

## 10. Feministinen taloustiede

Työryhmän vetäjä Tiina Vainio

Työryhmä kokoontuu salissa SS 103 käsityöluokka

### ***Perjantai 14.11.2003 klo 16.00-19.00***

16.15	Tiina Vainio	Feministinen taloustiede
16.55	Emma Vironmäki	Tieteenalan rajat
17.35	Kalle Tuhkanen	Tragedia, etiikka ja hinta
18.15	Petri Huhtanen	Itsen teknologiat ja taloustiede

Alustus 20 minuuttia, keskustelu 20 minuuttia. Yhteensä 40 minuuttia / esiintyjä.

***Tiina Vainio, [tvainio@uih.fi](mailto:tvainio@uih.fi)***

### **FEMINISTINEN TALOUSTIEDE**

Esitys vetää linjaa feministisen taloustieteen kansainvälisen tutkimuskeskustelun ja Suomessa opetettavan talouden feministisen tutkimuksen vaiheilla. Lyhyt historiikki tutkimusalueen tapahtumista viimeisen kymmenen vuoden aikana. Tarina alkaa laman aikana virinneestä hyvinvointivaltio vs. hyvinvointiyhteiskunta – keskustelusta. Tähän liittyen markkinat on ajettu yhteiskunnan keskeisimmäksi mekanismiksi. Pelin periaatteet on hyväksytty myös sosiaalipoliittisissa puheenvuoroissa ”hyvinvointivaltion tragedian” hoito-ohjeksi. Pelin henkenä on ollut viimeisinä vuosina laskea hyvinvointivaltio markkinoiden varaan. Hallitus kokoontuu parhaillaan työttömyyden hoitoseminaariinsa suljettujen ovien takana.

Feministisen taloustieteen kansainvälinen tutkimus liikkuu sekä dekonstruktion että konstruktion linjoilla. Alan aikakausikirjan *Feminist Economics* päätoimittaja painottaa dekonstruktion korvaamattomuutta taloustieteen feminististen käännösten tukena. Ehdoton dekonstruktiivinen logiikka on pätevä tutkimuskumppani feministisen taloustieteen projektiin, jonka tavoitteena on avata talouden tutkimusta ihmisten, syntymän ja muistamisen maailmaan sujuvassa yhteistyössä taloustieteen miestutkimuksen kanssa.

Samaistumisen painotus feministisessä taloustieteessä tarkoittaa tutkimuksen siirtymistä kategoristen identiteettien rajoille, niiden mahdollisuusehtoihin. Feministisessä taloustieteessä subjekti voi olla rauhassa raiteiltaan suistunut ilman, että valinta haittaisi talouden teorioiden kriittistä uudelleentulkintaa tai uhkaisi utopiaa omassa tavoittamattomuudessaan.

Poliittisen taloustieteen tutkimus on vaivalloista umpeen ohjelmoidussa julkisessa tilassa, sellaisessa kuin suomalainen hyvinvointivaltio. Silti pidän hyvinvointivaltiota elvytyksensä ansaitsevana kansallisena arvona, suomalaisena kulttuuriperintönä muiden sellaisten joukossa. Iloisena uutisena riennän kertomaan, että taloustieteeseen on vihdoinkin perustettu miestutkimuksen tutkimusala. Ensimmäinen tapaaminen on sovittu loka-marraskuun vaihteeseen 2004 Kreetan Rethimnoniin, jossa järjestetään eurooppalaisen poliittisen taloustieteen yhdistyksen kansainvälinen tutkimuskongressi. Tervetuloa keskustelemaan Eroksen ehdollistamasta taloudesta ja sen tutkimisen tavoista, palautumattoman eron merkityksestä taloudessa ja markkinoilla.

**Emma Vironmäki, [emma@postikaista.net](mailto:emma@postikaista.net), Tampereen yliopisto, kauppatieteiden laitos**

## **TUTKIMUS TIETEENALAN DISKURSIIVISISTA RAJOISTA**

### **Case: Markkinointi**

Tieteenalojen olemassaoloa on totuttu pitämään jonkinlaisena pysyvänä ilmiönä, etenkin kun on kyse vanhemmista tieteenaloista. Tämä tutkimus käsittelee nuorta tieteenalaa, markkinointia, diskursiivisesta näkökulmasta. Tällöin sen olemusta tarkastellaan siitä luotujen tekstien avulla, puhuvina päinä esiintyvät markkinoinnin professorit kautta suomenmaan, samoin alalla tehdyt väitöskirjat ja opetuksen suosituimmat oppikirjat.

Diskursiivisuudella tarkoitetaan sen hyväksymistä, että teksteistä tehtävä (paikallinen) analyysi on riittävä tiedon mittapuu. Diskurssit luodaan vuoropuhelussa tutkijan ja aineiston välillä – niitä ei ”löydetä” aineistosta jonkinlaisella arkeologisella toimenpiteellä tekstissä jo valmiina olleena

ominaisuutena. Diskursiivisuudella tarkoitetaan myös sitä, että kaikkeen tekstiin suhtaudutaan samalla lähestymistavalla. Siten ei luoda faktuaalista taustaa, johon diskursseja analysoimalla saatavaa ”tietoa” voitaisiin verrata. Kielen ulkopuolelle en voi astua, otan siis sen annettuna, huomioin oman suhteeni siihen, ja yritän olla johdonmukainen.

Kiinnostukseni kohteena on siis se tosiseikka, että joku rakentaa maailmankuvansa eri tavalla kuin minä. Olen utelias ymmärtämään, miten markkinoinnin tieteenalan edustajat ajattelevat ja miten he rakentavat maailmansa. Markkinointi on tyypillinen nuori tieteenala, joka hakee rooliaan tieteiden kentässä. Se ei määrittele suhdettaan muihin tieteisiin kuin hyvin ajoittaisesti, mutta sitäkin enemmän se määrittelee suhdettaan itseensä.

Markkinointi on hakenut tieteellisen imagonsa pääosin kansantaloustieteestä, jonka parista se ainakin Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulussa erkani erilaisten määrittelyjen kautta. Ei siis ole ihme, että sen parissa tehtävä tutkimus hakee myös kriteerinsä ja arvonsa kansantaloustieteen vastaavien parista. Kentällä elävät vahvoina modernin tieteen ihanteet, realistiset tutkimusotteet, empiristinen maailmankuva ja tarve olla niin ”tieteellinen” kuin mahdollista. Tämä on osittain johtanut siihen, että markkinoinnin akateemiset tutkijat kirjoittavat pääosin toisilleen, ja konsulttiakateemikot hallitsevat puheellaan toiminnan keskikenttää vähäisemmästä lukumäärästään huolimatta.

Tutkimukseni on idealistinen, sillä uskon tieteentekijöiden vastuuseen inhimillisestä hyvinvoinnista (huolimatta siitä, että tämäkin on epämääräinen käsite). Tutkimukseni on kriittinen, sillä tohdin väittää, että markkinointitiede sellaisena kuin se nyt on, ei lisää kenenkään hyvinvointia. Markkinoinnin kentällä toimintaa määrittävät arviolta kahdessa kolmasosassa kaikista haastatteluista seuraavat seikat: Kiire, yksinäisyys, kateus, paineet, muutos (huonompaan), ristiriidat, kritiikki, muiden tyytymättömyys ja tietämättömyys, oma riittä-mättömyys, ympäristön vaatimukset, väärinymmärrykset, ”huono tuuri” ja epävarmuus. Hyvin vahvakin toimija voi kuulua tähän ryhmään, kyseessä ei siis ole mikään ”luusereiden” koalitio, vaan kentän itsensä määrittämät pelisäännöt.

