ANTHROPOLOGY AND HUMANISM

The *Hau* of Theory: The Kept-Gift of Theory Itself in American Anthropology

Jessica Marie Falcone
Kansas State University
Anthropology Program
204 Waters Hall
Manhattan, KS 66502

SUMMARY *In this essay, I deploy anthropological theories of exchange to trace contemporary practices of theory exchange in the academy, most specifically in anthropology. I examine participation in various sites of theory exchange from classroom to conference, from citer to cited, and from writer to reader and back again. By explicitly deploying the theoretical toolkit of anthropology that we have at our disposal, we can and should simultaneously examine our own knowledge production practices with more deliberateness even as we seek to understand our subjects' varied worldviews.* [academic culture, gift exchange, fame]

Most tenure-track academics know the old adage that one must "publish or perish," but when our own anthropological theories about gift exchange are directly applied to the exchange of theory itself, the results suggest that the maxim ought to extend beyond what is at stake in the ladder toward tenure and promotion, because if we publish, then we do not utterly perish, *ever*. Publication fixes our names in pixels, and many names are carried forward into the future conversations of our discipline. Participation in the publication and theory-exchange world allows scholars entrance to a social milieu that is bigger than themselves, and one that promises durability and remembrance. I am talking about immortality here.

Citation lies at the very heart of our gifting rituals. Insofar as the chain of our own citations is just as endless, originless, unignorable, and reinterpretable as any other social phenomena, I would have us examine the "citationality" (Butler 1993) of *actual* citationality.[1] Dominic Boyer has noted that citations serve to situate us in free-floating conversation with theorists whether dead or alive: "by de-contextualizing (and thus sanctifying) these works as part of a timeless canon of pure theoretical expertise, we reciprocally sacralize ourselves through the contact of citation" (2001:210). Following Boyer (and thus sanctifying him), I will argue that the exchange of theory is mystified because of the systematic misrecognition of our desires to "sanctify" ourselves in a bid for both fame and even a kind of immortality. I argue that in addition to the obvious instrumental and socioeconomic reasons for doing so,[2] when anthropologists engage in a lasting system of theory exchange, it also serves an affective desire for life, eros, and permanence. These exchanges are a critical part of the establishment and maintenance of our anthropological personhood.[3] The spaces of theory

Anthropology and Humanism, Vol. 38, Issue 2, pp 122–145, ISSN 1559-9167, online ISSN 1548-1409.
© 2013 by the American Anthropological Association. All rights reserved.
DOI: 10.1111/anhu.12014.

exchange in anthropology transcend the main stage of publication—classroom lectures, mentorship and advising, conference participation—but there is a social hierarchy of exchange, which I intend to explore further in this piece. If theoretical narratives have a life of their own, a longevity that belies the mortality of the theory makers, then the academy is engaged in a never-ending story: brave new readers become implicated in each successive version, and while the actual individual stories (our new knowledge, our new articles, our path-breaking work) themselves change, the overarching story writ large (of our story-making practices) remains a worthy object of understanding in and of itself.

Since I began this study in 2005, I have conducted dozens of informal interviews with anthropologists at a handful of different liberal arts colleges and research universities who are currently at various points in their careers. I have done ethnographic observations and collected data at conferences, symposia, retirement functions, and memorials. Though I will discuss some academic practices in general terms, I focus most specifically on the subculture of cultural anthropologists, simply because as an anthropologist myself they are the group with whom I have been doing participatory observation the most.[4] My male and female American cultural anthropology informants were graduate students, retirees, contingent adjunct faculty, and faculty on the tenure track, so the "we" of anthropological academics is inclusive in this one sense, although not in terms of other nationalities, academic disciplines, or even anthropological subdisciplines. The majority of my informants were white and American-born, and while that sample is consistent with the demographic make-up of the departments in which I spent the most time, I am sure quite sure that fact has hidden some of the more subtle differences in beliefs and behavior.[5] I hope that the broad strokes of this piece can be further refined in future studies.

There are many good reasons to pursue the study of ourselves, for as David Schneider pointed out in his seminal work on American kinship, ". . . we *are* the natives. Hence we are in an especially good position to keep the facts and the theory in their most productive relationship" (1968:vi). We stand to gain a new perspective on our theoretical instruments, as well as our own motivations and cultural logics. I have written elsewhere about the significant knowledge-producing opportunities afforded by turning our critical and methodological gazes upon the *habitus* of our departmental, disciplinary, and university cultures (Falcone 2010). While the historical tomes on transformations in higher education, sociological work on academic labor, and the chatty blogs on the Chronicle of Higher Education website are important spaces in which to reflect on academic cultures, I would argue that there is still a dearth of more sustained ethnographic engagements with our own knowledge production practices.[6]

The wealth of anthropological theories on exchange should be applied to the temporal present of our greatest material presents: the gifts of our theories. In this article, I argue that the study of the gift of theory, and its social exchange and circulation in classrooms, publications, and conferences can best be accomplished by bringing our own gift exchange literature to bear upon the subject. The rich tradition of gift exchange theory in anthropology can serve as a lens we turn onto our own knowledge production practices as a means to both further the study of sociocultural exchange and to honor the ancient maxim to "know

thyself." In order to most effectively produce knowledge about the ethnographic subject, we can and should simultaneously meditate on our own knowledge production practices with intentionality; why not do this by explicitly deploying the anthropological theories that we have at our disposal?

The *Hau* of Theory

If Marcel Mauss' *The Gift: the Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* is one of anthropology's substantive gifts to the academy, then it behooves any anthropologist studying gifting to carefully examine the question of the *hau*. Here Marcel Mauss argues that gifts are not free and volitional (2000), as Bronislaw Malinowski (1984) had intimated, but that gifts are always a part of a complex system of obligations that bind society together and maintain its equilibrium: giving, receiving, and repaying/reciprocating. Mauss argued that the hau (or "spirit") of the gift, which demanded to be returned to its original source, contained the key to the motivation behind gift exchange. The gift retains its original connection to the source by manifesting itself as an active part of the source: "to make a gift of something to someone is to make a present of some part of oneself" (Mauss 2000: 12). Social solidarity and relationships are then established and maintained through the constant circulation of gifts.

Although debates rage on in anthropology regarding the precise nature of the hau of the gift, none of the critiques and revisitations of Mauss by Marshall Sahlins (1972), Annette Weiner (1985; 1992), Jacques Derrida (1993), James Laidlaw (2000), or others has managed to dull the hau of the theory of hau, which perhaps gives the notion its ultimate redemption. That is to say that even while critiquing Mauss, by citing the origin, his interlocutors enacted the theory of the hau by returning the gift.

