

From the beginning of the discipline the main anthropological interest in things was an interest in Exchange and circulation of objects.

Interest in both Exchange and relationship between persons and things starts with the Marcel Mauss' essay *The Gift: The form and Reason for exchange in archaic societies* (1923-25).

- Focus on circulation and exchange of objects in social anthropology

Type of exchange characterizes the type of society. For classical authors, particular types of Exchange classified particular types of societies, or cultures.

As a legacy of Mauss' *Gift* the interest in Exchange is also an interest in relationship between persons and things.

Today – we will work on such themes. We will start with your experience and connect it to classical works on Exchange in SAN and SOC.

Group activity

Question for individuals: What do you remember about Mauss? Why was he interested in gifts.

Mauss

- The aim: to identify forms of exchange in various societies (Melanesia, France)
- exchange in context of social organization and ideas: How social groups and relations are created through exchange of objects?
- Focus on gifts: mediums for creation of relationships
- Reciprocity: Why are gifts returned? -> three obligations in early Exchange systems: to give, to receive, and to return a gift.
- Gift creates a bond, because it contains a spirit – HAU: it is an embodiment of givers and their relationships to receivers

Intermingled character of persons and things is for Mauss the solution of the problem of reciprocity> how a gift generates an obligation to reciprocate “What power resides in the object given that causes its recipient to pay it back?”

For Mauss, a gift contains within itself a part of its giver: “to make a gift of something to someone is to make a present of some part of oneself” (Mauss 1990> 12)

to make a gift of something to someone is to make a present of some part of oneself.

one clearly and logically realizes that one must give back to another person what is really part and parcel of his nature and substance, because to accept something from somebody is to accept some part of his spiritual essence, of his soul. To retain that thing would be dangerous and mortal, not only because it would be against law and morality, but also because that thing coming from the person not only morally, but physically and spiritually, that essence, that food,³³ those goods, whether movable or immovable, those women or those descendants, those rituals or those acts of communion—all exert a magical or religious hold over you. Finally, the thing

given is not inactive. Invested with life, often possessing individuality, it seeks to return to what Hertz called its 'place of origin' or to produce, on behalf of the clan and the native soil from which it sprang, an equivalent to replace it.

Critique

CLS: Exchange is primary, fundamental phenomenon. Instead of approaching it in its totality, Mauss splits it into three obligations – he needs to add HAU, which is just justification. Instead of systemic relations we get an indigenous theory. Every society has Exchange of information, women and things.

Bourdieu: Theory of practice / disjuncture between subjective and objective understanding of Exchange. Misrecognition of Exchange as a discrete act of giving/receiving/reciprocating is crucial to their strategic manipulations of the timings of giving.

Social actors do not approach giving, receiving and reciprocating as a chain of related activities that unfolds over time. Only outside observer can see Exchange in this way. The time lag between giving and reciprocating makes it possible for social actors to misrecognise these acts as separate and irreversible and affords them space for strategic manipulation.

- Mauss: výmena je výrazom spoločnosti ako celku, aktéri sú morálne osoby
- Malinowski: aktéri sú jednotlivci s potrebami a túžbami.

- Focus on circulation and exchange of objects in social anthropology
- Type of exchange characterizes the type of society
- **Pre maussa je dar a komodita esencialistická, ukotvená v reálnych javoch.**
- Gift and commodity relations are analytical categories in the Maussian model
- Maussian model:

The questions:

- What are relations between transactors, and between transactors and objects?
- What type of object is a gift/commodity
- What is the relation between types of exchange and types of society?

All these questions are related to the problem of relationship between persons and things

the Maussian model identifies two polar types of social relations: commodity relations and gift relations. At the risk of over-simplifying, commodity relations are transient and impersonal, though certainly not necessarily unpleasant or cold, for they can be cheerful and gracious (e.g. Hochschild 1983). Equally, gift relations are durable and personal, though certainly not necessarily pleasant or warm, for they can involve conflict (Schwartz 1967: 5–7), even the exchange of blows rather than gifts (Schiltz 1987). In commodity relations objects are impersonal bundles of use value and exchange value that are bought and sold. In gift relations objects are personal possessions that are given and received.

Nichola thomas – Gift is described as the opposition of commodity and not as characterisation of the relationship.

Antro Romantizuje dar – stotožňuje ho s gemeinschaft.

