
a socializing cultural device predefining and stereotyping the relation between the two organizations.

This fractal narrative discursive pattern affects Beta/Delta House, sensing the hostility in all aspects of the intra-organizational communicative practices. Consequently, the Us-Them cultural identity constructions are co-produced and lead to a kind of ritualized fractal relationship patterns in the merged company. These fractal patterns manifest in specific sociomaterial ways of relating to each other that seems to impede intra-organizational collaboration and task accomplishment. For instance, the three houses refused any attempt to advance an integration between their separate but related agricultural disciplines. In the same fractal way, they also fought against job rotation among the three houses which otherwise might have produced more synergy. In line with the fractal pattern, the management of the merged company decided not to take the necessary steps to rationalize and optimize the operations of the merged company for which reason the obvious economic benefits of the merger were lost. In fact, the managers ceased to act out of fear of producing more resistance.

Following Barad’s distinction between inter-activity and intra-activity (2007), the organizational activities and practices relate primarily to the inter-activity occurring in already pre-defined and pre-structured relations (relata according to Barad or as-structure according to Heidegger) at this initial state of the merger process. The fractal narrative reproduces and repeats the pre-defined as-structure without any further inquiry. In so doing, it materializes in stereotyped and self-stereotyped relations, detaching and estranging the actors not only from one another but also from oneself. Caught by the monologic closure of the narrative, the possibilities for inquiring into and for arriving at the authentic self is lost and subsequently the cross-cultural meeting is stuck in the past-oriented, generalized abstraction of the they-self. Consequently, these cross-cultural discursive practices do not lead to the open antenarrative process of bridge building but preserve instead the fixed relations.

Conceived as a vicious closed circle of interpretation, the fractal narrative interpretations solely operate in the inter-active as-structure. As opposed to this, the open, disclosing spiral of interpretation operates in the intra-active fore-structuring, meaning that the cross-cultural relationships are open for new configurations of similarities and differences and subsequently for the emergences of new ways of relating to each other (Svane, Boje 2014). The antenarrative interplay between narratives and living stories is a prerequisite for the disclosing spiral.
Figure 6: The Storytelling of The Merged Company

The above-mentioned fractal narrative and the disappointing economic performance of the merger gave rise to the emergence of a new fractal narrative produced by Alpha House. This fractal narrative can be conceived as a counter-narrative opposing the merger decision, the strategy direction, the management and the poor economic performance of Beta/Delta House. According to the counternarrative, the merger was a managerial mistake that eventually would lead to an economic failure. Therefore Alpha would have been better off standing alone or merging with Zeta, the other major competitor on the market. As it turned out that the merger actually did not meet the economic expectations during the first two years following the merger, the narrative of a more profitable future with Zeta House was further reinforced and repeated. Gradually, Zeta House gained more and more presence in the narrative, almost as a “ghost” (Morson 1994) of a future that could have been. When Steven became the new CEO, he eventually decided to silence this counternarrative; a decision making that in the end proved to be fatal. The silenced counternarrative continued to work in the manner that Morson refers to as a “hidden process of change”, where small unnoticed, silenced and erased events haunt from the side shadows (Morson 1994: 161, according to Boje 2010: 239).

As a Deleuzian rhizome, the new counternarrative kept on working in the subterranean of the merged organization, producing and maintaining resistance to the merger, the strategy, and the management, and in the subtle and unnoticed shadow, it continued to bet on (fore-telling) and sociomaterially path the way for (fore-having, fore-structuring, fore-conceptualizing) the arrival of a future with Zeta House. As such, the counternarrative developed in opposition to the fractal narrative in support of the new strategy direction. The counternarrative aims at resistance and is grown and reinforced in the antenarrative meeting with the rhizomatic fractal stories exchanged with Zeta House. Still rooted and stuck in the past-oriented, stereotyped relationships, it is not really dialogical oriented or open for antenarrative inquiry into (fore-caring of) the existing merger. At the contrary, the inquiring fore-caring is solely attuned towards the possible future with Zeta House.

