Sentimentality, the ostentatious parading of excessive and spurious emotion, is the mark of dishonesty, the inability to feel; the wet eyes of the sentimentalist betray his aversion to experience, his fear of life, his arid heart; and it is always, therefore, the signal of secret and violent inhumanity, the mask of cruelty.—James Baldwin, “Everybody’s Protest Novel”

Rogers and Hammerstein’s *The King and I* is a rare instance of classic Americana whose subject is not America. Atypical for its time (1949), the lavish musical is set during a fictive imperial crisis in relations between Britain and Siam that involves the deployment of a variety of military and economic pressures.¹ The arrival of Anna Leonowens in Siam reminds us that Britain also exported a civilizing pedagogy dedicated to undermining corrupt forms of authoritarian rule and immoral modes of intimacy through the education of “native” children away from the worlds of their parents and their nation. Yet to describe *The King and I* this way neglects the sensuous spirit of the play: the spectacle continuously overwhelms the story, displaying the King’s visibly smooth and muscular body, the Palace’s surface of shining metal and richly colored fabric, the women’s and children’s adorable exoticism, and the intensities of erotic and familial life in the world of the palace. Haunted by the love plot that never develops between the Siamese “King” (Mongut) and the British “I” (Leonowens) whom he imports “for bringing to Siam what is good in Western culture,”² the play’s story nonetheless uses
the tragicomic conventions of “the war between the sexes” to express political and cultural antagonisms that also appear here in stereotypic drag as national tragedy and imperial farce.

The scene of this war is the passing into modernity of Siam, for which the King has prepared by insisting that the elite of his nation develop economic, technological, and rational literacy in the ways of the West. He comes to learn from Leonowens, however, that to be modern requires something more than a cultivated mind—it wants an educated heart. But the King’s heart breaks and he dies when he is unable to follow Siam into the moment in which the nation becomes a state of feeling as opposed to a regime of power. As the play proffers the abjected image of the King’s waning virility and pompous philosophizing, it sets up a series of organizing antinomies by which the audience can measure the King’s and the nation’s progress, including East and West, barbarism and civilization, the vulgar and the refined, the vernacular and the literary, the student and the teacher, the brutish and the feminine. These antinomies are haunted and symbolically resolved by a romance with a constellated third term: sentimentality, intimacy, democracy, America.

This is an essay on the unfinished business of sentimentality. It argues that in the United States a particular form of liberal sentimentality that promotes individual acts of identification based on collective group memberships has been conventionally deployed to bind persons to the nation through a universalist rhetoric not of citizenship per se but of the capacity for suffering and trauma at the citizen’s core; that this structure has been deployed mainly by the culturally privileged to humanize those very subjects who are also, and at the same time, reduced to cliché within the reigning regimes of entitlement or value; that the commodities of “women’s culture,” the first subaltern-marked mass-cultural discourse, especially represent the paradoxes of liberal sentiment, since they not only locate the desire to build pain alliances from all imaginable positions within U.S. hierarchies of value, but render scenes and stories of structural injustice in the terms of a putatively preideological nexus of overwhelming feeling whose threat to the survival of individual lives is said also to exemplify conflicts in national life. “Women’s texts” are gendering machines, tracing paths toward survival through plots of feminine feeling that locate the ideality of femininity in fantasies of unconflicted subjectivity in a flowing and intimate world.
The conjuncture of politics and mass norms of affect thereby raises aesthetic questions about the conventions with which exemplary relations have been posited between narratives of the experience and redemptiveness of personal suffering and the collective circumstances in which these plots are inevitably placed. The archive of this essay—Uncle Tom’s Cabin and a set of related texts including The King and I, Dimples, The Bridges of Madison County, and Beloved—inhabits many positions within the domain of the politico-sentimental aesthetic and enables us to understand the ways its conventional forms and ideologies of feeling have influenced the construction and valuation of subjects, types, and publics in the U.S. since the mid-nineteenth century. Why and how do specific kinds of collective but individually experienced pain get turned into modern forms of entertainment? How do we come to terms with the use of aesthetic conventions of excess (in melodrama, satire, comedy, romance) in processes of national-cultural normativity and critique, insofar as these genres are relied upon to express the true suffering and true desires of ordinary persons? How are different types of person and kinds of population hailed by the universalist (but really national) icon of the person who loves, suffers, and desires to survive the obstacles that bind her or him to history? What are the political consequences of the commoditized relation between subjects who are defined not as actors in history but as persons who shop and feel?