Feministinen taloustiede ei tutki naisten ongelmia naisten tavalla ja ole naisten tekemää. Sen sijaan se haluaa haastaa maskuliinisen tiedonmuodostuksen tavan, joka survoo tutkimuskohteensa laatikkoon ja hakkaa huonosti sopivat reunat irti. Se haluaa kyseenalaistaa rationaalisuuden, tehokkuuden ja abstraktion ensisijaisuuden hyvän tieteen kriteereinä.

Tämä tutkimus, minun tutkimukseni, taiteilee veitsenterällä, sillä tässä ei ole pyrkimyksenä osoittaa kokonaisen tieteenalan olevan huono tai kelvoton. Markkinoinnin alalla työskentelee monia älykkäitä ja kykeneviä ihmisiä, ja joskin olen eri mieltä heidän tavastaan suhtautua tieteelliseen tietoon, ei pyrkimykseni ole asettua kentän yläpuolelle ja julistaa tämä asiointi totuutena. Pyrkimykseni on pikemminkin kirjoittaa tieteenala "ulos" siten, että tuottamani uusi konstruktio voi avata uusia tapoja toimia ja nähdä.

**Kalle Tuhkanen**, [kalle.tuhkanen@helsinki.fi](mailto:kalle.tuhkanen@helsinki.fi)

## **TRAGEDIAN ETIIKASTA JA ESIMERKILLISISTÄ HINNOISTA**

Voisiko Antigonen kreikkalaisuuteen, Ari Hirvosen tragedian etiikan muotoiluun (*Tiede ja edistys* 3/2003), tukeutuen nostaa esille kysymys Antigonestä taloustieteen sankari(ttare)na? Esitän (Kreonin henkilöön ja intuitioon tukeutuen tosin), että Antigonen vaatimus haudata Polyneikes, moderni kohtalottomuus, voidaan asettaa kulutusyhteiskunnan jumalan/t haastavana *traagisena kulutuksena*. Hölderlinin traaginen esitys (mimesis, *Darstellung*) ihmisen *praksiksen* esityksenä elementin – fyysisen, olemisen, luonnon – vaikutusvirrassa palautuu tässä vaatimuksessa Kreonin hamartiaan (arviointivirheeseen), myyjyyden (poliittiseen, tyranniseen) määrittämiseen ostajuuden allekirjoituksena. Kreonin hybris jännittyy, kun Antigone ei suostu kyseiseen poliittiseen allekirjoitukseen, vaan tilaa myyjänä laskun ja maksaa mahdollomuudella maksaa (allekirjoittaa myynti, talouden alue) eli kuljettaa tragedian lakiin.

Tragedian lain kyseisellä tavalla tematisoivissa Antigonen vaatimuksen perussanoissa, Suomen joutomaan käyttöopas osa 1:ssä ("eli kuinka laskea ja

toivottaa tervetulleeksi yhteen "luonnonvarattoman" tavaran käyttökertaan tai mahdolliseen palveluysikköön kuluva materiaalin ja energian määrä") , moderniin hybrikseen/katharsikseen suostumaton Kreon lausuu tragedian *käyvän* oikeutta (talouden allekirjoituksesta?).

AUTHOR'S PREFACE:  
CRAZY ABOUT AMELIE

This sister-dialogue that I am happy to deliver had been lost for several years to its conformity with the idea of self as money (or "giving what one does not have", which some seem to translate as an act of love). This comfort, or delicacy, to which it was so much intimidated, not trusting its wings, entailed a lot of purchase power, which for Amelie, a close relative to sisters, didn't prove much. Not a single event, for that matter.

For Amelie a box behind the wall "had just waited for a call", a call to a mathematician, who regularly walked by her Bureau of Inviting to Re-Think the 'National' in National Economy. Hadn't it been Amelie this Bureau would never have turned into that unforgivable Chocolate Shop in which sisters originally started to question the modern narration.

THESE SISTERS THAT ARE NOT ONE: Would Manara ... ?

[Let us go back to] what links the event to the gift: No gift without the advent of an event, no event without the surprise of a gift. What happens to the beggar and to the friend of the narrator, what in effect passes or comes to pass between them seems, at first glance, to constitute the central event of the narrative. But the repercussion of this gesture *appears only in a discourse*, in the friend's triumphant *confession* when he says to the narrator: "It was the counterfeit coin." Then, in fact, all the rest is taken up with a sort of interior monologue or private deliberation by the narrator. The latter speaks in the first person. He always does so, he speaks continuously *to himself*, and sometimes he remarks it, as if speaking out loud in an inner voice, for example, when he says *to us* what he is saying *to himself*: " 'What a singularly minute distribution' I said to myself." The essential

movement of the narrative as such, what makes it advance depends *first of all*, or one could say only, on what then happens to the narrator. And what happens to him is what occurs in his friendship, what befalls that friendship, so as to surprise it [*la surprendre*]. But still more precisely, the event does not boil down to what befalls the narrator and affects his friendship. It takes the form of a meditation *on the event* and a meditation that is not exempt from reasoning and speculation – *ad infinitum*. The narrator speculates on a speculation, on this event which, consisting in a gift (the gift of some money that *proves* [*s'avère*], if one can put it that way, to be counterfeit), could well be the effect of a speculation that engenders in its turn, in a capitalizing fashion, other speculative events. The event, *in sum*, is what urges the “I” to ask himself: “What is happening to me?” “What has just happened?” and “What is an event?” What does “to happen” [*arriver*] mean? Can one create an event? Can one *make history*, make *a story*, can one *make* in general on the basis or with the help of a simulacrum, here counterfeit? The narrator says, *to himself*, at a certain moment, at the beginning of his speculation: “such conduct in my friend was excusable only by the desire to create an event in this poor devil’s life.”

but what passes and what comes to pass, through a movement of *transference*, is that the event has been created in the life of the narrator himself; it has affected the fabric of *relation* itself, relation as narrative and narration, that is clear, but first of all the relation *between* the narrator and his friend.

What happens through what comes to pass happens to the narrator and to his relation of friendship: to be unable to absolve the other, to be incapable of forgiving him, of giving him his forgiveness following the event that the other will have *perhaps* provoked by offering counterfeit money. The narrator tells us, in effect (and one must hear it in the act of narration rather than in the content of the story or the narrative, to make use still of these categories): This is what is happening to me; this is what is happening to us, to my friend and to me. I cannot give him my forgiveness, in truth I do not owe him this forgiveness, I ought to even to refuse to give it to him – and we infer from that: because by not really giving *to this poor man*, he has not given *to me*. Given what? The question is relayed by too many detours and ruses for a single and immediate response to measure up to it

right away. For the moment, let us simply try to exhibit one locus of the event that risks remaining in the background of the story and even of the narrative.