GREGORY

C. A Gregory gifts and Commodities 1982

Výmena darov: **Výmena neodcudziteľných predmetov ľuďmi, medzi ktorými je vzťah, prípadne má byť vzťah. Čas neohraničený – reciprocita.** Má byť trvalý. Výmena darov orientovaná na systém sociálnej reprodukcie. Ale je tam vzmena hodnoty a protihodnoty ako u komodít. Ale už existujúci vzťah spája transaktorov navzájom a s predmetom.

Povinnosť dať, prijať, vrátiť

neodcudziteľnosť

Taonga – dedičstvo – nesie moce a idenritu tých, ktorí ich vlastnili pred nimi. Natolko spojené s vlasťíkmi, že získať cudziu taonga je získať aj jeho rank, meno a históriu.

A **taonga** is now a treasure in [Māori culture](#); it can be anything from a word to a memory. The current definition differs from the historical definition, noted by [Hongi Hika](#) as "property procured by the spear" [one could understand this as [war booty](#) or defended property].

Tangible examples are all sorts of [heirlooms](#) and [artefacts](#), [land](#), [fisheries](#), natural resources such as geothermal springs^[1] and access to natural resources, such as [riparian water rights](#) and access to the [riparian zone](#) of rivers or streams. Intangible examples may include language and spiritual beliefs.

Zničiť, vrátiť, dať ďalej dar...

Výmena **komodít: Výmena odcudziteľných predmetov ľuďmi, medzi ktorými nie je vzťah. Čas ohraničený samotnou výmenou,** nemá minulosť ani budúcnosť, po jej výmene vzťah medzi ľuďmi končí. Transfer a protitransfer sa môžu, ale nemusia odohrať v tom istom čase. Nedefinovaná peniazmi – peniaze sú často darom,. Definované tým, že výmena spája transaktorov a objekt.

C.A. Gregory says that commodity exchange is oriented to the system of the material production of objects, and thus “must be explained with reference to the social conditions of the reproduction of *things*”, which means ultimately “class structure and the principles governing factory organization”

Commodity exchange is

not simply oriented to the *physical* production of objects, for such production is important in all societies.

Instead, commodity exchange is oriented to the *social* production of objects. This includes not just their physical production, but also the creation of their social identity as commodities and the creation of people's

unequal relationships with them in the process of production, and consequently elsewhere in society. These unequal relationships include the division of labor, the class structure, the different roles of producer and consumer and the significance of people's positions in these orders.

Komodita produkt ľud. práce, ktorej cieľom je naplňať ľudské potreby. Schopnosť naplňať ľudské potreby je **úžitková hodnota**. V kapitalizme má komodita aj **výmennú hodnotu**. Výmenna hodnota je historický fenomén. výmenná hodnota spočíva v tom, že sa hodnota istého množstva jednej komodity môže byť vyjadrená v istom množstve inej komodity. Je to kvantitatívna a abstraktná hodnota. Komodita musí mať obe, úžitkovú aj výmennú hodnotu, pričom výmenná hodnota nie je v žiadnom vzťahu s úžitkovou, ktorá vychádza z konkrétnych vlastností predmetu. Výmenná hodnota je relatívna – nevychádza z vlastnosti veci, ale zo vzťahov medzi komoditami.

Marx distinguishes the use-value of objects (the use they have to the human labourer) from their exchange-value (the fetishised, fantastic form of value they have as commodities). Use-values are to do with the quality of objects and are only realised in use or consumption whereas exchange values are quantifiable in terms of other commodities (Marx 1976: 126-128). account of fetishism in **Capital**, Marx follows a very similar line but here the analysis is of the commodity form rather than private property.

Výmenná hodnota vzniká podľa Marxa len v kapitalizme. Kapitalizmus je spoločnosť, ktorej systém produkcie je založený na výmene. Vplyv na spoločenské vzťahy. Význam výmeny taký veľký v kapitalizme, že určuje hodnoty. vzťahy medzi osobami majú formu ekonomických transakcií – subjekt kúpy a predaja.

The 'real' value of a commodity is analysed as a social relation determined by the amount of labour that has gone into its production - it is nothing to do with the material form of the commodity (Marx 1976: 165). The exchange value of commodities appears to be something intrinsic to them as objects and their relationship as things.