When Steven took over the responsibility for managing the future development of the merged company, he consciously decided that the strategy process should not be constituted as an exclusively managerial task but rather as a social construction bottom up process with a high degree of employee involvement. The strategy process was divided into two steps. In the first step, all employees and
managers, the board of directors as well as a large number of customers and owners were asked to participate in formulating the strategy by identifying key strategic themes. The strategy formulation process lasted for about a year and was carried out by cross-cultural groups composed by members from each of the three houses.

In the second step, the employees were invited to participate in the implementation of the strategy and in the further development of the strategic themes. Accordingly, strategic groups were formed in order to work with the various strategic themes. Employees who joined the strategic groups, would work partly on the strategy and business development of the company and partly on the operative tasks. Essentially, the strategy group work constituted a sensemaking process as the employees tried to develop the meaningfulness of the specific strategic theme by relating the theme to their everyday life experience and local knowledge. Based upon their micro level experience, knowledge and activities, they generated new ideas for business development and strategy change. In so doing, the strategy emerged at the micro level of practices within the framework of the accepted strategy formulation: "The strategic groups run their own life right now. More or less. Steven is actually not part of our strategy group. Once in a while, he is informed about the things that we work on. And only if he thinks that something is way out, then he interferes.” Jill, Delta House, employee.

To the extent possible, also the strategic groups were cross-culturally composed. The managers participated in steering groups in order to coordinate resources and ensure sufficient capacity for the various strategic and business development initiative as well as for the operative tasks.

Finally, every year the whole company was gathered together for three days in order to evaluate the strategy process, business development and organizational performance; retrospectively by sensemaking of the past and prospectively by looking into the future.

Organizing the strategy process as a dialogical living story web, Steven aimed at two purposes. Firstly and in order to enhance a broad organizational commitment and ownership to the strategy, he aimed at creating a shared understanding of and identification with the future strategy and business development of the merged company. Secondly, and as a side effect, he also aimed at facilitating the emergence of a more “We” based cultural, identity construction in replacement of the Us-Them narrative. According to the following quotations, these purposes are to some extent achieved by this way of organizing and strategizing:

“It is properly the greatest success of interconnectedness; that we all take responsibility. We know what is in the strategy. We know what to do to make it work”. Philip, Alpha House, employee.

“At that time [before the new CEO], we did not feel that we were one big family. But his way of approaching this made us feel more like being employed in ONE organization. It was a long journey because we had to get used to it but both the social and professional cooperation is much different today.” John, Delta House, employee.

“It has become much better, but to begin with, I think we all were frustrated, because we were used to manage our own little house. And there was a feeling of… did we dare share with the others? Or would they play games with us? That has disappeared today.” Jill, Delta House, employee.

As indicated in the above-mentioned quotations, the identified narrative and counternarrative are to some extent transformed into new patterns of relationships as part of the multivoiced process of
cross-culturally organizing and strategizing. This strategy process relates to the practice and process oriented approach that closely links together strategizing and organizing as two entangled processes that are hard to separate from each other (Tsoukas, Chia 2002: 567, Whittington 2006: 618). Svane & Boje (2014) argue that cultural dynamics is entangled with the strategizing and organizing process at the micro level. Turning to the micro level of actual happenings, events and new emerging situations implies a shift away from the generalizing, abstract level of the fractal (counter)narrative and towards the polyphonic living story web as it unfolds in the rhizome, here and now, in the subterranean of the organizational life; that is in the beneath of the narrative. The cultural dynamics of the living story web is driven by the open, centrifugal forces of the dialogue through which living stories of life world experiences are exchanged, inquired into, unfolded, merged and transformed (Boje, Svane & Gergerich in review). According to Bakhtin (1986), the life worlds of lived cultural worlds and communities merge in the ongoing dialogical chain of heteroglossic communications. As part of this process, also identity may transgress as “an individual becomes other than what he was” (Bakhtin 1981: 115) through the process of dialogical transformation.