The event takes place in the structured layers of the narration, in the fabric of the narrative relation that links the narrator to his friend. For even the relation as link or as religion of friendship between them also takes – between them – the manifest form of the narrative relation. If the friend had not told the narrator what had in fact happened (“‘It was the counterfeit coin,’ he replied calmly as though to justify himself this prodigality”), if the friend had not recounted what had in truth happened, if he, while seeming to boast, had not confessed, told, *made* the truth, nothing would have happened to the narrator and to the narration. Whatever perverse or twisted motivation we may attribute to the friend when he tells the narrator the truth (and we will come back to this), we have every reason to think that he wanted to produce an effect on the narrator. This effect *had* [devait] to happen to the narrator or to the friendship that links him to the narrator. It was a matter of “creating an event” also on that side of things, the side of the narrator. One hardly needs to push things very far in this direction to imagine that, had he been alone with the beggar, the friend would not perhaps have offered the counterfeit money; he only did it *in the presence of the narrator* and in the order to *provoke* the narrator with his confession. For a confession is at the center of this circulation or this economy, a confession without repentance and without mercy, but a confession in which the guilty one (the so-called or supposed guilty, the accused) confides by confiding the truth in the friend-narrator. *Confiding himself* thus (in the name of truth or of friendship), he *gives* himself, to be sure, he pretends at least to give himself, to make a show of himself [*se donner en spectacle*], to present himself to view, to give himself over to judgement, but we will see that the narrator does not want to take any account of this gift and in any case he will not respond with forgiveness. If the friend sought to provoke the narrator, what did he want to push him to do? And how? Perhaps we will see, presuming, that is, that there is anything *to see* and that the *relation* (ference, reference, difference, differance, transference, or narration) is not there to say the saying inasmuch as it withholds from seeing.

So something happens, an event takes place. Where does it take place? Where does it happen? To whom does it happen? In what does it consist? That which

happens here is not the content of a story, those events that a narrative relation generally reports. What happens happens to the narration, to the elements of the narration itself, beginning with the fiction of its supposed subject. One generally thinks that a narrative discourse reports events that have taken place outside it and before it. Narrative relation, so one thinks, does not recount itself; it reports a content that is given outside it and before it. Here, we must keep in mind that what happens happens to the narrator and to the narration; what happens provokes the narrator and the narration; the components of the narration are that without which the event no doubt would not take place. It is *as if* the narrative condition were the cause of the recounted thing, *as if* the narrative produced the event it is supposed to report. It is on the condition of the narrative produced that the recounted thing would have taken place, that it will have taken place. As cause and condition of the thing [*chose*], it is the narrative that *gives* the possibility of the recounted thing, the possibility of the story as story of a gift or of a forgiveness, but also and by the same token the possibility of the impossibility of gift and forgiveness: "I will never forgive him," concludes the narrator. Let us note in passing: In every situation where the possibility of narration is the condition of the story, of history [*de l'histoire*], of the historical event, one ought to be able to say that the condition of knowing or the desire to know (*ēpistēmē*, *historia rerum gestarum*, *Historie*) gives rise to history itself (*res gestae*, *Geschehen*, *Geschichte*), which could complicate, if not contradict, finally, many argumentations of the Hegelian or Heideggerian type that always seem to require the inverse order (no *Historie* without *Geschichte*), although it is true they do so only after having first integrated the possibility of narration or of the relation to knowing into that of the event.

Such would be the given time, such would be the given space, such would be the strange spacing structure of "Counterfeit Money" from the moment the two friends – of whom one is the narrator – take their distance, one from the other, but first of all together from the tobacconist's. Spacing: They leave in the same step, but in a step that must also be altogether other. This step scans the time of the story, it proceeds from a given moment to a given moment.

There must be event – and therefore appeal to narrative and event of narrative – for there to be gift, and there must be gift or *phenomenon of gift* for there to be narrative and history. **And this event, event of condition and condition of event,**



must remain in a certain way unforeseeable. The gift, like the event, as event, must *remain* unforeseeable, but remain so without keeping itself. It must let itself be structured by the aleatory; it must *appear* chancy or in any case lived as such, apprehended as the intentional correlate of a perception that is absolutely surprised by the encounter with what it perceives, beyond its horizon of anticipation – which already appears phenomenologically impossible. Whatever the case may be with this phenomenological impossibility, a gift or an event that would be foreseeable, necessary, conditioned, programmed, expected, counted on would not be lived as either a gift or as an event, as required by a necessity that is both semantic or phenomenological. That is why the condition common to the gift and the event is a certain unconditionality (*Unbedingtheit*: let us leave this German word suspended here; it says something about the thing [*Ding*] and the non-thing; we should moreover read it after Heidegger, return it to Heidegger). The event and the gift, the event as gift, the gift as event must be irruptive, unmotivated – for example, disinterested. They are decisive and they must therefore tear the fabric, interrupt the continuum of a narrative that nevertheless they call for, they must perturb the order of causalities: in an instant. They must, in an instant, at a single blow, bring into relation luck, chance, the aleatory, *tukhē*, with the freedom of the dice throw, with the donor's gift throw [*coup de don*]. The gift and the event obey nothing, except perhaps the principles of disorder, that is, principles without principles. In any case, if the gift or the event, if the event of the gift must remain unexplainable by a system of efficient causes, it is the effect of nothing: it is no longer an effect at all, even if there are, as I would say in French and in both senses of the word, *des effets de don*, gift *effects*: for example, the aleatory events created by the gift of counterfeit money and on which, in sum, both partners are speculating.

And yet – effects of pure chance will never form a gift that has the meaning of a gift, if in the semantics of the word "gift" it seems implied that the donating agency freely has the intention to give, that it is animated by a wanting-to-give and first of all by a wanting-to-say, the intention-to-give to the gift its meaning of gift. **What would a gift be in which I gave without wanting to give and without knowing that I am giving, without the explicit intention of giving, or even in spite of myself?** This is the paradox in which we have been engaged from the beginning. There is no gift without the intention of giving. The gift can only have a meaning that is intentional

– in the two senses of the word that refers to intention as well as to intentionality. However, everything stemming from the intentional meaning also threatens the gift with self-keeping, with being kept in its very expenditure. Whence the enigmatic difficulty lodged in this donating eventiveness [*événementalité*]. There must be chance, encounter, the involuntary, even unconsciousness or disorder, and there must be intentional freedom, and these two conditions must – miraculously, graciously – agree with each other ...

... While talking to himself, while reflecting – and the whole narrative is caught in the echo of this mirror – the narrator speculates on the speculation like a painter of modern life. He speculates on what can happen to capital in a capital during the age of money, more precisely, in the age of value as monetary sign: The circulation of the counterfeit money can engender, even for a "little speculator," the real interest of a true wealth. Counterfeit money can become true capital. Is not the truth of capital, then, inasmuch as it produces interest without labor, by *working all by himself* as we say, counterfeit money? Is there a real difference here between real and counterfeit money once there is capital? And credit? Everything depends on the act of faith and the credit we were talking about ... This text by Baudelaire deals, in effect, with the relations among fiction in general, literary fiction and capitalism, such as they might be photographed acting out a scene in the heart of the modern capital.

Let us return to the place of this scene, we could say to the scene of the crime ...

*Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money* by Jacques Derrida,  
119-125. Published 1992. Paperback edition 1994.  
Transl. Peggy Kamuff. The University of Chicago Press,  
Ltd., Chicago - London, © by The University of Chicago.

- Take any city. Venice. Stockholm. Madrid. New York – Manhattan. Helsinki. Paris. Milan. Prague. A sailor. A View: over the roofs. Palace-hotel. Skin: mellow, soft, dark. Sparkling, glamorous eyes: staring through a window from a conference-room. Cities in an eye, full of surprises. Eclipses. Howling wheels. Frames: hollow, not too obvious. A sailor. A statue. Like the sails in 'Una

ballata del mare salato'. Somebodies having beaten a woman at The Wall.  
 Unsurprising: unconditioned economical perception. Of any city. Witnesses:  
 zero. Footsteps. A businesswoman. Lights: Wall-marts. A park in daylight.  
 Sailor staring. Ruins. A barrel of oil.