Kvantitatívny vzťah je založený na tom, že obidve rôzne komodity sú produktom ľudskej práce. Každá práca je výdajom energie, z hľadiska kapitálu je možné sústrediť sa na spoločnú vlastnosť, ktorou je výdaj energie. kvalitatívne odlišné druhy ľudskej práce môžu byť porovnateľné na zákl. času potrebného na jej vykonanie. ďalšia abstrakcia kapitalizmu. rôzne zručnosti a schopnosti na výrobu topánok a kabátu, ale správa sa k nim rovnako. Useful labour sa stáva abstract labour. hodnota komodity určená sociálne nevyhnutným časom na jej výrobu. plátno je lacnejšie ako kabát. Podľa Marxa labour theory of value len v kapitalizme. Kapital nekupuje prácu, ale schopnosť robotníka pracovať za určitý čas. za ten čas/plácu robotník reprodukuje cenu práce a surplus value.

But this form of their value is illusory since the fetishised exchange establishes a fantastic relationship between things that obscures the real relationship between people - workers whose labour produces things of value to others². The cultural forms which incorporate such 'fantasies', mistaking them for reality, are critiqued by Marx in his analysis of commodity fetishism in **Capital**.

- problém: Marx ignoroval vzťah medzi use a exchange value v rôznych štádiách vývoja, prechod komodít zo sféry exchange do use a nao, zdá sa, že vstupujú do vzájomných vzťahov a ich hodnota sa javí ako ich súčasť. Porovnanie feudalizmu a kapitalizmu.

V kapitalizme je komodita odcudzená špecifickým spôsobom výmeny, v ktorom môže byť produkt práce postavený do vzťahu s iným produktom práce na základe istého kvantitatívneho vzťahu. Kedykoľvek dôjde k výmene komodít, abstrahuje sa od užitkovej hodnoty (veci v obchodoch stoja, nie sú používané), pretože len spoločný element kvantity určuje výmenu. Marx tu nesleduje 3 základné veci: zmena vo vnímaní času, redukcia kvalitatívnych rozdielov v práci na jednoduché operácie, ktoré môžu byť vykonávané v rôznych odboroch: deskilling, strata kontroly nad pracovným procesom.

Fetišizmus komodít

Commodity fetishism: **opisuje tendenciu kapitalizmu veriť, že hodnota je substancia, ktorá sa nachádza v komoditách a pripisovať komoditám nadprirodzené vlastnosti.** K tomuto dochádza len, ak je **výmena komodíty cieľom produkcie.** To je centrálné. Komodity majú mysteriózny charakter len v spoločnostiach, ktoré majú také spoločenské vzťahy, ktoré nútia individuá veriť, že hodnota komodity je súčasťou. Ak v to veríme, pripisujeme im moc, ktorú v súčasnosti nemajú.

Marxov žart. je to obrátenie celej histórie fetišizmu na hlavu. Fetišizmus je prílišný vzťah k materiálnemu predmetu. Viera, že história, minulosť, skúsenosti, pamäť, túžba sú materializované v nejakom používanom objekte. Je to špecifický fetišizmus, kde objektom nie je animizovaný objekt ľudskej práce a lásky, ale oceňovaný neobjekt, ktorý je predmetom výmeny. Fetišizmus komodít definuje imaterialitu ako základnú črtu kapitalizmu.

Fetišizmus komodít ďalej eliminuje dvojaký spoločenský charakter produkcie:

1. vytvára užitkovú hodnotu, ktorá slúži na živobytie
2. produkcia use value má významnú úlohu v sociálnych procesoch

Vo feudalizme vzťahy medzi individuami v práci sa javili ako ich osobné vzťahy a nie ako vzťahy medzi vecami. Práca ich nekonfrontovala ako odcudzená vec, ako komodita s nezávislou hodnotou. V kapitalizme soc. vzťahy formu výmeny. Všetky vzťahy, ktoré spájajú producenta so zbytkom spoločnosti sú vzťahy výmenné. Vzťahy sú zahmlené, lebo naberajú formu vzťahov medzi vecami, medzi kupujúcimi a predávajúcimi, medzi producentami a konzumentami.

Reification.

In the **Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts** Marx uses the term 'fetishworshippers'

to describe the supporters of the monetary and mercantile system and how they looked upon private property. Following Engels, he

7

compares the fetishism of the mercantilists to that revealed by Luther's critique of the paganism and external religiosity of Catholicism. The objects of private property stand in for real human relations and so appear to have a power that is their own whereas the political economists' critique shows that human labour is the essence of private property. Of course Marx goes on to criticise the political economists for not identifying the contradictory essence of private property as the product of alienated labour.