The cross-cultural strategizing and organizing process can thus be conceived as an antenarrative process of connecting the subterranean living stories (beneath) with the narrative (in between centrifugal living stories and centripetal narrative) and of initiating an open inquiry into what is becoming. Hence, interpretations can operate in the open-ended spiral and produce new meaning structures. As the quotations indicate, the patterns of similarities and differences are antenarratively transformed into new meaning structures and patterns implying new ways of relating to other in the practice of organizational everyday life. Organizations can thus be conceived to be “a pattern that is constituted, shaped and emerging from change” (Tsoukas, Chia 2002: 567) in the antenarrative connection between the dialogical web of fluid, centrifugal living stories and fractal narratives - counternarratives.

The organizational storytelling pattern that emerges from this change process is a fragmented pattern composed by competing narratives and counternarratives that split the organizational members into at least two dominant groups, those in favor of and those against the strategy development.

The storytelling of the organization leads to a new performative cut of stereotyped relationships. The Us-Them narrative is now a cut between those who are in favor of and those who are against the strategy direction and the management. As several Alpha employees eventually came to identify with the new strategy during the strategy process, the configuration of relationships changed into new groups. Hence, the antenarrative interplay between living stories and fractal narratives-counternarratives produced new cuts of cultural, fragmented relationships in Alpha House. Accordingly, the employees of Alpha House became critical towards each other depending on their attitude towards the strategy process: “A lot of people here were getting tired of their [the Alpha department who left to work for Zeta, the competitor] negative attitude towards everything.” Lily, Alpha House, team leader.

When the whole Alpha department collectively resigned and left the company in order to work for Zeta, the competitor, the company was left in shock and surprise. According to several employees and Steven, the CEO, the employees of the department kept silent about the plan, not revealing any single sign that this was the decision they were about to make. “It came as a shock... I did not see it coming… They said nothing… How could they manage, 32 people, to keep it a secret…” are frequent expressions uttered in the aftermath of the dramatic event. The hidden process of change resulting in this event is an example of a ghost story living in the shadow finding its way in a rhi-
zomatic manner. The organization was part of discursively suppressing it, so perhaps after all the hidden counternarrative was not that much of a wonder. The silent voices of the department as well as the fact that the doors to the department got closed as an exception to the open door office landscape were sociomaterial signs which the organization ignored and omitted to act upon. Gradually, the CEO realized: “I did not listen enough.”

The key lesson learned in the company is the need to engage in a caring inquiry. Inquiry is part of the five B antenarrative dimension. The process of caring inquiry stopped, as the organization ceased to care about the 32 employees by gradually silencing and erasing their stories, and as the 32 employees ceased to communicate as a counter-reaction and even planned to leave the company and to bring with them as many customers as possible. Being-in-the-world in a caring inquiring mode could perhaps have helped the organizational members to become more sensitive and alert to the vague unnoticed signs of what was becoming, and to act to either prevent or advance (fore-having) the arrival of different alternative futures (bets). The signs are a manifestation of a sociomaterial fore-having of arriving futures. If the course of events continues undisturbed, it is a fore-telling that this future might very well arrive. Engaging into an antenarrative inquiry is to fore-care about the becoming of the organization and an antenarrative way of managing that process of becoming.

Hence, being-in-the-world in a caring inquiring mode constitutes an antenarrative mode of being-in in being-in-the-world encompassing all 5 B antenarrative dimensions. It is a mode of being-in that goes beyond the narrative and counternarrative level and reaches into the more primordial, anterior and antecedent pre-reflexive level of embodied, sentient and practical engagement.

This development of the case story illustrates how the antenarrative interplay between rhizomatic living stories and dominating fractal narratives give rise to the production of the new emerging fractal narrative patterns. In this way, centrifugal living stories can be conceived as fractal ruptures; that is, the existing fractal narrative patterns and rules are challenged and broken. However, they carry the potential to create new fractal patterns, either as a rhizomatic fractal development as in this case or as a branching fractal development.

