

## **Recombinant Folk History and Non-Genre I for Belt Sanders and Female Black Metal Guitarist**

Non-genre is like Non-gender: a sexless trope without all the fussiness of assignments and rules. But people don't usually like such ambiguity. Like the unisex toilets at PS1. Sometimes you come out of the stall and a man is standing in front of you with his pants pulled down.

I went to Mike's retrospective at PS1 with two beautiful lesbians. One was a Peruvian-American Texan, and the other, an ex-Scientologist with perfect bone structure. Although the latter was wearing pink Timberland work boots, the PS1 guards kept calling her sir. It happened like 8 times. She has tightly cropped hair, but she still looks like a Norse goddess.

We ended up in front of an Extracurricular Activity Projective Reconstruction, the one with the stall-like doors and the video of the little boy going to get a haircut from the dirty old men barbers. Mike makes the barbershop the ultimate stage for gender humiliation. The boy waits for his haircut and flips through a magazine; he looks at pictures of a very adult man: bearded, smoking a pipe, serious gaze. The man is Scott. Flipping past pictures of Scott, the little boy stumbles upon a close up of a vagina in the magazine. It's like something from a 1970s porno and the little boy looks embarrassed. He quickly turns the page and we see Scott's smug, hairy face again. His expression suggests there are things that the boy does not yet understand. The lesbians laugh with wicked delight. Mike would have loved it.

Like belt sanding or gestural painting, black metal (and thrash metal, death metal, doom metal, etc.) is a strictly masculine activity. Those deep tones, shrieks, and sinister tempos seem born from some internal male anxiety, a disenchantment with the world or a fascination with its heaviness. Nothing is neutral in the violence of this sound. So, would the female black metal guitarist be a performer of drag? Would her gender become a political surface? "To operate within the matrix of power is not the same as to replicate uncritically relations of domination."

- Catherine Taft

One explanation is that C, the financial disrupter, averted personal hardship with deft maneuvering that resulted in substantial protections in both legal and business contexts. While penalties were significant, the equivalent of 150 sharks, he was himself never implicated as having committed any wrongdoing.

Which brings us to another point: Should insider trading be legalized? As Edward Luce writes, “competent people can be dull.” But in the case of C, insider trading is made to look sexy, and only slightly incompetent. One less important feature of the argument is that if an insider, such as an employee of the POST, has been made aware that media favorable moves are to be made, and therefore she doesn’t sell her shares of POST stock, is she guilty of insider trading? What if the information dissuaded her from selling when she had already made up her mind to do so? Isn’t that insider trading anyway?

Johann Tetzl, a man of Catholic faith and considerable power, similarly authored and sold policies designed for the full forgiveness of future sins. Ironically, an assailant eventually produced such a letter of indulgence as Tetzl was robbed on the way from Konigsutter to Schoppenstedt. As a further measure of risk mitigation, the assailant’s letter was written by Tetzl for the absolution of two sins, of which one remained unused.

(And the question also has to be asked, what are the long-term consequences of these actions anyway? In the US, insured banks have a credit line, which justifies mandates on their capitalization. But in the Eurozone, where austerity deals have exposed some banks as undercapitalized, there is no mutualized credit available as a fiscal backstop. The dominant economy in the system controlled by the ECB, is given favorable banking rules while the other less robust economies suffer the risk.)

“Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on in his job, and B replies, Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn’t been to

prison yet. At this point, A might well inquire what B was implying, what he was suggesting, or even what he meant by saying that C had not yet been to prison. The answer might be any one of such things as that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation, that C's colleagues are really very unpleasant and treacherous people, and so forth. It might, of course, be quite unnecessary for A to make such an inquiry of B, the answer to it being, in the context, clear in advance. It is clear that whatever B implied, suggested, meant in this example, is distinct from what B said, which was simply that C had not been to prison yet. I wish to introduce, as terms of art, the verb *implicate* and the related nouns *implicature* (cf. implying) and *implicatum* (cf. what is implied). The point of this maneuver is to avoid having, on each occasion, to choose between this or that member of the family of verbs for which *implicate* is to do general duty.”

- From *Studies in the Way of Words*

“The exchange of complex abstract ideas multiplies this miraculous transmission of meaning to the *n*th power. Yet ideas can signify only in a dialectical matrix, an exchange, and they accrue value only in their circulation. And it is in this quality that they strangely resemble money.”

- Antonia Hirsch

“This is, by the way, why this stuff became so untradable. How do you trade a one-of-a-kind? There is no real market for them. It has a utility as a contract on a one-on-one basis. But there is no trading function. And that has been part of the whole problem. They don't mark to market, i.e., because there is nothing to compare it to. What's out there that you can compare this one thing to? So they mark to model. They come up with fancy, financial models every quarter. And they mark this thing to the model.

And for many years the model said they were worth more, worth more, worth more, so you mark them up. And then finally the model said: ‘Uh, you know what? Foreclosures are up. Subprime is down. We have got to start marking them down.’ You start to blow up. But even though they are blowing up, you are still stuck with them. There is nothing you can

do with them. You can't trade them.”

- Joe Nocera

A writer for a popular financial news source argues that such a lift on insider trading bans would make transparent what we already assume: that insiders already have an informational advantage as to what pricing changes are yet to occur. The level playing field simply doesn't exist and investors shouldn't be fooled into an illusion of fairness.

C's collection is worth \$750 million or so. “Le Reve” was purchased for \$150 million. While other works will be transacted, he will not have to sell either the Picasso or an American flag painting to cover his legal costs.

- Eric Kim