Sahlins himself once drew the same parallel in a throwaway introductory sentence: "Marcel Mauss's famous Essay on the Gift becomes his own gift to the ages. . . . [I]t remains a source of an unending ponderation for the anthropologist du métier, compelled as if by the hau of the thing to come back to it again and again, perhaps to enter into a dialogue which seems to impute some meaning of the reader's but in fact only renders the due of the original" (Sahlins 1972: 149). Sahlins draws attention to an important aspect of the hau of theory: anthropologists are enthralled by the spirit of the theoretical gift. Unfortunately, from my perspective at least, Sahlins made this provocative observation and then dropped it like a hot potato; he hurried past it, content with letting the anecdotal observation stand alone and unexplored. But Mauss' obligations to give, receive, and reciprocate are keenly felt within the academy, and because these compulsions sit at the heart of our research and publication practices and strategies, we really ought to examine our theory-gifting subcultures. Academic theories are "given" to scholars through publications, lectures, and talks. Academics are compelled to "take" the gift of theory: being socialized into the academy involves spending dozens of years reading and writing, and developing a theoretical fluency so that the hau of theories past can be evoked in current work.

We are also compelled to "reciprocate" the gift of theory: in the end, we must wield, cite, and/or produce theories, and send them back out into the landscape

of exchange. If we do not publish, then our careers are stymied, stalled, or rerouted off the tenure track. In less instrumental terms, if we do not publish, then our research is devalued, and we may mourn aborted work that never got written up and properly shared with our peers. In forwarding our own theories we are giving a gift and by engaging with those of others, we invite others to cite us, that is, take our gift and evoke the hau of that gift. Even as the scholar gives, the scholar is also reciprocating what was previously received through the practice of citation. Reciprocity involves keeping theory in circulation, both theirs and our own. In a general way, we must reciprocate the gifts we were given, and we expect our gifts to be reciprocated in turn. The exchange of theory is a raison d'etre, it binds the academy, our society, together, and it creates a sense of a permanent community with a history and a future. The gift of theory is sometimes even gift wrapped, such as when a theorist italicizes their theoretical contributions almost as a suggestion that the reader ought to take it, use it and refer to its hau through citation, such as Jean Baudrillard's italicized "*precession of simulacra*" in *Simulacra and Simulation* (1994) in Michel Foucault's italicization of "*power*" in *The History of Sexuality* (1978), or Arjun Appadurai's italicizing of "*ethnoscapes,*" "*mediascapes,*" and more in *Modernity at Large* (1996).

Reciprocity is itself a complex and fluid notion; Mauss may have been onto something, but the gift literature has worked to complicate his claims in productive ways. Sahlins has differentiated three types of reciprocities that exist on a continuum: "generalized reciprocity" that includes Malinowski's much maligned "pure gift," as well as exchanges of solidarity and "kinship dues" and "chiefly dues"; "balanced reciprocity," which refers to an equal exchange of things of the same value in which the goal of both social parties is to take and receive goods of equal quantity and quality; and finally, "negative reciprocity," which refers to the exchanges that take place in which social parties are each trying to maximize their utility at the others expense (1972). For the purposes of this paper, theory exchange can run the gamut of reciprocities, as one can find examples of each of these types of exchanges in many our academic sites (classrooms, conferences, lectures, and texts). For example, "generalized reciprocity" in this context may refer to a citation that is the obligatory celebration of the work of one's academic advisors or colleagues. Citing an argument or point in support of one's own argument, without dwelling on its possible limitations, is an example of a theory exchange that could be seen as an act of balanced reciprocity. Of course, academic theory exchange very often involves "negative reciprocity," because theorists often try to one up each other by dismantling one another's arguments. Mauss focuses on negative or "agonistic" exchange, such as the potlatch exchanges of the Kwakiutl, in order to demonstrate the compulsion to give, even when it is performed with hostility. There is something of the agonistic in much academic citation, which can be caustic and occasionally savage. Reciprocity only tells part of the story, as Annette Weiner has significantly expressed in her work (1985; 1992), but it is important nonetheless.

In *Given Time*, Derrida accused *The Gift* of being Mauss' counterfeit gift because his basic argument is that the gift as presented by Mauss is essentially impossible (1993). Derrida's deconstruction of the gift is sound enough from a postmodern vantage point—the gift is impossible because it creates a

relationship or an obligation, and therefore the only possible gift is one in which both giver and receiver immediately forget the transaction. So then, perhaps theoretical gift exchanges are not real gifts in the absolute sense of the word because we take them, strings and all, and give them with similar expectations attached. I concur with Derrida's view that our gifts are ultimately impossible (they are exchanges so not gifts). Yet, as with so many other elements of sociality, it is our responsibility as anthropologists to be cognizant of even these cultural aporias because our cultural illusions compel cultural action. When it comes to academic theory exchange, we do not often call our actions "gifting" or "exchanging," and yet the hau of our exchange is deeply embedded in academic culture.

The hau of theory, then, is the innate "spirit" of the theory that compels its circulation and citation within and sometimes even outside the academy. I am not suggesting that the Maori hau and the academic hau are exactly the same, nor are the rules of *kula* exchange just like those of the American Anthropological Association. Still, theory itself is a partible analytical framework that invites wider applicability to numerous localities; theory would be a different creature altogether if it could never be decontextualized and moved to reframe another locale. For my part, I have found that the theoretical gifts of Mauss, Derrida, Nancy Munn, Weiner, Maurice Godelier, Pierre Bourdieu, and others are very constructively deployed in the process of examining theoretical exchange, and in the forthcoming sections I will continue to use gift theory to analyze the microcultures of our theory exchange.

The Space of Exchange: From Anthropology 101 to the AAA

Munn's description of "local" and "translocal" circulations in Gawa can be immensely important tools in elucidating the exchange of knowledge in the academy. In her ethnography, *The Fame of Gawa*, the island of Gawa embodies the "local" and the interisland commerce is "translocal" (Munn 1990b: 2). While drawing a precise analogy between our gifts and their gifts would over-simplify the matter, there are aspects of the Gawan system of exchange that can shed some light on our own scholarly gift exchange practices. Gawa's anthropological analogue: classroom discussion, paper writing, presentations, department seminars, meeting and even informal discussion all become "local events," in contrast to publications, conference participation, outside lectures and the AAA meetings, which embody "translocal events."