Finally, the case also illustrates how rhizomatic spaces emerge as unmanaged terrain with the organization; “a terrain which is not and cannot be managed, in which people, both individually and in groups, can engage in all kinds of unsupervised, spontaneous activity” (Gabriel 1995: 478). According to Gabriel, this is a kind of organizational dreamworld of desires, anxieties and emotions. In the merger case, the manager ceases to have access to this dream world when communication and inquiry break down, and the dream world becomes sociomaterialised through the hidden engagement with Zeta House. This dreamworld worked as an escape from the control-resistance struggle of the managed organization; an unmanaged line of flight. This dreamworld could have shined through the stories and become accessible if not management, if the stories had not been silenced. The prerequisite for this to happen is the hermeneutical antenarrative fore-caring inquiry.

**Theoretical Discussion of The Homeless Veteran Theatre Case**

There is a dominant cultural narrative regarding the homeless as alcoholics, drug abusers or mentally ill (Knecht et al., 2009). Camp Hope in Las Cruces, New Mexico offers a counternarrative to this dominant perspective on homelessness by offering tent shelters, and social support services for long
term residents (MVCH, 2015). Other cities that have tried to utilize a similar tent city model have come up against the dominant narrative of homelessness. In 2009, Sacramento homeless individuals created a tent city with campsites, trash pickup and portable toilets, however, police disbanded the community and threatened arrest for those who stayed (Middleton, 2014). As a result, a social movement “SafeGround Sacramento” is working to decriminalize homelessness and offer social services and transitional housing.

There is more to be learned than simply hearing the narrative and counternarrative regarding homelessness in these cities. A deeper understanding of the reality of these individuals may be gleaned through listening to the unique experiences of the veterans in Camp Hope. The unique experiences of these homeless veterans offer an antenarrative developed through fractal storytelling. This antenarrative is an ongoing, fluid web of interrelationships between these individuals and the others and groups with whom they interact. There is no solid coherence for this antenarrative. It is instead, a ‘prereflexive’ process through which a new dominant narrative and even living stories of individual homeless may be developed.

In the first act of the play, we learn how a female 1st Sargent comes to be homeless, through a series of misunderstandings with the police and court system. Act four, depicts veterans experiencing difficulty being seen in a timely manner by the doctors at the VA. We often make sense of the world by following the dominant cultural narrative. Through inquiring about the reality of being in and in-between various narratives, we are led to a richer narrative. This is what the Veteran’s Theater brings to the surface. The play offers a new understanding of homeless Veterans’ experiences and challenges dominant beliefs about this group. The following quotes were offered by audience members after attending the play.

“Awareness…men and women who serve in our military to keep our freedom…our greatest gift…need to be taken care of with love and respect regardless of their mental and physical condition. The plan entitled “Dead While Waiting for my VA Appointment” depicts the way veterans are treated within the VA system. Their individual situations get lost in the system’s bureaucracy with untimely appointments, improper diagnoses and medications.”

“This project is a very innovative and effective way of enhancing the lives of the participating veterans in the community, but at the same time, it raises public awareness of the issues veterans face as they try to (re)adjust to their old-new home-lives. The play is bound to be entertaining, heartfelt and cathartic all at the same time.”

“The vignette of the play “Dead While Waiting for my VA Appointment” was a powerful recounting of the lived experiences of its performers – women and men who served honorably and with distinction in the U.S. armed forces. The play shines light on the challenges they and countless other veterans have faced while trying to obtain medical care and services from the Veterans Administration. Especially notable is the play’s depiction of the uneven care offered to different classes of vets (for example homeless vets vs. middle-class ones, or those with physical vs. mental health issues), as well as the potential over reliance on prescription medication as a primary means of treatment.”