Anyone who has seen The King and I will know that my title, “Poor Eliza,” derives from the scene in which Tuptim, a sexual slave in the King’s palace, stages a dramatic adaptation of what she calls The Small House of Uncle Thomas. The occasion is a dinner party at which the King is trying to convince the British ambassador of his own and Siam’s sophistication, its worthiness to be considered a peer nation in political, economic, and cultural terms. Tuptim’s play provides the “native” entertainment. However, she is motivated to perform Stowe’s text not to reflect the nation’s glory but because this audience is the only sympathetic public she will ever have. The play provides her a licensed opportunity to speak, albeit from a script that she has adapted. Tuptim’s complaint is that the King has decreed that she become his currently most favored “wife.” She has thereby been denied access to her true love, Lun Tha, and become a prisoner in the King’s harem as well as a slave to his sexual will.

Tuptim’s hope to build a life around consensual love in a conjugal
family rather than the authoritarian rules of royal sexuality crystallizes the play’s Cold War-ish espousal of “democratic” individual freedoms in a “modern” capitalist economy. Yet Uncle Tom’s Cabin is far more than a commercial for U.S.-style democracy in The King and I. In the autobiographical text by Anna Leonowens and its fictionalization by Margaret Landon, there is no royal performance of Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Its extended acknowledgment here confirms the novel’s status as a master sign or supertext, whose reiteration in the twentieth century magnetizes an array of distinct and often conflicting desires about the execution of cultural difference in the global postslavery era. In The King and I, the novel’s citation touches on the aspect of Stowe’s pedagogy that exhorts the nation to embrace the progressive urgencies of a revolutionary historical moment in order to preserve its ambition to be good as well as great. The citation of Uncle Tom here also figures the centrality of the aesthetic to national life. Just as the novel puts forth characters who model virtue for the individual reader, its example is a monument to the fact that inspired art can produce a transformative environment toward which the fallen social world can aspire. The politico-aesthetic tradition of sentimentality associated with the novel is especially animated when a critique of the violently rationalized world is put forth in the name of the authenticity of feeling, especially the feelings of love and suffering, the claims of which stand on the high ground of an ethics beyond politics; sentimental politics are being performed whenever putatively supra-political affects or affect-saturated institutions (like the nation and the family) are proposed as universalist solutions to structural racial, sexual, or intercultural antagonism.

It is thus not surprising that very different presumptions about the meaning of the novel’s citation are put into play in The King and I. For the King, its presence at Court is a sign of Siam’s modernity: a foreign text translated, an American text appropriated and mastered, a politics consumed that proves the achieved enlightenment of Siamese consciousness. Tuptim’s decision to stage the book appears to the King as merely an act equivalent to the other preparations he makes for the event, such as learning Western table manners and clothing style to augment the “scientific” knowledge he has cobbled together. Beyond this, however, the King’s linkage with Uncle Tom’s Cabin has already been established through his strong identification with the rationality and wit of “President Lingkong,” whom he has
been trying to enlist in a plan to bring elephants to the United States to help the North win the Civil War. Lincoln's presence in *The King and I* represents a horizon of possible development for the King, whose voice and body are otherwise staged through a kind of generic Asiatic "bronzeface," his body exposed and his vernacular enjoyed in what a U.S. audience would recognize as minstrel fashion, further highlighting the paradoxical differences and linkages between "their" kind of slavery and "ours." The King's attraction to Lincoln's great and simple wisdom implicitly enables him to imagine saving Siam with similar aplomb at its own time of radical transition. Yet this self-understanding is a joke the play plays on the King. He comprehends the relation between wisdom, greatness, and the abolition of slavery, but he never recognizes the sexual slavery of the harem as relevant to these issues. His speeches about "Lingkong" are staged as funny and stupid, even though the self-misunderstanding he reveals through them has visibly violent effects. But the King's aspiration to be the American President is nowhere quarrelled with in the play.