Like gifts that circulate among those on the island of Gawa, the "local" space of theoretical exchange is important. First, the building blocks of theory are communicated in this space. Lest we think that theory exchange is only happening in the pages of academic journals and monographs, I would argue that every lecture by a professor to students is also the site of the exchange of theory. The department is the "local" space in which students are socialized into the narratives and valuations of theory, so these classroom spaces should not be underestimated—it is here in the trenches where the social phenomenon is reproduced and reinforced.[7] Most of my informants were active teachers, and some privileged this local space of exchange over any translocal venues. As I've noted previously, the experiences of anthropologists in the classroom are

variable—graduate students, postdocs, those on the tenure track (at various stages: assistant, associate and full professors), and those instructors off the tenure track (some with job security, but most without, both those who are shut out of tenure track jobs due to the sharp "postFordist" rise in temporary academic labor[8] and those few who choose contingent status effectively shunning tenure track jobs)—and the emphasis put on theory exchange in the local venues very definitely vary according to many factors, such as expectation of the institution given a particular job description, ambition toward professional fame, and commitment to publication. The burgeoning adjunct labor force, for example, is creating a whole new category of theory exchangers who are not expected to publish by their employer.

Aspects of the annual American Anthropological Association meetings are similar to the "translocal" kula in essence, though not in substance. Although anthropologists do not practice this as a rigid ceremony, one can easily imagine the circulation of business cards one way and conference papers the other way. The point of the annual meetings is to publicly and ritually demonstrate our skill in theory exchange. This is especially true of the official sessions, which are organized, networked, and vetted many months in advance. The strategizing, in Bourdieu's sense, that is involved in these gift exchange rituals begins as individuals from different universities reach out to each other to form necessarily "translocal" panels. Bourdieu developed his work on gift exchange by advocating for a careful examination of the temporality of the exchange act and the strategy of the exchange partners (1977). In examining the habitus of panel construction, one sees just how academics strategize their gift making and gift exchanging, and how we engage our social milieu(s) with remarkable agency and creativity. Many panel organizers, eager to share their own gifts, have emailed discussion list and/or scoured university websites for anthropologists with similar research interests in order to find other panel presenters. Others begin their work in forming their panel at the previous year's AAA meetings, using their time in between sessions to network and plan. Still, others find friends to work with and cobble together a panel at the last minute. These "translocal" events accomplish the kind of social networking that serves many purposes from reproducing the social to adding lines on one's CV toward tenure review to keeping theory in motion in perpetuity. The AAA's annual meeting is also a place for getting one's name out on the professional scene. It is a space of citational intensity.

All AAA panels are not created equal.[9] How do meeting goers decide what to do at AAA meetings? Some of my informants mark up the preliminary programs in small groups weeks ahead of time, highlighting the academostars (whether paper presenters or discussants) and arguing about whether it is really acceptable to leave a session halfway once the shining stars have had their say, in order to pursue another hot scholar in a ballroom one floor up. Others look at the titles of the panels and try to decide what subject matter will be most interesting or directly relevant to their own research or area specialization. Many, including myself, go to see a few academostars, plus a few panels of genuine areal or thematic interest, before hitting the town each evening with friends, colleagues, and/or mentors from my department and others.

Each session represents a site of theory exchange, but it also happens in conversation over lunch, and before and after sessions. Many important exchanges happen post panel, as participants head out for a meal together. Panel participants may decide to begin planning a book or decide to take a similar panel to another conference elsewhere. Post panel many participants are approached by audience members who ask them questions, give them their cards, or ask for a copy of the paper. Networking and socializing with anthropologists also provides countless opportunities for theory exchange. In 2003, a graduate student noted that she had no intention of attending any sessions at the AAA; her strategy at AAA meetings was to meet old friends and connect with new people. "I don't just chit chat down here," she said while sitting at a table in the lobby of the conference hotel in Chicago, "I talk shop too. I've had the best anthropology exchanges of my life over drinks at the meetings."

Theory exchange in the translocal conference also occurs through the dissemination of new publications. The Marketplace is a ballroom full of publishers hawking the newest and hottest theoretical treatises and treatments, as well as the old standards. The book vendors have their own important place in the veritable kula of anthropological exchange at the AAA Meetings, as they meet hopeful authors, host book launches, and make anthropological writing available to its reading public.

In Munn, the "regional" is the synthesis of "local and translocal" which manifests as "Gawans carry forward certain past events (spatiotemporal 'moments') and configure certain futures in their present experience" (1990b:2). Munn narrates the "event history" by which locals process the past effects of gifts in the present and the consequences of that history for the present understanding of the future. Regional events take place in both local and translocal spaces, according to Munn: "We may say that at any given moment, local and translocal dimensions mutually inform each other and are meshed together; and such syntheses are themselves the grounds and media of ongoing processes of synthesis" (1990b:13). The discipline writ large, made manifest through books, journals, websites, films, and blogs, encompasses the spaces in which we narrate the history of anthropological history of exchange, and quibble over how theories past have impacted the present and to what extent those spatiotemporal norms govern our sense of what our theoretical labors will generate in the future.

What's in a Name? Fame

The exchange of theory is rarely anonymous. In his tome on academic social reproduction, *Homo Academicus*, Bourdieu has noted of academia that, "one of the objectives of the milieu is to 'make a name for oneself' " (1988:2). The exchange of theory relies heavily on citation, as fame is one of the oft-unspoken desires of circulation. William Clark's excellent work on the history of modern universities proves that the desire for fame in the academy has long required the construction of "noise" about a particular work through the work of citation and review (2006:374). Clark cited a sensational example in his book—an 18th century German scholar named Johann Justi wrote of his academic culture thusly, "In the Republic of Letters, the academic ware is publically vended for

money, I mean 'academic money' there. One needs to know that the academic Republic of Letters mints a sort of coin called 'fame.' In the learned tongue, this minting means to cite someone else with much credit." (Justi in Clark 2006: 373). Justi calls the manufacture of fame through the network of citation akin to a "trading company" (373). The manufactured coin of scholastic fame that Justi describes could also be reinscribed as the literal "false coin of our own dreams" (Graeber 2001).