There are several kinds of counternarratives in the veteran case. First, to the City and social welfare agencies’ narrative, that states, Camp Hope (the tent city), is not supposed to be a ‘home’ to the homeless, but rather it is only temporary day shelter. The homeless, in short, should not make the
mishandling of treating this as their ‘home.’ The counternarrative is that homeless veterans and homeless are building community, individualizing their tent sites, such as by putting flags and flagpoles on them. The non-veteran community, countered with their own counternarrative, we are patriotic, and we want to fly our own flags. Of course the situation got out of hand, and out of ‘fear’ that the City’s code enforcers would shut down the Camp for having unsafe poles, potentially dislodging in a 70 MPH wind, and causing bodily harm (was the anticipated bet on the future, antenarratively). As a result the administrators in agreement with the veterans organizations, and the City, did issue a memo to the campers, the flagpoles are being removed. I (David Boje) made those poles in my blacksmith shop, and was replacing the shoddy poles. However, the rumor and gossip, all that idle talk was handed around, and became so forceful, that the facts of the case really did not matter. One fact, for example, is the Veterans Theater, the veterans homeless and homeless actors, of the community did in fact raise and donate money to buy regulation flags, and paid for the metal I used in the poles.

In the cases, the fractal patterns develop as a multifractal consisting of both branching and rhizomatic fractals. The Spice is a fractal-virus for which there is not much possibility of counter-narrative other than ‘don’t do drugs’; the Pharmaceutical industry has its many medications as another sort of virus that affects/afflicts the homeless veterans — since if they cannot get the pain medications, they self-medicate with Spice. Then there is the fractal of stigma that is against all mental health care-seeking especially by the military, and the anti-stigma campaigns in U.S. and Europe do not compose an effective counter-narrative.

The multifractal pattern leads to the downward spiral of 22 suicides a day, just in the US veterans (1 of which ever got treatment for their war trauma). The point of the Veterans Theater is to confront the stigma, to speak back to power of illicit institutions like Spice trade and against the power of pharmaceutical company practice which have been shown in too many cases to be unethical.

The stigma fractal is a branching sort, subdividing one group versus another, the populace against the veterans, veterans who are macho and don’t seek help against those seeking care, etc. The Spice fractal is a downward spiral, to self-destruction, and the ultimate, death. The Pharmaceutical fractal is like Jeff Noon’s Vurt, the Curious Yellow Vurt, a trip into a world of drug addiction, and playing the game of risk to the point that one of the times, maybe even the first time user’s first toke, and there is a one-way passage to death.

In the struggle between authentic Self and inauthentic self, between the publicness narrative of homelessness, and what it is Being-homeless, we are persuaded by Corey Anton’s (2001) book, Selfhood and Authenticity. We cannot keep recirculating the tired old superficial narratives, even when they go fractal-narrative in their selfsameness scalability, rather attuning (tuning-in) to the threads of intention of all the participants lets us understand how contested and problematic it is to map out a Quantum Storytelling space, especially, one I (David Boje) called ‘home’ for 15 years, as an assistant professor at UCLA, and a full professor at Loyola Marymount University.

We want to understand and interpret what is home in all its spacetime mattering, but not using an odometer, or a stop watch, but rather, in attunements. Home seems something we can “individualize” in “its ownmost potentiality-for-Being” in a freedom of choice of taking hold of itself, this thing called home (Heidegger, 1962: #188). Irony, I (David Boje) used to call Los Angeles my home, and now I call Las Cruces, home. For Heidegger home is “Being-free” (IBID.) I seem to be anxious about being home, and it reveals itself in my Quantum Storytelling, in mapping the face of
anxious Being-in-the-world, authentically, and moving away from Being-there inauthentically. So for me, to individualize, and not “solus ipse” (Means alone Self) “innocuous emptiness of a worldless occurring” (IBID.).

In sum, the Veterans Theater, puts on plays to communicate counternarratives of what it means to be homeless.