- In Venice?
- Any city. Woman with black hair. Balance sheets. International academic  
 "value free" research institute of economics focusing on (1) operationalizing  
 and locating power of markets, (2) energy argumenting economy. Crispy  
 morning-after. Clear-cut images. Early spring. A statue. A sailor. Not from any  
 rescuesquad. Leaning on a fence.
- Woman approaches.
- Not just any prat.
- Some hope?
- As hopeful one could wish of a park in early day-light. Some trees. Some  
 flowers. A river. Closure of economy? Markets in balance?
- Woman approaching. Manara?
- Would he ... ?
- Women without noses. Lubricated by his interest.
- No. Woman at him. Questions of money. This impossible work. His line of work  
 ... ? His line ...?
- Statue standing still. A horse. Woman in just another frame. Looking. A horse  
 statue?
- With wheels?
- Cities like Troy? Woman approaching. Woman at him. Horse at a gate. Horse  
 as a gate. A statue. A sailor. A park. Day-light. A bridge? A bridge to fill a gap?
- Frank Gehry & Co? Architectural matter?
- A bridge for trafficking horses over a river? Dripping people to the other side?  
 Financial Times Millenium Bridge Competition Entry by Frank Gehry, sculptor  
 Richard Serra and engineer Jörg Schlaich?
- No. Not just any supplemental individual strengths.
- Manara?
- His line of work. Apt for dictation. Yearns for a 'click' like in Click 2.  
 Gulliveriana. "Duger". "Lite moomiländska då och då, men ...". Woman  
 approaching. Sailor. Not just another urban plan. Questions of spacing  
 economy, of markets appearing, disappearing ...

- Into a comic-book, into some book store? For fighting against modern contextualisation?
- Of prising. A take off - if you like - from prising based on numbers.
- Manara?!
- Reaching for feminist basketball company. Shakespeare's sisters from Harlem. A statue. A dime. Without a number? Numeric money: he would, although, but, it is. Crispy air. As always. To women. Without noses.
- Lizard! Published! Money laundry?
- Money laundry in the age of value as monetary sign? Like in the commentary of Baudrillard's Counterfeit Money? To rediscover the 'National' in National Economy. Hardly. Laundry: consumption? Revisiting Antigone?
  - For persuading not-yet-born-children, future owners to engender before time?. Like if this kind digital voice-recorder never existed. To hear that cherishing –or should I say: che-rishing – sound. Bleep. To sketch a few remarks about Che's "Mein-selbst Kampf" or "mining energy from exchange": about she who would rather take the name Cheherazade as her name with Theoriza than further continue to fall for some revolutionist and the restorer of the relations of numericity of money.

### **Suggestion by Theoriza**

T: Che, You are tickling me ... please stop biteing my ear ... Che? ...

C: I would prefer this without clothes ...

T: ... to enshine your assets, perhaps ... my 'breasts and other body parts' ... with never-seen-before-clothes of the emperor

C: Here she goes again ... !

T: If only your hands weren't so 'aesthetic', 'expressive', my beloved sister.

C: I'll spare them for your eye's only, for their beauty ...

T: I'm so thrilled ...

C: Sister is unhappy of the sheets and wouldn't like to sleep with me.

T: Only if you think me as such and only if you only think our sisterhood.

C: Aren't you a bit well-to-do here. All of a sudden. There is something troubling you?

T: Mostly nothing. Quantity? Maybe. I had a dream the other day ...

C: I'll listen. Dreaming costs nothing. It's free.

T: Free? Dreaming is not free. Numeric, perhaps, 'less than'. Like writing.

C: I can dream you for instance. I see a ring. And a golden tiara. Jewellery.

T: Jewellery? How rich and polite can one become? A story teller?

C: Film agent rather. Film excites ...

T: ... certain films specifically? Brando?

C: No. Not Brando ... or maybe him at the Apocalypse. Now.

T: ... No. It wasn't just a dream. Or. Perhaps there is one film, perhaps one specific film has an itch for me ... if I'll ever become or remind a bank-note, I'd love to have a line in the bottom that say's "Affording sisters that are not one". That would be a challenge for a film to come. Definitely.

C: A Film? A bank-note?

T: In a way, sis, you will eventually 'betray' or 'accuse' me for different reasons.

You will overexpose – and see me as 'film' as you have appetite for transparency.

C: Me? But I am your sister? I couldn't do that.

T: That's what you have been telling, as 'theory' is to you either a promise or guilty. Or ...

T: ... perhaps 'explanation' wasn't so important as we sat around this round table the other day. Don't you remember? We had an argument you insisted us 'having had' as we never, as you said, were able to come up with a solution, a solution that we both would have been pleased. You tried to conceive me.

C: I remember ... but how can you be so sure that I will betray you? Aren't you trusting a promise yourself?

T: The question was about money. You insisted on contextualizing, eliminating that question – and saw me barely as having just another or non-knowable 'context' behind me. And further. You insisted an explanation. In your photosynthetic device I didn't answer. Perhaps you thought I was overexposed. If only we could draw on these sentiments again ...

C: But we did ... wasn't it you who shouted "Stop! You're hurting me" all of sudden. I was merely following your guidance, sis.

T: No that was pretty much it, or as I would like to further comment particularly: pretty Much of It, of You. Only You Cheherazade. You relate to your father. You really fear for your talent. You try to realize what and how much is the Prise, your share.

C: But you agreed to stay with me, sis ...

T: For a moment, perhaps, but certainly not for long-time.

C: So you're saying it really isn't for us ... You mentioned (us) ...

T: Yes, pretty (much)

C: ... and we should draw on this conflict.

T: Yes, very.

C: Can you clarify me then? How do you understand an event?

T: Let (us) pay (our) due.

C: How?

T: Let 'money' get inscribed into (us).

C: Can (we) do that? What do you suggest?

T: To start with: let us play some basketball for your appetite for 'context' and 'history' for me, as you, particularly, seem to find/need a place for your motivations and energy.

C: That'll be the day ...

---

C: What a restful silence ... in this empty ... and ... echoing room do we meet? ... There certainly isn't that much to tell about a basketball-court that we couldn't agree on naming with particular names. Don't you agree? Teams get points as exchange for moving or guiding the ball through a basket-ring. These numerically represented points are summed up and coded as visible messages on the flashboard for the audience, which uncodes them as it follows the game from the benches that surround the court. Missing a point in this code would lead the game to miserable arguing about a detail apart of some whole. Certain rules have to be assumed. The Rule of the Father gathers this idea and many details circulate around it signifying signified ...

T: ... yes ... very much ... to a point when we, you and me, can't help noticing that our answering keeps following a scheme, the scheme of the 'how and what', one that works as a sort of non-present signifier of 'our' communication. Accordingly we could think that the ball is guided to one side of the court and ... hop ... the ball has gone inside the ring as the explanation corresponds the explained. Why not? We are pleased about the linear horizon of numbers that are taken as such, as the future or prize of our pursue. We get points as these 'numbers' pretend impartiality.

C: And you are saying that the 'court' could be addressed some other way. Not only seen through an account book, through 'numbers' ...

T: We should think the court more as a purse – or rather as purs(u)e.

C: And you think you could give an illustration of this kind of a 'metaphor'.

T: A metaphor? Yes. Why not? To start with.

C: Go ahead, I'll listen.