Munn writes about a crucial element of persuasion in the kula in Gawa: the element of persuasion produces *butu* (fame), which is described as *i-taavin* ("one's name travels around") (1990a). The shells in the kula each have their own value, so if a man succeeds in attaining the shell he desires then he is known to have exercised control over the giver; that is, the recipient has succeeded in "moving the mind" of his kula partner (278). This observation has a significant bearing on our discussion of the exchange of theory because theories have disparate values as well. It is the ability of the theorists/givers to "move the mind" of readers/receivers that achieves the coin of academic recognition; the element of persuasion (and even the reputation of the scholar) is key in establishing the value of a theory. The more persuasive the theory, the more its hau will be evoked in successive citation and the more value the theorist's name continues to gain over time. Once a theory has gained value though widespread circulation it becomes unavoidably famous, or infamous; as Boyer keenly observed, at one specific moment in academic culture, even if one did not agree with Foucault, if one was writing about power, sexuality, discipline, or institutions, one was almost forced to cite him (Boyer 2003). But theories and academics go in and out of fashion. George Marcus has noted that the classic, exemplary ethnographies of the pre-Writing Culture rupture in the 1980s have been displaced (or at least supplemented) in the classroom by the circulation of newer experiments in ethnographic writing—a phenomenon that contributes to the contemporary mores of academic reputation building (Faubion and Marcus 2009:20). Examining the "social lives" of theories by outlining their full journey and social context could help us to explicate their fluctuating values.[10] Or looking at the context of the "creativity potentialities" at work in the giving and receiving of theories could help us understand their value in a particular sociocultural time and place.[11]

One might equate the "magic" of the Gawan receiver with the "magic" of a theorist being evaluated: Was the "magic" of the actor powerful enough to have the effect that was anticipated? If a theorist/giver is able to persuade the reader/receiver, then ostensibly the gift will be more valued and receive wider circulation. The hau of a theory is related to the magic or skill of persuasion, and the corresponding strength of the name rests in part on the success of theory in "traveling around." The skill involved in persuasion is a crucial aspect of the gift exchange of theory because it is only persuasive arguments and theories which will be recirculated and accrue greater fame.

In the context of editing the *Minnesota Reviews'* exploration of public intellectuals and "academostars," Jeffrey J. Williams has scrutinized the issue of academic fame. In particular, in his article, "Name Recognition," he profoundly hits upon the affective power of being cited: "Citations work to spur the repetition, memorialization, and sacralization of those they name" (Williams

2001:202). Because the citation is the foremost node of reciprocity in the exchange of theory, it is worth acknowledging that the institution of citation is utterly taken for granted. Williams recounts the various way citation is deployed by academics: (1) citation as a transparent practice of factually delineating sources; (2) citation as a rhetorical practice deployed in order to invoke expertise; (3) citation as a rhetorical launch pad, used as a beginning point either in agreement or disaccord; (4) citation as "memorial homage" (2001). The citation is given its due as the sacred node of fame generation in academe, even for non "academostars": "The ritual intoning of names—even in disagreement—might be seen as a kind of memorial narrative, familiar in the Bible, Beowulf, or other instances of the oral formulaic tradition" (202). It is worth noting that being cited even in disaccord can be a boon to one's ultimate fame; in terms of the hau of theory it matters less whether one is cited in support or contra the claims of another, as long as one remains in circulation. It may wear upon the *mana* of a theory if it is attacked too often, as it may be discarded as unfashionable or problematic, so attacks are sometimes rebuffed by authors or supporters in later work. But the gift always manifests the stuff of social bonds, whether it is agonistic or not. Recall the contrary giving practices, or "total services of an agonistic type," such as potlatch, in which the social is manifest through the exchanges meant to reestablish hierarchy (Mauss 2000:7). The debates, controversies, and theoretical battles may rage on, but the actual scholarly gifting conventions themselves are upheld by all sides, and the social system is thus reinforced.

While Williams does not himself identify citationality as a practice of exchange, his work supports the reading of citationality as a system of reciprocity. He writes, "Rather than invoking the Muse, they beckon the system of professional recognition—recognizing others presumably with the hope that one will also be recognized" (202). Williams notes that the psychological desires, hopes, and fears of academics are largely ignored in discourses on professionalism, yet the psyche motivates a great deal of our production.

The majority of academics are not academostars, but Bourdieu's work on temporality and strategy in gift exchange helps to explain some of the complexity of the publishing game for the academic masses (1977). Academics are faced with publishing houses of varying reputation, so an assistant professor may ignore a lesser publisher in favor of wooing a more highly respected publisher, in part in order to work toward achieving tenure but also in order to gain the social capital that may give his/her theory more "magic." One scholar might hold onto an article for a few years, editing and perfecting, strategically trying to get it into the most prestigious peer-reviewed venue possible; another academic may publish only insofar as they need to in order to get tenure, so they can focus on the mode of theory giving primarily in the "local" space of the classroom. Every academic faces similar patterns of regional social rules in their discipline but faces various dynamics of their specific translocal and local environs, so it is not surprising that in practice academics strategize and choose such different paths of exchange.

Perhaps the most celebrated form of name recognition in theoretical circles is the mere inference of it. The most famous theories have generated such enormous hau through circulation far and wide that the name of the theorist can be

implicitly attached. "The panopticon," "the uncanny," "the iron cage of reason," "the master-slave dialectic," are all theoretical registers, which like so many others are instantly associated with their respective theorists. Each discipline has its own collection of these "big men" (see Sahlins 1963) and big women among theorists, their own "academostars" whose work is cited because it must be and who provide theoretical touchstones to add value to the work that follows it.

Most academics do not have pretensions to academostar status, but many have dreams of inventing a slam-dunk theory or being published in the most prestigious journals. There would be no academostars without non-academostars to put the former up on a pedestal. In academia, everyone gives and takes theory, but as the most famous theory makers, male and female academostars are certainly the "big men" of the exchange game. Perhaps, in part, we retain these great theories in some part to serve as a theoretical gold standard, backing up and guaranteeing (through the act of citation) the worth of our own theoretical currency.

The Kept-Gift and the Promise of Immortality

> "Why write, if not to create a double to survive one, even if only for a short while, until the work is pulped?" (Faure 2004:128).

If the exchange of theory means gifting "some part of oneself," and scholars desire that the hau of our gift remains in circulation through citation in order to bring us fame, are scholars then satisfied with a career, even a lifetime of success in professional exchange? Let's face it, many academics want far more than that—they want to be remembered after retirement, even after death. The value of being as widely cited as, let's say, Judith Butler or Clifford Geertz, would be significantly less so,] if upon their deaths their theories and all citations in reference to their theories were to somehow instantly vanish. One of the appeals of the citation is its relative permanence; to engage in theory exchange, therefore, is to participate in the promulgation of an implicit promise for immortality because "some part of oneself" will remain in circulation after death.