There is a “tranquilizing” that is “at the same time alienating“(Heidegger, 1962: #178). The public press release, by the university photo for its own annual fund raising, a way of idle talk of a university, an ambiguity, and getting entangled, a self-entangling, and still the community was in a “downward plunge … into groundlessness and nullity” (IBID.). Homelessness is a nullity (literally means, without-home).

Idle Talk-antenarrative travels with and is interconnected with two other antenarratives: curiosity and ambiguity. These three antenarratives of attunement to Being-in-the-world are already emerging before the public (Heidegger, 1962: #174). There is a struggle in the world of homeless veterans, in all of homelessness, and in all the world of Being-veteran, Being-homeless. It is the struggle of being always defined as the “they” that Idle Talk knows all about being thrown into Homelessness World, yet has never spent 24 hours sleeping in a shelter-dorm, or the temporary shelter of a tent city. How different Tent City Solutions would be if the Mayor and City Council of Albuquerque spent 24 hours in their own shelters.

This is quantum storytelling through the telling of living stories with antenarrative threads, leading to transformed relationships between homeless veterans and residents of the community. Consideration for only the narrative and counternarrative ignores the richer reality of these individuals which is fluid and may be responsible for future transformation of the dominant narrative.

Research Contributions and Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we develop a conceptual and methodological storytelling framework that contributes to analyzing and understanding the cross-cultural storytelling dynamics occurring in the interplay between the cultural narrative-counternarratives, the living story web, and the sociomaterial, antenarrative connections. The framework helps to identify the cross-cultural interaction and dynamics between cultural fractal narratives – counternarratives and fractal stories that occur in cross-cultural situations. Our contribution lies in developing an understanding of the subterranean ‘fractal’ patterns between antenarratives out of which new narratives and counternarratives are produced and living stories are affected.

We presented two case studies to explore the ways fractals operate in relation to counternarrative in order to accomplish cross-cultural change. In the two cases, we identify how the cross-cultural narrative-counternarrative transforms and change when connected with the living story fractals associated by the antenarrative process, and give rise to the emergence of new cross-cultural narrative-counternarratives. Hence, it is our contention that the interplay between a dominant cultural narrative and the many less known counter narratives is played out at the level of the antenarrative pattern.

In the two cases, we identify how there is a process of escalation and contraction of the counternarrative fractal, how it moves and assembles and disassembles and reassembles over time as part of
the cultural dynamics. Hence, over time, series of counternarratives develop and can be conceived as a dynamic assemblage of interweaving counter-narratives.

The veteran case itself is a multifractal, an opposition of one fractal, an ascending spiral of selfhood authenticity against all the branching fractals (stigma), the downward spirals of drug dependency (be it Spice or pharmaceutical meds). Additionally in the beneath, the layers of institutional (non-profits & religious organizations) have their own pragmatic reasons for working with aspects of the homeless situation (survival of their institution, their own fund raising, to save souls, etc.). The pre-reflective threads of antenarrative makeup an underlying becoming, beneath, and between.

The merger case also illustrates a quantum storytelling development of a series of branching multifractal narratives and counternarratives that transform and change at the antenarrative level. Furthermore, the Alpha ghost counternarrative develops as rhizome fractal in search for an exit; a line of flight. The case does not only illustrate the rhizome fractals but also the spiral fractal dynamic as the narrative and story fractals develop and give rise to the emergence of new constructions of selfhood in the interplay between authentic self and they self. The case provides example of how the cross-cultural stereotyped narrative patterns produce estranging spirals of relationship and how story fractals effect on this spiral and turn it in new directions at least in some parts of the organization.

Once we know the patterning of the fractal in spacetimemattering, we have some possibility to intervene in the process of patterning in spacetime and sociomateriality (the entanglement of matter and meaning). Hence, we suggest further research into antenarrative fractal change management as this is about identifying the development of fractal patterns by getting at the subaltern and pre-reflexive aspects of the spatializing, temporizing, and mattering of the quantum storytelling field.
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