Tuptim's identification with *Uncle Tom's Cabin* also mixes up the personal and the political, but she configures their zones of overlap in distinct and incommensurate ways. "Harriet Beecher Stowe" represents to the slave the unthinkable possibility that a woman can write a book, especially one that challenges the patriarchal national regime that forces her to do sexual hard labor. But Tuptim also identifies with "poor Eliza," whose story inspires her own subsequent flight from the palace. As Lincoln is an emblem for the King, Eliza models for Tuptim the need for the slave's courage to invalidate morally unjust law. Like Eliza, Tuptim breaks the law that has broken itself by escaping to a new space and putting her body on the line to bridge the authoritarian world in which she lives and the emancipated world of freedom and love to which she seeks transport.

Usually the citation of the *Uncle Tom* form involves questions about whether intimacy between and among races is possible in the United States. These questions are frequently played out through love plots in which heterosexual intimacy and gender norms are also deemed fragile. This casts sexual difference and the conventional hierarchies of value associated with it in the U.S. as vaguely analogous to the scene of racial difference, wherein visible corporeal distinctiveness is explained as something between species and cultural difference. *The King and I* supplements these conventions and reveals their em-
beddedness in economic and imperial relations by having the King and Tuptim imaginatively enter the War between the States through Lincoln and Stowe. Where they are concerned, the activity of citation marks a desire for identification and translation across nations, lexicons, and systems of hierarchy. It also marks the mobility of categories of privilege and subordination: for example, the King is imperially vulnerable but sexually strong, while Leonowens’s lines of privilege are the inverse. For both figures, identification across radically different cultures involves a serious ambition to act courageously, to learn to become something radically different than one is. But the will to appropriate difference to explicate and transform the scene of one’s own desire necessarily involves distortion, mistranslation, and misrecognition. In *The King and I*, as in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and many other texts of sentimental politics, the play between various matrices of “difference” produces comedy amidst calamity, making a sort of slapstick of survival. But the desire for vernacularization, the making local of a nonlocal phenomenon, is a serious one as well.\(^3\)

The political tradition of sentimentality ultimately equates the vernacular with the human: in its imaginary, crises of the heart and of the body’s dignity produce events that, properly publicized, can topple great nations and other patriarchal institutions if an effective and redemptive linkage can be constructed between the privileged and the socially abject. *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* is an archive people come to out of a political optimism that the revolution in mass subjectivity for which it stands might be borrowed for the transformation of other unjust social institutions. The novel’s very citation is a sign that an aesthetic work can be powerful enough to move the people who read it into identifying against their own interests. In so doing, the text of sentimental politics figures a radical challenge to the bodies and body politic hailed by it. The artwork is shown to be as potentially powerful as a nation or any world-saturating system: it makes and remakes subjects.

Yet the forces of distortion in the world of feeling politics put into play by the citation of *Uncle Tom* are as likely to justify ongoing forms of domination as to give form and language to impulses toward resistance.\(^4\) In *The King and I*, as in many melodramas, the soundtrack tells this story first, and then the plot follows. Frustrated by the King’s imperiousness, Leonowens begins to think of him as a barbarian. But his head wife, Lady Thiang, sings to her: the King “will not always
say, / What you would have him say, / But now and then he’ll say / Something wonderful.”5 Because he believes in his “dreams” and makes himself vulnerable through that belief, he is, it is suggested, worth loving. He is, in that sense, like a woman, and indeed his patriarchal authoritarianism is revealed as mere bluster. As a result, the King takes on the sacred aura of a sentimental heroine, complete with sacrificial death. This plot turn marks a classic moment of politico-sentimental pedagogy. Although he is a tyrant, the King’s story demands sympathy, and then empathy, from the women who surround him. Here they become stand-in figures for the audience, witnessing his death as a process of dramatic detheatricalization. As the play progresses and the King is “humanized” by feeling and therefore put less on display as a body, the narrative loses focus on the systemic violence of the King’s acts. Violence must be taken offstage tactically in order to produce startling and transformative lines of empathy, but this empathy is mainly directed toward the pain of the privileged for being enslaved by a system of barbarous power in which they were destined, somehow, to be caught.