In Weiner's theory of gift exchange, the hau is the spirit of replacement and the promise of longevity, which works to establish the identity of an individual within an ostensibly permanent social and a spiritual world (1985). Weiner upholds Mauss' perception that hau is not a passive force in the eyes of the Maori people, but she imputes onto it her perception that the Maori view it as a promise of something far greater than economic or social gain: a semblance of immortality.

Hau, then, is a means to obviating some of the mental discomfort people face regarding their essential impermanence. Weiner writes: "*taonga* are 'to some extent parts of persons' in the sense that the taonga is the material document of its owner's ancestral past and is itself the carrier of the hau. The stone and cloth valuable believed to contain the same life force, the hau, as do humans, are not only the agents of individuals, but through their collective histories the valuables become proof of a group's immortality" (Weiner 1985:223).[12] The affective

motivation for hau is compelling. Weiner notes that the historical lineage of the object is imperative in reassuring people of permanence and constancy:

> An individual's role in social life is fragmentary unless attached to something of permanence. The history of the past, equally fragmentary, is concentrated in an object that, in its material substance, defies destruction. Thus, keeping an object defined as inalienable adds to the value of one's past, making the past a powerful resource for the present and future. The dynamics surrounding keeping-while-giving are attempts to give the fragmentary aspect of social life a wholeness that ultimately achieves the semblance, thereby adding new force to each generation (1985:224).

In sum, Weiner was able to compellingly argue that the gift is not just of economic or social relevance but that it also serves to psychologically assuage some of the mental dissonance about death and impermanence. Likewise, I would submit that theory is a gift that scholars offer to other scholars, in part to claim a place in an ostensibly permanent system, which implicitly promises to recirculate their hau.

Weiner's symbolic interpretation of gift exchange as means to economic, social and psychological well-being can serve as a powerful model through which to view our knowledge production practices in the academy. Scholars enact "keeping-while-giving" when exchanging theory: their names are firmly affixed to the theory they produce so that even as a theory is circulated out into the academic world by publication or presentation, the source retains an essential connection to it. Copyright laws and intellectual property rights attest to the method of keeping-while-giving: fail to cite a theoretical perspective at one's professional peril.

The hau of a theory is the socially generated implicit power or "spirit" of the oft-cited, the widely circulated. Our present theories generally have most resonance in reference to our discipline's history, lineages, and legacies. A sense of the permanence and structural integrity of our discipline relies on our recourse to the hau of theory. Weiner's work as an object of theory itself can serve to illustrate our dependency on evoking the hau of theory: Mauss drew on the hau of Malinowski and others; Sahlins drew on the hau of Mauss, Levi-Strauss, Firth, and others; Weiner drew on the hau of Mauss, Sahlins, and others. In this very essay, I draw on the hau of Mauss, Sahlins, Weiner, Strathern, Foucault, and Appadurai. We are all *hau*nted by those we are compelled to cite. If we stopped citing altogether, we would have effectively sabotaged the discipline's promise to retain "some part" of ourselves.

I am not arguing that we exchange theory only through acts stemming from a mystified desire for permanence, because I have noted practical instrumental benefits to the exchange. Yet I believe that it would be a gross oversimplification to suggest that our motivation for theory exchange is merely for economic gain as professional academics bent on promotion or even that we are simply writing out of desire to shed light on some aspect of the social. The hau of theory points to a strong affective motivation that adds underlying nuance to the normative, socio-economic, and academic motivations for exchange: our identities are constituted by the process of participating in the historical conversations of our discipline, to which we necessarily desire to impute some semblance of permanence. Furthermore, we hope that our institution will retain

memories of us through our skills of theory making or theory passing. Therefore, the institution must continue to exist so that we will be remembered. We must cite our predecessors' theory (activating their *hau*) in order to reconstitute the hope that we will be cited by our successors.

Weiner identified two kinds of inalienable possessions: those that must circulate albeit while retaining its connection to the source and those that must never circulate (1985; 1992). I would posit that for the anthropologist there is a similar distinction. The inalienable wealth I have noted thus far, especially publications and talks, has been put into public circulation. The inalienable wealth which remains out of circulation is our fieldnotes, our drafts, and our personal journals and diaries from our stints in the field. Godelier argued that the key to the sacred lay buried in uncirculated inalienable wealth (1999). Fieldnotes themselves remain beyond the pale of exchange. The controversy ignited when Malinowski's journal, *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*, was published in 1967 may have been in some part due to the fact that a sacred object was suddenly circulated in the public sphere (1989). The discomfort of the anthropological reader is perhaps in part a realization that the inalienable wealth in circulation can lose value if its sacred anchor is unmoored. Also, the implicit threat of our sacred wealth being thus desacralized is itself disconcerting.

Academic kinship plays a role in theory exchange. Anthropologists have particularly well-known penchant for transmitting lineage stories; in the classroom our professors recall their professors and tell stories about their character and their theoretical designs, while often religiously assigning their own former professors' texts to their students. Some academics approach graduate students as potential recruits, and some graduate students convert or surrender to the theoretical position of their academic mentors. This recalls Magali Larson's point that the reproduction of value entails the socialization of the next generation: "the producers themselves have to be produced if their products or commodities are to be given distinctive form" (1977:14). In part, for some, it is the hope that we in turn will be cited, remembered, and eulogized through the activation of the hau of theory by our students that motivates anthropologists to teach.

Theory can engender spirited commitment by its adherents, in part because the proliferation of new theoretical movements, and/or subfields is a strategy that requires receivers, the persuaded, and reproducers to reify its value. If Malinowski had been completely right, then what would we write? The cult of newness is pervasive in the academy because we often feel we have to stake out new theoretical territory in order to be worthy of being oft cited. I would argue that the convention of denying disciplinary conventions is motivated in part by the notion that only the next big thing will capture the imagination of theoretical receivers and that fame depends on accelerating the momentum of one's theoretical position. I am suggesting that in general scholars are not *just* looking for *true* theories but are also guided by conscious or subconscious ulterior motives, including a desire to be recirculated ad infinitum.

We create and maintain exchange networks in the "local" and "translocal" arenas in order to further the hau of our own theories, the hau of our predecessors' theories, and the hau of our disciplines' theories. Our own postmortem

remembrance depends on the strength of the system of exchange *in toto*. The human desire for permanence despite the universal fact of death is a recurrent human pattern if not a human universal (Becker 1973). Humans of various ages and cultures have manifested their desire for permanence through myriad means of creation: building pyramids, creating art, bearing children. Humans often create with the hope that the effects of their work will continue to resonate indefinitely. For academics, it is our name, our "spirit," that we hope will ripple outward after we pass away, for therein lies the affective illusion of permanence.