T: What is curious to me in the basketball is that a talented team plays by reading the 'ball that almost never exists'. Let us think 'screening' for instance. A player makes a 'screen', a path for an other player, an 'ally', of his team and thereby lets the ball go through an 'allie' that normally would be closed by the defender. The 'screen-giving'-player doesn't have a physical touch to the ball and doesn't even necessarily anticipate its possible movements in the future, but still can be interpreted as 'playing' the ball. Even when he stands still in a co-incidentally well positioned place, he can be understood as 'playing the ball'. Every now and then the ball goes in assisted with personal 'skills' of particular players. The more we read the game as 'screening', we realize how essential this 'touching the ball without touching it' is for the game – and it is very much respected in the game as well. We can articulate a skilful team that has the ball in their 'finger tips', one that really plays well together.

C + T: If adding the rules of the game and hours and hours of hard training with a good mix of strategical thinking behind the team, I can imagine the ball 'in the fingertips' of this 'almost non-existent ball' –metaphor of yours.

T: It is not just me. It is the playful nature of the game that has respect for this kind of reading of the almost 'non-existent ball in the fingertips'. Take, for instance, the rule that demands a player to bounce the ball. The ball is almost at the fingertips of the defender as well when one bounces the ball. Nobody needs to get physical. Touching is expected from the handling of the ball, not holding it possessively: in use. There has to be 'air' or 'space' in the evening spent at a basket-court for the evening not to go nasty, or dull. We expect us to be challenged like the ones who defend and 'not fully actually do that by letting extra mole-holes to be unguarded'.

C: So the 'court' doesn't let us go too easy, beyond its mystery.

T: No, not really. (We) have sympathy for it.

C + T: And you have something in your mind.

T: Well. I've always found it interesting that those, which remain stable in this dynamic game, are the basket-rings. Now, why is that? An immediate answer

could be, of course, that without them, without some finality, the game would lose its most significant characteristics. There is no screening without a basket-ring. That's for sure. But. By not admitting or re-enforcing this kind of negative answer, and instead, trying to find a more characteristic enhancement to the dynamics of the game, I figured, why not try to 'make a screen' with them as well. With the rings.

C + T: That'll be the day. The players would not just defend the ring, but carry and defend it. Points would be counted on the basis: when one player gets hold on the defenders ring, the point is received, when somebody else from the team, 'ally' as you say, throws the ball through that ring. This could be figured out also so that the ring has a new type of strategical use-value. Not only the ball.

T: Indeed. Even to a degree that we could imagine a game in which there is many balls and many rings, which really would give room for thinking 'screening' with 'rings and balls'. One could imagine that points could be made in plural and not as before, when 'screening' was just a momentary degree of one portion of points, that is 'two points'. There could be a set of rings, lets say dozen, held together on top of each other by a player, and dozen balls would be needed to give dozen points. Several rings in the play – and not outside of it – would break the teams apart (unless one colours the rings to signify ownership to specific teams). Players would find themselves more at screening than having an identity as being 'allies'. Rings having such a (use)value would affirm screening as a standard and replace 'belonging to a certain team' from which 'screening' have so far only had a derivative meaning.

C: ... and this would lead to ...

T: ... a basic understanding of the elementality of numbers.

C + T: I don't get it. Aren't you just describing some sort of a model of selling and buying. Players have occasionally money of their own, some amount of 'balls', and they are able to buy if they can afford a price, namely 'rings', through which they throw the balls for exchange to points.

T: Only if 'we' figure this through numbers 'we' fall into a simple scheme of 'screening' as a derivative from the ring. Instead of that our sisterhood could be regarded as rejecting such a transparency, and be transcribed out of the image of 'owing the rings', the inscription of (us) as the outside of the term 'to owe' as I will try to convince you, my dear.

---



C + T?: Sister Brown. I seem not to be able to figure out your point and certainly not think you as any of the numerous lenses in my photographic device that 'have balls thrown in'. As framing and reframing. Rings will eventually be coloured in my point of view as 'I' need a frame of an object. You remind me some mixture or a blend of colours, definitely a mixed 'something' ... but you seem to take me also to a sort of canyon, which opens into a supermarket. As you speak 'I' am conditioned by this colour-supermarket aporia. The players were like consumers in a supermarket at the basket-court, weren't they? As they seemed to loose the idea of a coloured ring as their symbol for their 'belonging to a team' they were able to join other games or buy different products from the shelves of some shops in the supermarket. In fact, they had started to take their wallets out of their pockets as the type of screening you described led them to a position in the market. As I'm standing here with you I feel like taking my wallet out of my pocket and figure out, what to buy. Why not start from this kind of a position in the market-economy rather than basket-court? To what or which 'screen' should I participate or form, if the question still was about, as you say, playing some sort of basketball with no teams?

T: Purs(u)e, my dear. The players don't just take wallets from their trousers to please themselves with the ball. Instead they play with us as they bounce in the basketball game. With (us) they purs(u)e.

C + T: Can you explain? (Is this about theory? Am I trying to participate a 'screen'?)

T: An image of a supermarket and consumers floating in-between shelves on which sellers have placed some 'products' can be regarded as an description of purs(u)e as numeric, as a particular type of a basketball game with 'enhanced-screening'. In this game there is sellers on the one hand and consumers on the other. Only the sellers are allowed to 'screen'. The rings as price-tags indicate possibilities to exchanges. Consumers can bargain, but the ordinary norm, the 'color', the rings-price-tags categorically describing haves and have-nots, remains intact. Consumers play accordingly: they can change their role, they can sell, but price-tags remain as the standard. Something has to be offered-priced and not bargained as, for instance, the Taylor Mouse eaten by the Customer Cat in H.C. Anderssen's saga, who couldn't create anything apt or fulfill his promise. Mouse was destined by wallet, by your way of playing this image, purs(u)e close to

wallets, close to a ring hung at certain height over the players' heads, close to iconography of numeric money.

C: And in and through purs(u)e the price-tags don't remain as the standard. Is that what you mean? They reach non-numericity, don't they?

T: They can have a certain role, but this time they belong to a more enhanced way of requesting invoices. Can you believe it? They loose their tackyness or taggyness, if you wish, as the rings in basketball broke into the actuality of the team-membership. As such, as their taggyness at some height in physical space, their meaning would be trusted to derive from mathematics, mathematically given numerality, from the separation between means of payment from means of requesting invoices. Latter are considered non-valuable as we request invoices only within pay-back times of particular debts to our creditors. There might be some extra costs out of paying a debt, out of requesting an invoice, but as a particular activity it is considered as marginal as the 'real valuable substance' is transferred or 'moved' in a physical space to which – 'in this way' – 'requesting an invoice' is regarded by nature as something secondary. In a restaurant we could choose several ways of performing such an act. We could raise our voice, lift our hand or nod our head to raise the attention of a waitress. Either way 'requesting an invoice' is regarded as necessary at certain point and 'paying a debt' voluntary.

C + T: I see.

T: There is a definite delay between a sale decision and requesting an invoice for covering the costs of that particular sale. And because of that, because of the ideality of the term 'term', pre- or non-interpreted 'nature' of numbers, we think that requesting an invoice is done or expected to be done after the decision.

Nobody raises his hand in the restaurant to request an invoice beforehand, before he or she has eaten, having had his or hers, say, lunch. During lunchtime we eat, decorate time with many details. But. Having said that, having us first looked at the price-tags separated from invoices as an 'ally' for the 'term' (or even as the 'term'), for the elementality of the numericity of money, there is a chance to open them as 'allies' – like 'screening' in basketball.