Can we say something general, then, about the contradictions deliberately or inevitably animated by politically motivated deployments of sentimental rhetoric? Here is a hypothesis: when sentimentality meets politics, it uses personal stories to tell of structural effects, but in so doing it risks thwarting its very attempt to perform rhetorically a scene of pain that must be soothed politically. Because the ideology of true feeling cannot admit the nonuniversality of pain, its cases become all jumbled together and the ethical imperative toward social transformation is replaced by a civic-minded but passive ideal of empathy. The political as a place of acts oriented toward publicness becomes replaced by a world of private thoughts, leanings, and gestures. Suffering, in this personal-public context, becomes answered by survival, which is then recoded as freedom. Meanwhile, we lose the original impulse behind sentimental politics, which is to see the individual effects of mass social violence as different from the causes, which are impersonal and depersonalizing.

Thus far, I have focused on the general processes of entextualization that sentimental culture promotes as a way of acknowledging and actually exploiting apparently irreducible social differences to produce a universalism around, especially, modes of suffering or painful feeling. Two other ways of entering the rhe-
historical conventions of true feeling in the U.S. political sphere also contribute to its symbolic valence: its relation to the feminine and to femininity as a way of living; and its relation to capitalist culture, both at the juncture where abstract relations of value are sublimated into and represented by particular kinds of subaltern bodies and at the place where the magical autonomy of the commodity form (the mirror of the stereotype) is positioned as the disembodied solution to the experience of social negativity or isolation.\textsuperscript{6} I will return to the commodity in the next section.

Here let me emphasize the particular place that femininity has played in maintaining optimism around sentimental pedagogy in and about the United States. In Margaret Landon’s fictional retelling of Anna Leonowens’s books on the court at Siam (Landon’s \textit{Anna and the King of Siam} is the source of the musical), a similar domino theory of the \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin} effect is put forward: female authorship leads to female sexual dignity and women’s identification across distinctions in racial, class, linguistic, national, and sexual privilege. But in Landon’s text the narrative that moves from the end of slavery to the beginning of democratic modernity exists apart from any love plot. In the historical texts it is not Tuptim who resists through Stowe (Tuptim does have illicit love, but she is executed for it).\textsuperscript{7} The King’s senior wife, Son Klin, brings Stowe into Siam and adopts Stowe as her own epistolary persona.

According to Leonowens and Landon, Son Klin desires not to escape to another man but to identify her way out of her isolation through homosocial sentimentality. Sentimentality is her form of adultery. Son Klin desires to imagine a world where women and Kings will violate their privilege, just for a second, to make a fundamental structural shift in the modes of rule that dominate her and her world; she imagines that the sovereign classes might be converted not by principled argument but by being convinced to honor what ought to be their feelings of grief and shame at the scandalous social violences they have been perfectly willing to see as ordinary, or necessary, or hardwired into the system they administer. In this relation to the transformative environment of true feeling about pain, she too is a typical sentimental subject. She is not fictional but is transformed by the utopia of fiction into a new kind of person.

Stowe-style sentimentality enables Son Klin to identify against her own privilege with other women in the King’s domain. But she can
form of ethical subjectivity and the ideals of liberal culture, which lie about the identity of subjects under the skin, usually in normative terms of feeling? How does the relation between the critical and the universalist tendencies in sentimental discourse produce a confusion between survival and freedom, and between changed minds and changed worlds? Finally, how is this story about race and femininity also a story about the exploitation styles of capitalism and the magical return of value promised by the commodity and the nation form?

The Unfinished Business of Sentimentality

*Uncle Tom's Cabin* is a much adapted text, one whose moments of comedy and pathos are differently foregrounded in its many recurrences. But the place of “Poor Eliza” in this ongoing story is striking: almost every adaptation of the novel involves an elaborate dramatic staging of the scene where she crosses the Ohio river riding rafts of ice. This event takes less than two pages in the text. Yet it is a powerful scene, electrified by the awesome power of the mother to harness her own sublimity to the sublimity of nature, thus transforming herself into a species of superperson. Even in its syntax the spectacle of Eliza seems to rise out of history and the text, simultaneously flashing into the present tense of the writing and the reading:

A thousand lives seemed to be concentrated in that one moment to Eliza. Her room opened by a side door to the river. She caught her child, and sprang down the steps towards it. . . . In that dizzy moment her feet to her scarce seemed to touch the ground, and a moment brought her to the water’s edge. Right on behind they came; and, nerved with strength such as God gives only to the desperate, with one wild cry and flying leap, she vaulted sheer over the turbid current by the shore, on to the raft of ice beyond. It was a desperate leap—impossible to anything but madness and despair. . . . The huge green fragment of ice on which she alighted pitched and creaked as her weight came on it, but she staid there not a moment. With wild cries and desperate energy she leaped to another and still another cake; stumbling—leaping—slipping—springing upwards again! Her shoes are gone—her stockings cut from her feet—while blood marked every step; but she saw nothing, felt nothing, till dimly, as in a dream, she saw the Ohio side, and a man helping her up the bank.
More than any other scene in the adaptations of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* this one remains unadulterated—elaborated, embellished, naturalized or made artificial and iconic, but almost never written out of the text, as the death of Uncle Tom frequently is, or reversed, as both Tom’s and Eva’s deaths sometimes are. This phenomenon recurs even when the story is rendered comic, as in “Felix the Cat in Uncle Tom’s Crabbin” (1927), where, as Felix flees Simon Legree by jumping into an ice truck, the intertitle card reads “Felix substitutes for Eliza crossing the ice!”

This one irreverent moment aside, it is worth considering further why the bridge over troubled waters made by Eliza’s sublimity survives the continuous transformations of the supertext or semiotic field that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* becomes. In the dramatic texts, this spectacle is often sublimely rendered. Indeed, the dramaturgic and cinematic history shows that if its main purpose is to solicit audience identification with the overwhelming power of the mother’s will to survive for her children, the tacit purpose of the adaptations seems often to have been to generate awe at the technological capacities of the play or the film. It makes the spectator merge awe at the woman’s power in the face of the danger she endures for freedom, love, and family with the techno-aesthetic power of an entertainment medium to reframe the real, to generate surplus pleasure and surplus pain at the spectacle of the sublime object of sentimentality. Here moral victory and economic survival in plots about vulnerable, desiring, dominated, and powerful women merge with a consumer pedagogy: the act of enraptured consumption becomes inextricable from the moral act of identification.

Additionally, the capacity to experience awe at the bridge sublimely made by Eliza further becomes a sign of personal, cultural, and national modernity, both ideologically and aesthetically speaking. Thus witnessing and identifying with pain, consuming and deriving pleasure and moral self-satisfaction, and imagining these impulses will lead, somehow, to changing the world—this ideological, aesthetic, and capitalist cluster is at the center of the death-driven, pain-saturated, therapy-seeking, and unevenly radical discourse of protest that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* generates. I will turn to two specific later instances of this genealogy; here I want to focus on the way this scene bridges the testifying moral function of suffering—which is the condition that authorizes the reader to imagine changing the world—and the commodified world of aesthetic pleasure, distraction, and instruction that
capitalist culture provides. I want to understand how the powerful hunger to know and to adapt the ways other oppressed people survive becomes sutured, with a therapeutic intensity, to acts of consumption; and to know how the virtues of identification with pain have become mediated through plots whose conventions are so formalized that they might as well be things, as though a free gift shimmers inside the tarnished box that promises ever more pleasure.

I have been speaking of conventions, stereotypes, and forms—the diacritics of congealed feeling that characterize the cultural scene of sentimentality. Behind this is a desire to see the sentimental itself as a form, not just a content with scenic themes like those of weeping, sacrifice, and sanctified death. As when a refrigerator is opened by a person hungry for something other than food, the turn to sentimental rhetoric at moments of social anxiety constitutes a generic wish for an unconflicted world, one where structural inequities, not emotions and intimacies, are epiphenomenal. In this imaginary world the sentimental subject is connected to others who share the same feeling. Historically, this involves a fantasy scene of national feeling, which incorporates moments of collective desire, instruction, and identification that persist outside the instability of the everyday. The politico-sentimental therefore exists paradoxically: it seeks out monumental time, the sphere of dreaming and memory, and translates its idealities into an imaginary realm where agency is somehow unconstrained by the normative conventions of the real.