Theorizing Legacy

Retirement celebrations hosted by their departments in order to bid farewell to outgoing professors serve to reinscribe and reinforce the promise of remembrance. Such practices serve as concentrated efforts to solidify and reinvigorate the hau of theoretical gifts past. Often former students, current students, and colleagues gather to commemorate the lasting influence of the departing faculty member. Sometimes, at a retirement conference (more common at bigger, research universities), the retiring professor is treated to a series of papers, which should all evoke the hau of his past theoretical gifts in some way, shape, or form.

Retirement is not just the exit from active department life; it is the beginning of the end of one's engagement with the academic sites of exchange. The retirement conference or celebration serves to ritually mark the end of one's career and the beginning of a new phase of life outside the academy. It is a rite of passage, and as such it involves a ritualistic passage through a liminal phase that allows for a reincorporation outside of the academy. In the midst of the liminal phase, the retirement celebration serves to recollect and reinscribe the significance of a scholar's academic journey; it permits a community a special opportunity to re-empower the *hau* of the retiree's work. I observed and/or interviewed participants from several retirement celebrations at different colleges and universities—Colorado College, Cornell University, LaSalle University, Kansas State University, New College of Florida, University of Virginia, Warren Wilson College—and while they were each quite different events (and from various departments), they had certain important elements in common that point toward a desire for legacy construction.

Each retirement event was a public affirmation of the legacy of the retiree, in which colleagues, and/or former students, were invited to speak publicly to the contributions of the retiree to the field, the university, the department, and their students' lives. Often the publications of the retiree were itemized, and especially at bigger universities, the retiree was regaled with speeches detailing her theoretical contributions to her field. At smaller colleges, there seems to be greater emphasis placed on the contributions of the retiree to the lives of students and colleagues, but publications and theoretical contributions were mentioned as well. The retiree's academic credential and a biographical sketch was always shared with the gathering, and especially if there were big names in her academic pedigree, the audience was told who the retiree studied under and sometimes who those people studied under. The former and current students of the retiree often rehearsed their own academic kinship in the process,

and the feeling of solidarity between attendees increased as people performed their common lineage. The implicit promise hangs thick in the air at these events; we will all be thus memorialized someday.

At the retirement conference held to commemorate Terence Turner's departure from active faculty status at Cornell University on April 16 and 17 2004, Turner's colleagues and former students gave talks detailing the many ways they owed a debt to his theoretical and scholarly contributions in their own careers. The conference was a unique site of theory exchange itself because each paper actively worked to cite Turner's theories—that is to return his gifts—yet each presenter also strategically worked to stake out their own theoretical territory in the process.

At the end of the final day, Turner was given the last word; the final slot on the program was left for his speech. Turner used the opportunity as a means to articulate his own theoretical legacy but also to respond to the conference participants about their use of his work. In effect, Turner's gifts of theory were reciprocated by each speaker, and he was able to informally re-reciprocate before the end of the conference.

For example, Steve Sangren's 2004 paper, "Fraught With Implications: Turner's Back Burner," recapitulated Sangren's acceptance of Turner's gifts by noting his significant theoretical contributions: logics of tropic structure in ritual process, the advancement of Marxist anthropology through innovative theories of production and praxis, the critique of idealism in cultural anthropology. However, Sangren (2004) also noted his own points of theoretical departure from Turner, such as his desire to synthesize Marxism and psychoanalysis, and engage in a dialectical reading of Freud, in part in order to complicate the utopian tendencies of Marxist ideology. During Turner's final remarks, Turner replied directly to Sangren regarding the points at which their theoretical perspectives converged and diverged, saying that he agreed that psychoanalysis is an aspect of social production but was adverse to the use of certain Lacanian formulations that Sangren had begun to examine in his work. The exchange of theories was deeply sanctifying and collegial, despite the fact that the two scholars were each hoping to profit the most out of the encounter. At the time, I felt that I was witnessing a kind of kula exchange between elder partners that had been exchanging for years.

The Turner Conference was the retrospective of Turner's theoretical gifts to the discipline and affected the creation of legacy by giving him and his colleagues an opportunity to restate his theoretical sound bites publicly, for the record, thus recalling and re-empowering the hau of his theory. Even the name of the conference, "Critique of Pure Culture," served as a tribute to Turner's theoretical donations to the field of anthropology because it referred to one of Turner's theoretical projects and a potential edited volume.[13] Given that only a fraction of Turner's work has been published, there was special investment in establishing a sense of longevity and lasting contribution. Yet the conference served as means for early and midcareer anthropologists to work toward the prospective formulation of their own legacies by hosting rapid fire theory exchange: Turner's gifts were revisited and reciprocated, and re-reciprocated. The reification of the *hau* of Turner's theories served as proof positive to the gathering of anthropologists of the group's immortality. My informants in the

room admitted later to thinking about their own future retirement event: What will my legacy be? What part of me will continue to effect change once I am gone? For what will I be remembered?

At another retirement function I attended at a small liberal arts college in Colorado in 2007, the retiree's family gathered with colleagues and current students to celebrate his contributions to the field (as ascertained by his colleagues by the reception of his work at professional conferences), the university (as discussed by the president of the college given his service on committees), and his department (as outlined by current and former colleagues in terms of his tenacious teaching and mentoring). This retirement function was quite different than Terry Turner's because this retiree was being celebrated more as a theory giver than a theory maker.

At a retirement function in Manhattan, Kansas, in 2011, a senior physical anthropologist was feted by colleagues, scholars in his field, former students, and even by law enforcement authorities who had tapped him for forensic work over the years. The scholar's achievements were touted by colleagues and students alike, each one talking about his legacy and his contributions. This senior anthropologist's research, teaching, and forensic experience were all touted in a manner that sought to construct and reify a career that would go on (not just in a post retirement capacity) but as sort of acknowledgement for gifts that would remain in circulation. Retirement is then something of a new phase—not one that necessarily indicates the loss of productivity or an intention to stop publishing—and yet, as one moves from one phase to the next, academic conventions allow for a concerted, deliberate, even ritualistic re-empowerment of theoretical contributions.

Life after Death: Theory as the Gift that Keeps on Giving

Hopefully long after retirement, death eventually comes to us all, and thus academia has instituted certain rituals for honoring departed scholars. Memorial events, obituaries in professional magazines, commemorative edited books, and memorial journal issues have become common means of sacralizing the theoretical gifts of a former colleague. The scholar's theoretical gifts are revisited, revivified, and redeployed through the act of reifying legacy.