C + T: You mean (we) could join the meaning of price-tags and invoice-requests? To give invoice requests a place as in the basketball with 'rings and balls'? You are right: they could behave as price-tags–invoice-requests?

T: Not particularly 'join together'. There has to be – at least for you – some ideality of the ball/balls that goes through the ring/rings. Otherwise you're too close to (we) as numeric money, consumption as (our) numerization. That shall not be the case. (Our) sisterhood depends on what we should respect as the distinction between wallet and purs(u)e. (We) don't try to recover ownership to wallets, as walletians, but instead we let the others to decide this case of (ours). Others decide (us). They vote about (us) ...

T: Now I have come a bit too far in too short time, I notice, but, I believe, latter is important ...

C: You mean we/(we) stands for an objection for too pushy sales personnel?

T: Yes. 'Please' is the word that most likely is our third sister, pretty.

C: So. What about my wallet, then, for instance? There is some money in there, occasionally. Is it numeric?

T: There is a good chance for us to live in the wallet as invoice requests. For this purpose, for stability of 'purpose' or ethics of 'purpose', it is relevant to imagine us in accordance to the 'paying debts' like with money. That is: we should stick to a story: (we) are about requesting invoices. Full stop. (We) are about paying ones due out of requesting invoices, in a way. At least to start with – and cover (us). Bleep. For (our) sake other(s) will have influence on wallets filled with numeric money. On the Same. And vice a versa. (We) are not a purpose.

C: And about this 'way' of writing (our) name? How can a consumer approach this writing if he is notably the position of the category of 'we'?

T: Let's say some 'other' seems – for a 'consumer' – to be apt for something that normally would/wouldn't be recognized or having market niche in the market-economy. He is about to dis-enter numeric money. (We) – this particular ex-consumer, if you like – requests an invoice from this 'other' by giving Rishas, namely 'rings', or, Ches, namely 'balls'. In a way he willingly remains in debt to this 'other': he is about to pay for what ever this 'other' decides to buy. He is about giving (us) – valued in numbers in the same way as money is – to this 'other'. Can you believe it: we remind monetary notes. (We) are numeric, but also a way of writing numeric money another way as (we) request invoices by giving them to 'others'.

T: Then this 'other' has (us), means of requesting invoices. 'Other' can decide to buy something through us, join (us) together: as us. He goes to a bank to cash (us) in for money. Banks send a bill to the originary transmittor to get this debt

covered. Like a waitress in the restaurant. Trusting that we pay, banks can do this. Having requested in this way an invoice, that bank eventually deliver to us, we pay it in respect for (us). We don't only pay out of nothing, but for respect for (our) sisterhood. Through this – 'screen' or 'alley' – 'other' has a purs(u)e, an extra pocket, a bit more talent 'in his fingertips'. Or not. The 'screen' can remain imaginary.

T: One can pose questions such as "why am I to buy?" (or "... of buying"), "Is there really a need for products that are designed for potential consumers: in sum: for individuals?" (or "why products assume buyers?"), "How do 'I' relate to these questions?". They could be charged with questions like "what accredits to this particular 'other' that Ches or Rishas have been opening as a 'screen' so far?", "What could be expected to happen?". Everything seems so much at hand, but problematic, what comes to the whole: energy consumption is high, obedience to the thinking of Pareto according to which one is allied with denial to think the exchange between market-economy and non-incomic economy of care, one is likely to find only hard headed executives from corporation boards etc. Has there ever been any chance for pockets for others than mine? For a difference outside economy?

T: To put it bluntly: consumers can carry we/(we) in their wallets. Instead of reaching objects one can request an invoice without a particular object and 'screen' or be part of a 'screen' without actually knowing in which 'screen'. There won't be any debts for this unless Rishas and Ches are joined as 'rings and balls' giving points. Rishas and Ches can be positioned as similar units as money except that they have double nominal value than circular money. Five Rishas against five Ches give five points, a sum of money to be posited in the wallet in this 'exchange'. For five points you need ten Ri-ches, that is Rishas and Ches together. In this way Risha and Che form a currency: (we). Opposing to some measurable richness ri-ches secure purs(u)e ... if I only would have better words than we/(we)?

T: Giving just words to describe ri-ches seems to work in favor for some particular 'pricetaggy' warehouse (or philosophical system of action) rather than legitimize the fingertips that are essential for reaching the inscription of money into sisterhood. Ri-ches are at 'fingertips', effectively. Their 'fingertips' both turn to and oppose finality (numericity, numeric money, meaning) and/or vanish. Invisibility rather than visibility belongs to their character ...

C: As in the basketball ...?

T: As in the basketball.

C: Or prising?

T: Or what?

- You seem to 'yearn for better words', but isn't your intention more like 'prising', joining the meanings of prise-tags and invoice requests. Didn't you just accredit numericity of money to remain as the wallet in this picture? Isn't the wallet that you now have been describing just another ring, ring at a height? And Che still would just be another security/instance of numeric money?

- You are working in favor for prise-tags by giving a story of Che, a narration of Ri-che. All along the coastline of your 'challenge' it has been you that have been rejecting me ... It has been you who have been blending my 'formulae', the numericity of money ... and not Che. You're still speaking in the name of Us, Numeric Money. That we could pay the due out of requesting an invoice - in our utmost capability. Separating a narration, which reports a story.

- Am I?

- You don't speak of sisterhood.

- Don't I?

- No. You share with prizes. You're biting my fingers

- ?

- You don't have a gentle touch to the ball.

- ?

- We don't prise sisters (through ri-ches) ...

- ... instead (we) pay our due for requesting invoices and work through the animations prising/purifying of chance, intention etc. with (our) fingers (Risha and Che started to retire money)

- (We) don't share with numeric money in the wallet. Instead (we) reach paying for barely requesting an invoice with our fingertips.
- At not seeking to know the fingertips, (we) give (our) talent. That is reached with wallet/public -giving, wallet/non-public -giving, purs(u)e/public -giving, purs(u)e/non-public -giving. Fingers turn ri-ches as Risha and Che (Che replacing the idea of money) to the economy of sisters, which conditions simple semantics of perceiving, numerizing, prising, narration. In effect fingers 'prises' economical-semantical prising.
- Wallet/public -giving expects 'other' to use ri-ches for purpose and to inform about some succession to a giver or audience. Needs for prising are closer to identity or refer to history. Something is expected in return although nothing in exchange, because that could be addressed in honour for narration-reporting-story, economical circulation. Ri-ches are understood neutral what disinterestedly is regarded as a gift and not having anything to do with 'more philosophically' oriented accounts of meaning, which is typical for walletians yearning for differentiation of meaning and value, meaningful value-orientation, phenomenology, componential semiotics, enunciation etc. Ri-ches satisfy interests for charity, mingling into sister-communities.
- In wallet/non-public -giving price-expectations are in brackets. Walletian does not expect to pay attention on ri-ches, but insists still in this type of negativity the 'other' to take care of some purpose: to return although not necessarily to some original giver. Walletians could/would accept ri-ches as means of payments. He or she wouldn't leave that question to a bank. Effects of non-publicity would work in favor for silent knowledge, hermeneutics, raise criticism against philosophies of action, abstract conceptualizations of efficiency in mainstream economics.
- Purs(u)e/public -giving shakes walletians from disrespect for sisterhood in a brotherly manner. It involves giving Ri-Ches as sort of jokes of prise-market-brownie-girlie-talk, judgements out of too harsh behaviour, of individualistic, of ideal playing-style, of regressing into some ratio d'être. Ball-receiver is surprised as he thinks he is given a gift. Ri-ches should be regarded as Rishas and Che retiring money. Events haven't just taken place outside narrative discourse. Punishment would be 'of rejecting Che'.