Which is to say that where sentimental ideology is, there will be a drive to separate and compartmentalize fundamental psychically felt social ambivalences in such a way that all the forces in play seem formally equivalent. For example, the critique of patriarchal familialism constantly put forth by sentimental forms can be used to argue against the normativity of the family; yet the sacred discourse of family values within this very domain works to preserve the fantasy of the family as the smallest space of sociability in which flow, intimacy, and identification across difference can bridge life across generations. Likewise, the antisentimental presumption of bourgeois nationalism that proper individual self-management in the everyday will produce nationality in its proper scale has been used to build and to critique identity discourses associated with U.S. subaltern classes, and, on the other hand, sentimental rhetoric is deployed to describe everything from the timeless psychic unity of citizens possessing a national identity
to the fragility of normal culture itself when faced with challenges to its unity or continuity.\textsuperscript{13} Meanwhile, social progressives have for over a century represented the ordinary effects of structural suffering in tactically sentimental ways—modes of testimony, witnessing, visual documentation—to critique the fallen patriarchal/capitalist world of proper reason; now this same world has assimilated those genres to describe the psychic effects of multiculturalism on those who once felt truly free, nationally speaking.

What conclusions can we reach from this jumble of ambitions to use and refuse sentimentality in the political sphere? In the history of national sentimentality I have elsewhere outlined, we see that at moments of crisis persons violate the zones of privacy that give them privilege and protection in order to fix something social that feels threatening.\textsuperscript{14} They become public on behalf of privacy and imagine that their rupture of individuality by collective action is temporary and will be healed when the national world is once again safe for a return to personal life. Sentimental politics works on behalf of its own eradication. This utopia of autoerasure constitutes the dream work of sentiment and the culture industry that supports it, and in the heritage of sentimentality the nationally supported taxonomies—in particular those involving race, gender, class, and regional hierarchies—still largely govern the horizon of failure and possibility constructed by sentimental authors and readers. Dreaming is both the site of sentimental criticism and the consoling pleasure of its commoditized expression.

By the phrase "unfinished business," therefore, I mean to designate the specific conjuncture of adaptation, commodification, and affect that distinguishes this modern and nationally inflected modality of expression. I also mean to describe here the way the semiotic substance of sentimentality has been used not only to hardwire the history of slavery into the forms of affect that have long distinguished modes of pain, pleasure, identity, and identification in the American culture industry, but also to see specifically the ways these habits of emotional quotation or affective citation redraw the meanings of American history, in two ways. First, as Jane Tompkins and many after her have demonstrated, sentimentality signifies redefinition, and in the U.S. the definitions of power, personhood, and consent construe the scene of value in the political public sphere in such a way that any account of sentimentality has to be an account of change and of an ideology of
change that explains what gets to count as historic change and what kinds of activities fall out of the dominant definitions; second, the history of the deployment of sentiment has generated its own archive of gestures, structures, and identities of emotion, protheses and modes of commentary that come to signify a metaculture, a place where "adaptation" itself, as a form of domination, fantasy, and necessity, is consented to and worked out. That sentimentality always designates the activity of a transition and an ideology of adaptation to necessity means that the signs of surplus enjoyment, surplus pain, or sublimity itself, made on behalf of the sentimental subject for whom authors reimagine the real world, will link the overwhelming pressures to survive everyday life and overwhelming desires to inhabit an imaginary space of transcendent identity whose mirror of the quotidian allows the utopian and the practical to meet intimately, and in a text you can buy that will give you an experience you cannot, at this time, have elsewhere. We might call this aesthetics of remediation a space of disinterpellation or uncanny self-misrecognition because in order to benefit from the therapeutic promises of sentimental discourse you must imagine yourself with someone else's stress, pain, or humiliated identity. The possibility that through the identification with alterity you will never be the same remains the radical threat and the great promise of this affective aesthetic.

The Slave's Dimples

The publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* immediately generated an entire industry of toys that appeared to turn the fascinating text of pain and survival into new kinds of pedagogical pleasure involving play about slavery. Thomas Gossett reports that "[t]he novel inspired a whole new industry of souvenirs of its leading characters. Enterpriseing manufacturers hurriedly produced candles, toys, figurines, and games based upon it. One of the games had players compete with one another in reuniting members of slave families."\(^{15}\) That competition for control of the zeitgeist of national modernity became an after dinner pastime in bourgeois America of the 1850s does not diminish the importance of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a figure for the power of a commodity to shock its consumers into a contemporary crisis of knowledge and national power; indeed the novel's capacity to shock has become a continually revived beacon of what the collaboration of