Marxizmus v 20.st. – objekty, ktoré existujú vo veľkom množstve v konzumnej spoločnosti psychologicky a emocionálne poškodzujú ľudí – ničia kreativitu, využívajú emocionálne potreby, ničia autentické ľudské potreby. Objekty sú predovšetkým produktom kapitalizmu, ich význam je určený tým, že sú komodity. Nerátajú s možnosťou, že ľudia nachádzajú významy v predmetoch – predmet je vtelením kapitalistických vzťahov a každý vnímaný význam je len dôkazom falošného vedomia.

one could not assert that Marx was interested in material culture *per se*. That is, he is not interested in the nature of objects as material elements of culture, the relations between people and objects, and the cultural uses of objects. Objects are important for Marx because they are the unit representations of fundamental processes of capitalist society: alienation, exploitation and estrangement. So, even though in *Capital* Marx develops a formidable model of the materialist, class basis of capitalist society that begins with the commodity as its fundamental unit for analytic focus, he does so in a way that completely obliterates the possibility for an interpretive or cultural account of the meaning of objects.

Objects perform two principal functions in Marx's analysis of capitalism. First, because they are products of human labour organised within capitalism, they embody exploitative capitalist labour relations. Furthermore, objects engender a false consciousness within exploited social classes who focus on the lure of commodity

James Carrier Gifts and Commodities: Exchange and Western Capitalism since 1700 (1995)

Nakoľko je možné aplikovať základný rozdiel medzi darmi a komoditami na britskú a americkú spoločnosť a industriálny kapitalizmus.

Komoditné vzťahy – dočasné a neosobné, hoci nie nevyhnutne nepríjemné, alebo chladné. Objektom je osobné vlastníctvo- object, práca, človek, meno...

Vzťahy dar – trvalé a osobné, hoci nie nevyhnutne príjemné, alebo teplé.

Na západe ľudia spájajú tieto typy transakcií s časťami ich životov a priestormi – dom, domov, rodina, susedia – dar. Práca, obchod, ekonomické aktivity – komoditné vzťahy.

Pre maussa je dar a komodita esencialistická, ukotvená v reálnych javoch. Carrier sa k nim správa skor ako k ideálnym typom

Pre maussa je dar a komodita esencialistická, ukotvená v reálnych javoch. Carrier sa k nim správa skor ako k ideálnym typom

- Výmena tvorí hodnotu, hodnota je vtelená v komoditách, ktoré sú vymieňané. Ak sa sústredíme na vymieňané veci, nie na formy a funkcie výmeny, vidíme, že výmenu a hodnotu prepája politika.
- **Kopytoff – Kultúrna biografie vecí**

- to, či je vec komoditou, kedy je vec komoditou, a ktorá vec je komoditou záleží na špeciálnej morálnej ekonómii, ktorá je za objektívnou ekonómiou viditeľných transakcií.
- V závislosti na morálnej ekonómii môže byť vec vymeniteľnou, alebo nevymeniteľnou v rôznych momentoch svojho trvania v čase.

Inalienable possessions

of the Maussian model of gift relations is that the things transacted are inalienable—that they are in important ways bound to people (Mauss 1990:14). The gift is inalienably linked to the giver, and therefore it is important for regenerating the relationship between giver and recipient. The Christmas present that my mother gives me continues to bear her identity after I receive it, and so continues to affirm that she and I are linked as mother and son. At a more mundane level, the many everyday objects that my wife and I buy for each other as part of the routine of keeping house continually remind each of us of the other, and so affirm and recreate the relationship that links us. As these examples indicate, I take “inalienable” simply to mean associated with a person, a possession, “part of the self, somehow attached, assimilated to or set apart for the self” (Beaglehole 1932:134). For the archaic societies that Mauss described, the association was strong and inalienability was pronounced. However, the degree of association, its bases and consequences, will vary according to situations and societies. For example, in English law since the thirteenth century the gift has been formally alienated from the giver: once made, “the transaction is then irrevocable” (Lowes, Turner and Wills 1968:220). In other words, saying that the gift is inalienably linked to the giver does not necessarily mean that the giver has the jural right to reclaim the object, that such a right could be exercised in practice, or that the recipient has no right to dispose of the object. The nature of these rights and practices is an empirical question. What is important is the central point that the object continues to bear the identity of the giver and of the relationship between the giver and the recipient. Where does this relationship between possessor and possession reside? At the very minimum, it can reside in the mind of only one person and be a matter of individual psychology. In practice, of course, it is likely to exist in the minds of several people and so be a social understanding of the object. More broadly yet, social structure and practices will affect the ways that different sorts of people are likely to interact with different sorts of objects, and so affect the ways they are likely to experience those objects and hence think about them. Although Mauss based his discussion of inalienability on archaic societies, others have described it in industrial societies. Ernest