When Jacques Derrida died on October 8, 2004, it made headline news in countless media fora, from the *New York Times*, which called his work "abstruse" (Kandell 2004) to BBC News, which noted that some colleagues had dismissed his work as "absurd," (BBC News 2004), and finally to the satirical *The Onion*, which pithily quipped, "Jacques Derrida 'dies' "(*The Onion* 2004). Members of the academy mourned and remembered Derrida in their own very distinctive ways: moments of silence in classrooms, begrudging acknowledgement in lectures, or participation at one of the many memorial events arranged at universities around the world. At Cornell University, an event called, "Remembering Jacques Derrida" on Thursday October 21, 2004, included remarks by over a dozen professors from various areas (comparative literature, law, German studies, anthropology, romance studies, government, etc).

While scholars invariably mentioned his generosity and affability, over the course of the event Derrida's theoretical contributions were center stage, as

many scholars referred to the gift he had bestowed on them and the debt they owed his work. One scholar noted that "this sentence, 'Il aura obligé,' is coming back to me now because I feel infinitely indebted to his work, and because I want to honor the obligation and the obligator. But it is also reminding me, reminding us, how much Jacques Derrida was an obliging writer and an obliging man; it reminds us of the many ways in which, thanks to the gifts of language, thanks to his gift of language, the debt he felt, and the ethical injunction that his work carried with itself and answered to, was actually passed onto us as a gift, a grace, as if returned to us: 'il aura obligé' (in French as in English) means both 'he will have required' and 'he will have obliged (others)' " (Berger 2004). Derrida's work on the gift, debt and exchange (Derrida 1993; 1995; 2002) makes the analogy a natural one; his eulogizers were evoking the hau of his gifts of theory even as they were identifying his theories as just such a gift. The hau of a gift in Mauss' sense is precisely the obligation to return the gift that Berger evokes; it is the debt that demands one return the gift.

At the "Remembering Jacques Derrida" event the discourse of debt was also evoked by literature professor Neil Saccamano, who told a parable of a student who wanted to thank a sage for giving him knowledge but was told by the sage, "thank my teachers" (Saccamano 2004). Saccamano's memorial speech was an expression of obligation to Derrida for the theoretical gifts bestowed on the former by the latter. Peter Gilgen also evoked the timelessness and staying power of text by citing work written by Derrida in the future tense before his visit to Cornell in 1978 (Gilgen 2004). Gilgen noted that the textual gift always already outlasts the "present" time, again evoking Derrida's treatment of "the gift" (Derrida 1993). Although not written to Gilgen specifically, Gilgen spoke of his good fortune that the "gifts" of Derrida's making had happened to come to him. Jonathan Culler, the organizer of the memorial event, also considered Derridean theory an important "gift" to the academy (Culler 2004). While musing on the wealth of text still awaiting translation, Culler noted with exhilaration that despite Derrida's demise, his theoretical largesse had not yet been fully tapped:

> I realize now, with his death, what an extraordinary gift this is: to have so much Derrida that has so far remained unstudied, not properly read, to have so much Derrida still awaiting me, Derrida to come. And so much Derrida addressing the problems of a world to come. These texts of recent years that have been not yet assimilated offer an exhilarating prospect, the gift of Death, perhaps, to use one of his titles. . . . Death, "the end of the world as unique totality, thus irreplaceable and therefore infinite," nevertheless leaves us with this gift to which we can give ourselves.

Derrida's theoretical contributions are recognized by his interlocutors as a gift that keeps on giving.

The passing of Derrida gave Cornell's scholars and students an opportunity to consider the great body of work he had circulated to them, which would last in perpetuity. In the context of castigating mass media obituaries of Derrida as "tired caricatures," Philip Lewis noted the power of Derrida's work to transcend his mortality: "Much will be said in the years to come about the survival of Jacques Derrida, the thinker, about the forethought with which he operated

on the dual horizon of survival that ties surviving in life to our potential to survive ourselves—our fatal selfhood—only in or beyond death" (Lewis 2004). In a similar vein, anthropologist James Siegel noted that the work of mourning in our culture is often accomplished through separating the deceased through their achievements, which we believe will outlast any personal memories of him (Siegel 2004). Affirming Derrida's notions that life is inextricably intertwined with death, that survival is itself an aspect of death, and death a precursor to survival, Siegel said, "we are all postponed survivors" (Siegel 2004); Siegel challenges the notion that such a separation of the personal and theoretical is possible, and so takes comfort in the prospective longevity of Derrida's voice. Enacting the promise of theoretical immortality, Derrida's own recorded voice filled the amphitheater for the final minutes of the memorial event, thus presenting his absence and granting him the final word.

In general, memorial forums, the memorial journal issues, and the obituaries of scholars are all sites of theoretical circulation in which the hau of the gift of theory is reciprocated through concentrated, summarizing citation. The special resonance of these specific memorial events is the fact that the gift is almost recognized for what is, a promise and a prayer that a part of the self will remain in perpetual circulation. The memorial medium invariably inscribes theoretical contributions as gifts that have solicited debt, gifts that have constructed a legacy, and gifts that will remain extant in an exchange system long past the expiration of the minds from whence they came.

Cite Me

It is not conventional wisdom that the exchange of theory is done, at least in part, as unconscious resistance to mortality, and yet, if it is so then I believe that it would be most transparent and efficacious to acknowledge and understand the affective desires that hover behind our tireless knowledge-production endeavors. The notion of the hau of theory explodes any conceit that we produce independently,[15] or that we solely produce toward tenure and promotions. Also, and perhaps most importantly, it challenges the notion that we produce theory simply to push knowledge toward truer truths. I would argue that a close reading of our motivations has the potential to release us from some of the unconscious bonds of habitus so that we can produce more honestly, that is, with full cognizance of our ambivalence about the slow inevitable march toward death.

This essay is an exercise in taking theory production in the academy seriously as an object of study in and of itself. This meditation on professionalization by a junior scholar in the process of being assimilated into the collective asks scholars to pay more attention to the gift exchange practices we engage in every day in classrooms, conferences, retirement events, memorials, and our published writing. I acknowledge that for better or worse my specific positionality (as a white woman at the beginning of my career with experience in very particular American institutions) has shaped the contours of this article. There are more unanswered questions than I would like: How might someone at the end of their career on the tenure track (or someone in a contingent adjunct situation) approach the subject of the hau of theory? Does the system of theory

exchange works vastly differently in foreign (French? South African? Indian?) anthropology subcultures? To what extent would a scholar from another American academic field or disciplinary "region" (or even another anthropological subfield) experience theory exchange differently?[14] I find all of these questions extremely provocative, and I hope that at the very least I have compelled my readers to take the study of academic cultures seriously.

