

Exam questions:

1. Can we distinguish between moral economies and other kinds of economies? Justify your answer with reference to E. P. Thompson's paper (1971) and ethnographic research.
2. "There is nothing inherent in money that destroys morality, cooperation, or social order." Discuss this claim by Maurice Bloch and Jonathan Parry (1989).
3. "All forms of economic life are embedded within social structures." Discuss this statement with reference to anthropological theory and empirical studies.

Guidelines for examiners:

The course itself is structured on making connections through different themes, in exploring the economy as an all-encompassing phenomenon, rather than a decontextualized faction of human experience available only to experts. This would mean being attentive to weaving in different readings into an answer, while showing critical and independent thinking. It would encourage a firm grasp of how argumentation works, rather than a memorization of how authors express their points. In practice, there are specific reference points that examiners should expect.

A: These are papers that are *exceptional* in the ways that they bring in a range of readings from across the course. They naturally cover the key readings that are obvious reference points for the topic in question but also bring in a wide range of other *relevant* readings from the course and not only point out the connection to the themes and key readings of the topic involved, but also do so in a manner designed to shed fresh light on the key concepts or topics.

For the discussion of the idea of "moral economies", for instance, an A candidate would be able to use a wide range of various readings to build support for E.P. Thompson's theory, while also discussing how his framework can be criticized by pointing out, for example, how Thompson's concept of moral economies implicitly promotes the idea that there is an inverse relationship between markets and morality. Or reversely, an A candidate could ask, if all economies are equally moral, what explanatory potential is left in the concept of "moral economies"?

Papers that address the question about how "all forms of economic life are embedded within social structures" could be considered for an A if they 1) operationalize a convincing sense of what they mean by embeddedness and social structures, 2) draw on a wide and original range of readings from the course, both classic (most obviously Polanyi, but also Malinowski, Mauss) and contemporary (e.g. Zaloom, Ho, Holmes, Martin, or Ferry). Finally, 3) A papers should be able to produce an argument that coheres and builds up through the essay.

B: These papers are *very good* in the way that they show good understanding of the key readings relevant to the topic at hand and bring in some comparison with other

literature across the course. This will not be of the same degree as an A grade either in terms of range or sophistication of argument.

For example an answer to the question on Bloch and Parry – on whether money itself destroys morality etc. – might reference Hutchinson and Peebles without going more deeply into other papers that could be used to discuss the question, such as Taussig's analysis of the devil exchange; Barth's paper from Darfur (on the shame of selling one's labor for money); or Keir Martin's paper from PNG about the effects of categorizing social relationships as wage relationships. Exams that draw on a *wide range* of readings to show how Bloch and Parry are 'correct' in making a case against the revolutionary power of money itself, merits a B. Work that moves *beyond* this, towards an independent discussion of the theoretical framework that Bloch and Parry put forward *instead* (about the morality of exchange), could warrant an A.

C: These papers are *good*. They show a good enough level of understanding of the basic concepts of the key texts for the topic involved and have at least one small comparison across the course syllabus. They will bring in some comparison and show a degree of understanding of connections.

For example, for the question about embeddedness and social structures, C candidates will answer with reference three or four different ethnographic studies, most obviously including Polanyi, perhaps relying heavily on Hart and Hann's textbook. Cs will provide convincing examples of how economic life is woven into social structures, but their examples will to a lesser degree than B and A candidates add up to the candidate's own, cumulative argument.

D: These papers are *satisfactory*: They show a basic if sometimes incomplete knowledge of the key readings and have little or no accurate reading across the syllabus.

E: These papers are *adequate*: They show some understanding of the key texts or issues but with significant gaps or errors and little or no accurate reading across the syllabus.

F: These papers *fail*. They do not reference the key texts or arguments or use them in a significantly inaccurate manner.