- Don't (we) replace the law. Do (we) exceed the discursive/non-discursive?
- There is not only some suspicious "need" for that, but votes. Nobody is apt for loosing money as a horizon. There is reflections of the utilities of (us) and others use of (us), which is fair enough. Purs(u)e/public -giving of ri-ches is a vote for increasing juxtapositioning circular money with you, Che. There shall not be bare and harsh, industrial, footsteps of consumers, (we) say.  
Consumers don't just vote with their feet, but with (us). Don't forget that?
- And in purs(u)e/non-public -giving ...
- ... (we) turn (our) backs *as if* our narration *produced* the event it was supposed to report. Perhaps (we) are affected by somebody, but (we) keep the screen in the modesty of *as if*. There is no turning back. (We) pay our due out of barely requesting an invoice. First banks will have kept sending the bills for 'invoice-requests' to the original submitters, but later as Rishas start to be trusted as being double than Ches (former money), they can be accepted by any of (us) – or not.
- ... or played in the name of basketball.
- Yes. You name it. You vote for our sisterhood, what is it about. Bounce the money.
- Not just money.
- ?
- There is a story for which, I believe, there hasn't been much room for. Until now. Perhaps it could reach the benefits of purs(u)e by the help of (us), who eventually would pay. I am talking about catering and inviting people to restaurants – although not anymore by the feet of some customers walking the paths of numerical prising. Picture this: I deliver say 100 ri-ches (keeping the idea of requesting invoices) every month to a particular restaurant, which I noticed occasionally having served meals for strangers, free of charge. The chef could occasionally feed, or serve drinks to anyone he was pleased about – or just by accident. Eventually I would pay this 'surprising' service by accepting ri-ches as means of payments, by approving them as non-counterfeits, which I could be pleased in many ways. I could for instance think that at least the money is employing somebodies (thinking-employment).
- If the chef played along this, he wouldn't only keep his ball in his wallet ... say: use the money for him-self ... but carefully, with taste, he would get the blood circulated by choosing, for instance, evenings for regular customers only.

Nobody would show their regrets for not been invited since it would be regarded as simple-minded prising; instead they would continue requesting invoices, ri-ches in hope for eventually be invited. The chef wouldn't count ri-ches for his benefit only (and perhaps he might regard them as Rishas), if he really would be responsible for (us). Wouldn't anyone be pleased about being a regular for this kind of restaurant of wallet/pursue (at its sharpest, though)? There would exist some sort of unknowable responsibility, family-like orientation for sharing ... theaters spirally serving tickets out of the mis-en-abime of numerical prising ... there would be surprises ... caring ...

- ... or securing bank-loans. We could deliver ri-ches to an institution that makes ethical/risky investments. Occasionally there is companies, who are going to through harsh times. (We) could secure the loans and not let the companies to kneel in front of sharks ...
- What do you think? ..
- All of a sudden – as you were speaking – I got this crazy idea ..
- What .. tell me ?
- You know We have phone numbers. Somebodies can inform us ... say ... about their accidental daily routines ... or invite to a dinner-party ... but how about if phone numbers would function in favour for purs(u)e. (We) could deliver ri-ches through phone numbers ... At the moment there is some thoughts about designing cellular-phones that would function as wallets, but instead of that, cloning traditional numeric money into new technology, cellular-phones could work as a platform for non-prising fingertips. I have in mind the different modalities of giving (us) and their 'needs' for taking into account traces of former actorhood (prising) along reaching (breathing) to pay out barely requesting an invoice. This could be empowered by allowing dynamic postlisting for feedback. When some sums of ri-ches are thrown in non-prising fashion, consumer-others of ri-ches still judge the use of (us) in accordance to the fingerprints. They might want to do a search for how ri-ches were given and thereby more or less 'plan' or 'budget' in memory of prising. There could have been original, initiative plans and promises, which oblige to economical, discursive fixation, but fingerprints might also be regarded as forgotten and postcards delivered – after years and years – from one-to-many. Depending, of course, that archiving of these fingerprints was organized at the beginning. This could – if not open up a high-way for Risha and Che – lead to a walk-



ways or cycle-routes for them. Purs(u)e could always vanish as players stick to phenomenological vocabularies (locating monetary sign/value) and conventional markets – or a single send-command would reach (us) just as wink of an eye. Closer to purs(u)eazive players receiver wouldn't have to acknowledge single some/any-bodies and feel obligations to other than we/ (we), how and what kind of interpretations (we) gets. Sweeping away fingerprints – as well as working in debt to them – would just increase the numeric phonopathology. As opposed to that the 'former phone numbers' could work as addresses for delivering (us). The dinner-party at your favourite restaurant could come on-line from digital television ... say ... at seven o'clock ... if ... that is ... ri-ches ... were thrown wallet/publicly? Thirst for concept seem to vary ... and surprises, if prising wasn't so sickeningly evident, would continue to ...? Che?

- Che?
- Crispy air. Early spring. Some trees ...

## II

- Jos en erehdy, äkkipikaistuksissani tai muuten, olen melko varma, että tekijän on alusta lähtien täytynyt haluta suklaata – ja näin ollen jäljellä on täytynyt olla, ehkä jopa huomattavastikin, ostovoimaa. Seinämät, joita on ainakin kolme, eivät pidättelee halua piipahtaa Amelien toimistossa. Sisar-dialogi, joka seuraa digitaaliseen ääninauhuriin puhuvan äänen keskustelua itsensä kanssa, kieltäytyy luottamasta siipiinsä, tekijä on varmaankin jo pitkään odottanut, tietoisesti tai tiedostamattaan, soittoa suklaakaupasta ja kutsua suklaaseen on varmaankin valmisteltu hyvinkin kauan, kokonaisia vuosia “ajatuksessa itsestä rahana (tai “sen antamisena, mitä ei omista”, jonka eräät kääntävät [mahdollisesti hyvinkin pilailevasti] rakkauden aktiksi)” (hakasulkeet lisätty). Missään tapauksessa tekijä ei voi olla hullaantunut vain Ameliesta. Elokuvassa ei ollut mitään matemaatikkoa.
- Pariisissa, Tukholmassa tai missä tahansa muussakaan kaupungissa ei varmaankaan olisi yhtään todistajaa, jos kävisi vähän ...
- Ei edes Venetsiassa, jota tekijä pitää varmaankin eurooppalaisena kulttuuripääkaupunkina. Kaupunkien tyhjillä “tinakuorilla” ei ole minkäänlaista merkitystä kansainvälisen valtavirtataloustieteen markkinaoperaatioille.

Merimies nojaa kaiteeseen. On epäselvää, mitä teksti kehystää hänen katseensa kohteeksi. Ääni nauhalla ei osaa päättää rakentaako silta tai edes mennäkö joen ylitse. Mahdollisesti mitään ei ole pelastettavissa. Kaiteeseen nojaava jättäytyy liikkumattomaksi. Olisiko piirrettävä komedia päättämättömyydestä?

- On otettava huomioon prosessin traagisuus. Puistoon saapuneet vihjeet kahden sarjakuvataiteilijan teoksista tuntuvat esittävän kutsun, kyselevän kiinnostusta piirtää sisar-dialogi. Corto Maltese –sarjakuvahahmoistaan tunnettu Hugo Prat tuskin nousee haudastaan, mutta nenättömiä naisia piirtävä Milo Manaran saattaisi haluta piirtää oman kohtalonviivansa.
- Entäpä Katja Tukiainen?
- Minkälaisen tarjouksen teos hänelle esittää?
- Onko kyseessä edes teos? Maanpäällä ei ainakaan ole mittaa.