Because of the association between person and object, the object has a history and carries the stamp of those who possessed it previously. In possessing the object, then, we possess as well that object’s past. According to Annette Weiner, this is the case with *taonga*, a type of Maori valuable heirloom. These objects carry the power and identity of those who possessed them in the past and confer power and identity on those who possess them in the present. These objects are so bound up with the people associated with them that to acquire another’s *taonga* “is to acquire another’s rank, name, and history” (Weiner 1992:64).

Mauss' concept of "total prestations" was further developed by Annette Weiner, who revisited Malinowski's fieldsite in the Trobriand Islands. Her critique was twofold: first, Trobriand Island society is matrilineal, and women hold a great deal of economic and political power. Their exchanges were ignored by Malinowski. Secondly, she developed Mauss' argument about reciprocity and the "spirit of the gift" in terms of "[inalienable possessions](#): the paradox of keeping while giving."^[6]

Weiner contrasts "moveable goods" which can be exchanged with "immoveable goods" that serve to draw the gifts back (in the Trobriand case, male Kula gifts with women's landed property). She argues that the specific goods given, like Crown Jewels, are so identified with particular groups, that even when given, they are not truly alienated. Not all societies, however, have these kinds of goods, which depend upon the existence of particular kinds of kinship groups.

Weiner states that certain objects become inalienable only when they have acquired "cosmological authentication"; that is,

What makes a possession inalienable is its exclusive and cumulative identity with a particular series of owners through time. Its history is authenticated by fictive or true genealogies, origin myths, sacred ancestors, and gods. In this way, inalienable possessions are transcendent treasures to be guarded against all the exigencies that might force their loss.^[9]

She gives the example of a [Māori](#) Sacred Cloak and says that when a woman wears it "she is more than herself - that she is her ancestors." Cloaks act as conduits for a person's hau or life giving spirit. The hau can bring strength or even knowledge potentially but a person may also have the risk of losing their hau. "An inalienable possession acts as a stabilizing force against change because its presence authenticates cosmological origins, kinship, and political histories."^[10] In this way, the Cloak actually stands for the person.^[11] "These possessions then are the most potent force in the effort to subvert change, while at the same time they stand as the corpus of change".

Inalienable possessions are nonetheless frequently drawn into exchange networks. The subtitle of Weiner's book is "The paradox of keeping-while-giving"; they are given as gifts (not sold) yet still retain a tie to their owners. These gifts are not like those given in regular [gift giving](#) in the West on birthdays for example. Rather, these gifts can't be re-sold for money by the receiver because the value and the significance of the gift cannot be alienated or disengaged from its relationship to those whose inalienable possession it is.

Weiner begins by re-examining Mauss' explanation for the return gift, the "spirit of the gift." The "spirit of the gift" was a translation of a Maori word, *hau*. Weiner demonstrates that not *all* gifts must be returned. Only gifts that are "immoveable property" can become inalienable gifts. She further argues that inalienable possessions gain the "mana" (spirit) of their possessors, and so become associated with them. These goods are frequently produced by women, like the feather cloak above. The more prominent the woman, the more mana the object is thought to inherit. The longer the kin group can maintain the object in their possession, the more valuable it becomes; but it must also be periodically displayed to assert the group's status, and thus becomes an object of desire for outsiders.^[18]

Weiner argues that the role of women in the exchange of inalienable possessions has been seriously underestimated. [Kinship](#) theory as developed by [Claude Lévi-Strauss](#), used the "[sibling incest taboo](#)" to argue that women themselves are [objects of exchange](#) between lineage groups. Men had to find women outside their kin groups to marry hence they "lost" their sisters in order to gain wives. Weiner shows that the focus on women as wives ignores the importance of women as sisters (who are not "lost" as a result of becoming wives). Women produce inalienable possessions which they may take with them when they marry out; the inalienable possession, however, must be reclaimed by her brother after her death in order to maintain the status of the kin group. In comparing Hawaii, Samoa and the Trobriands, she argues that the more stratified a society is by ranked differences, the more important inalienable possessions produced by sisters become. The more stratified a society becomes (as in Hawaii), the closer the sibling bond ("sibling intimacy"). In these cases, women are critical to the "cosmological authentication" of inalienable possessions.^[19]