### **Miten niin minä-itse?**

Allekirjoitan ”sukupuolisen tasavertaisuuden ja oikeudenmukaisuuden, siihen liittyvän lainomaisuuden sekä näitä käytäntöjä reunustavan teoreettisuuden riittämättömyyden näkökulmakoosteeksi feministisen taloustieteen tarpeisiin” (Vainio 2003, Feministinen taloustiede, 3). Jatkan kysymällä, voisiko myöskään mikään markkinoiden transaktioihin pelkistävää varallisuutta tuottavaa *annettua hinnoittelua* (raportoiva narraatio) kyseenalaistamaton teoria riittää? Hinnoittelun annettuuden dekonstruktio on mielestäni välttämätöntä “[t]ulevaisuutta, jo nyt olemassa olevaa varallisuutta ja sen syntymättömiä ”omistajia” palvelevan markkinakäsityksen” lanseeraamiseksi.

Varallisuus kietoutuu, oletuksen mukaan taloudellisen toiminnan palkkiona hyödyllisesti ja tuotteliaasti toimivan talouden yksikön osalle. Talouden yksiköt vaurastuvat, luonnollisena ja oikeudenmukaisena korvauksena sijoituksistaan markkinoiden toimintaan. Taloustieteen valtavirtainen tulkinta on lineaarisen logiikan viattomuuteen luottava analyysiä välittömien syitten, seurausten ja yleisten taloudellisten lainalaisuuksien vallitessa ... Minä-itse on otettava vakavasti

talouden tiedon ehtona, jolle subjekti-objekti dikotomian muotoehto on mahdoton saavuttaa (Mt., 13 ja 15).

Miten niin minä-itse? “Poliittisen taloustieteen tabu, kysymys *käyttöarvoon pelkistyvistä taloudesta*” (Mt., 17), voidaan viedä Theorizan ja Cheheradzaden johdattamana koripallomatsiin kysymyksenä narraation ehdollistamista asioista *kuin jos* narraatio tuottaisi tapahtuman, josta sen oletetaan raportoivan (Vrt. Derrida: *Given Time: I Counterfeit money*). Taloutta ei voi “*etukäteen* sulkea tietyn analyyttisen käsitelmääritelmän kannattelemaksi kohdeilmiöksi”, kun sisarellisin sormin aletaan pomputtelemaan rahaa (rahan numeerista merkitsevyyttä). Sisarille voidaan heittää vastuuta tiedon tapahtumisen painotuksista hinnoittelun kontekstissa, ts. möyhentää synonyymiksi kivettyntä suhdetta markkinan ja talouden välillä.

Kirjoitat, että “poliittisella retoriikalla ei näytä olevan tapoja puhua taloudesta hyödykemarkkinoiden ja käsitteellisesti mikrotaloustieteellisen, atomistiseen itsean pelkistyvän yritys-instituutio-taloustoimijuus –oletuksen ulkopuolella. Tilanteen korjaamiseksi ei vaikuta olevan kiirettä investoida kansallista talouden perustutkimuksen hätäapuohjelmaa” (Vainio 2003, 28-29). Toiminnallisuuden eli funktionaalisuuden lumen pikkuhiljaa jäädessä sivuun tiedon arkkitehtuurin ideaalittyyppinä voisi vuorossa olla heittää hyvästit myös arkkitehtuurin hinnoittelullis-asioivalle idealisoinnille, “kieltä puhuvan ja kulttuurisen symbolijärjestyksen ohjeeseen tunnistavan *ihmisen*” samaistamiselle-hinnoitteluun *itseksensä* juuri tässä kulttuurissa ja tämän kielen antaman kommunikoinnin ehdoilla” (vrt. Mt., 21). Hinnoittelun tapahtumallisuuden tutkimus, jossa äänestetään kulutuksen luonteesta, voisi liittyä talouden tapahtumisen ymmärrykseen “representoituun läsnäoloon pitäytyvää, metafysisistä vakuuttuneisuutta kyseenalaistavana, lykkäävänä ja siirtävänä kirjoittautumisen tapahtumana” (Mt.,21). Talouden nimi ei tällöin täydentyisi, “taloudesta ei ehtisi muodostua käsitteellistä määritelmää analyysin tarpeisiin” (Mt., 21) myöskään hinnoittelun piirissä.

Numeerisen rahan sisäistämisessä sisäisiin niitä lompakoittavan lompakoimisen uhallakin voisi olla nupullaan jonkinlainen talouden sisätilan lain kokemuksellinen toteutus – tai vähintään taustoistaan irrallisen itsen kyseenalaistaminen “sellaisena

kuin valtavirtainen taloustiede toimijuutensa asettaa, kyseenalaistamattomien oletusten varassa analyysiä sitovaksi, implisiittisen omistusoikeuden [hinnoitteluoikeuden?] itselleen merkinneeksi tahoksi” (Mt., 22; hakasulkeet K.T). Teoreettisesti en kuitenkaan koe mielekkääksi ”syventää aihetta”. Teorian itseensä viittavuus (vrt. ri-che) on julma moderni tendenssi rationaalisen taloustoimijuuden (lue hintoihin palauttamisen), jollain yleisellä ja kaikkialla samalla tavalla eksistoivan, perustavuuden teesin vakauttamiseksi (“Ja Che:hän muurataan lompakkoon kuin Antigone, totta vieköön!”).

**Petri Huhtanen**, [petrihuhtanen@hotmail.com](mailto:petrihuhtanen@hotmail.com)

## **TUNTEA PREFERENSSINSÄ, VALITA JA KULUTTAA**

### **Itsen teknologiat taloustieteen pedagogiassa**

Tässä työssä kuvaillaan, millaisten ajatusten parissa kansantaloustieteen opiskelijat viettävät aikaansa. Perustana ovat omakohtaiset kokemukseni kansantaloustieteen opiskelusta sekä mikroteorian syventävien opintojen kurssilla käytetty kirja. Lähinnä tarkastellaan mallia, jossa vapaaehtoinen vaihto taloudentoimijoiden välillä johtaa koko yhteiskunnan kannalta parhaaseen lopputulokseen. Tähän tulokseen päädytään, vaikka toimijat eivät toimi yhteistyössä. Itse asiassa kaikki toimijat nähdään vain omasta tilanteestaan kiinnostuneina valitsijoina. Kuluttajien suhteen tehdään myös kaksi muuta oletusta. Ensinnä oletetaan, että he osaavat valita eri kulutuskorien välillä ja asettaa ne paremmuusjärjestykseen. Toinen oletus on se, että he tietävät kaikkien hyödykkeiden hinnat. Kyseistä valinta- ja kulutustilannetta voisi kärjistetysti kuvata seuraavalla tavalla: kuluttaja tilaa haluamansa tuotteet internetin välityksellä ja nauttii niistä yksin, jolloin hän on omalta osaltaan auttanut yhteisen hyvän toteutumista. Näitä oletuksia tarkastellaan myös Foucault’n itsen teknologioiden näkökulmasta. Opetuksessa käytetyt oletukset voidaan nähdä operaatioina, joilla muokataan opiskelijoiden ajatuksia siitä, mitkä oletukset muodostavat talouden tieteellisen tutkimuksen perustan.