At its most empowering, we can use the study of academic cultures to meditate toward better self-knowledge *and* better knowledge production practices. We owe it to ourselves and others to reflect upon the conventions of our academic gifting practices. When scholars refuse to engage reflexivity with their own subculture fetishisms and fallacies abound, which can sometimes lead to unfortunate outcomes: viciousness toward peers, profoundly inflated egos, institutionalized dissatisfaction, hollow scholarship, or perhaps even a sense of resounding professional failure.[16]

It is our own mystified stab at a kind of immortality that keeps the game of theory exchange in constant motion. I am no exception. Even in writing this essay I am performing the (only slightly less mystified) hope that my own modest theoretical insights will cause effects and that the hau of my gift will eventually be empowered through circulation. Is it cheating to openly anticipate the hoped-for reciprocations of gifts of theory? Does it dash the magic? Will this missive be integrated into the conventional discussions of conventions, and if so, how? Will it be returned in good working order or will it be smashed to pieces? Regardless, I do hope it is reciprocated through citation. I would add my name to the legions who are being circulated now, even as I write this, even as you read it. In making an implicit desire explicit I am not trying to end the story—to expose it as false in some essential way. If we are somewhat alienated from our products, then we should reclaim them as our own. If we burden our gifts with the expectation that they will carry our selves forward, then let us embrace our fictions as such, and know them (and love them) for what they are.

Toward the end of his career, Geertz wrote, "As my friends and co-conspirators age and depart what Stevens called 'this vast inelegance,' and I, myself, stiffen and grow uncited, I shall surely be tempted to intervene and set things right once more. But that, doubtless, will prove unavailing, and quite possibly comic. Nothing so ill-befits a scholarly life as the struggle not to leave it, and—Frost, this time, not Hopkins—'no memory of having starred, can keep the end from being hard' " (Geertz 2000:20). In honor of the late Geertz (and for his hau-nting hat tip to Frost), here is one final thought to carry forward into the fray of academic exchange: a comforting but cold libation that in the end there's just citation.

Notes

Acknowledgments. Allow me to take this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks to the peers, colleagues, and mentors who contributed interviews to this project both for their insights and their immeasurable generosity with their time. I would also like to express my gratitude to readers of earlier drafts of this article—mentors and peers at Cornell University, my Writing Group at Kansas State University, and *Anthropology and Humanism's* editorial staff, as well as the three anonymous peer reviewers—each of

whom provided me with constructive feedback that ultimately improved the quality of this omphaloskeptical act of gift exchange.

1. "Citationality" is most often deployed by anthropologists to signal Judith Butler's Derrida-inspired observations about citations of normative behaviors, which extends her ideas on the performativity of gender—the ways in which gender is often a citation of norm (or the reinterpretation of a norm) rather than an act of individual will (Butler 1993).

2. Some of the work of publication, of course, is motivated by socioeconomic needs: getting hired, getting tenure, getting grants, getting promoted, etc. David Graeber notes that academic literature production could be understood in materialist terms (albeit terms that limit but not produce creative action), like everything else, despite the fact that such observations rankle: "Even a discipline like anthropology tends to present itself as floating over material realities, except, perhaps when describing the immediate experience of fieldwork; certainly it would be considered rude to point out, while discussing the merits of an anthropological monograph, that it was written by an author who was well aware that almost everyone who would eventually be reading it would be doing so not because they chose to but because some professor forced them to, or, that financial constraints in the academic publishing industry ensured that it could not exceed 300 pages (2001: 54). See George Marcus' edited volume, *Critical Anthropology Now* (1999), for some excellent expositions on a few of these materialist considerations in academe, such as getting NSF funding (Brenneis 1999) or the act of "consecrating" scholarly work through publication in a peer-reviewed journal (Brent 1999). The Chronicle of Higher Education provides us with multiple spaces for reflection about the traumatic socioeconomic demands of our profession; Joseph Grim Feinberg's exposition on the endless parades of grant applications is a good example of this genre (2010). Professional progress and ambition certainly motivates academic labor toward respectable scholarly publishers. In addition, surely some of the work academics produce is out of love of their research topics and their sense of the actual value of their own potential contributions. In this article, I do not seek to disparage or downplay these professional and material considerations, I merely hope to add evidence of other, more *hau*-nting motivations for our publication and theory-exchange practices.

3. This phenomenon is symbolically akin to the exchange of pigs and pearl shell that give substance, personhood, and identity to Daribi people in New Guinea as described by Roy Wagner (1967: 62).

4. As a graduate student at Cornell University from 2002–2010, an adjunct anthropology professor at Warren Wilson from 2008–2010, and an assistant professor on the tenure-track at Kansas State University from 2010 to the present, I have been able to approach this study from a multiplicity of vantage points within the profession of anthropology.

5. Kathryn Graber rightly points out that "Citation is always more *ex*clusive than *in*clusive" (2010). I do not focus on sexism, racism or heterosexism (or prejudicial practices against other underrepresented identities) in this paper, but there is ample evidence that underrepresented groups do experience further discrimination in the realms of academic gift exchange. Many excellent studies of citational practices note the propagation of sexism through the undercitation of female scholars in various anthropological disciplines; see Hutson (2002), Graber (2010), Lutz (1990), and McElhinny et al. 2003) for more details. Signithia Fordham's important discussion of racialized writing, reading, and publishing practices in the academy does not address citation specifically, but it does show that publication conventions can frustrate or repress attempts to "write in the skin [one is] in" (2009). In her celebration of Zora Neale Hurston as a writer and anthropologist, Irma McClaurin notes that the Hurston's work, along with many black scholars, has been relegated to the margins of anthropology's literary canon (and even feminist anthropology's canon) (2009). In this article, I do not claim to capture the nuances of variable experience by underrepresented groups—most of them certainly involve structural processes of exclusion and stratification in terms of access to the stages upon which theory is exchanged. However, insofar as desire is concerned, I have found little variation, that is, I have concluded that underrepresented scholars desire inclusion

and success in the gift exchange practices of academe no less than my white male interlocutors.

6. This is not to suggest that historical and sociological analyses of academic history are unimportant or irrelevant. William Clark's exposition on the development of modern research universities from their medieval European antecedents (2006), for example, is a painstakingly researched tome on academic history that sheds a fair bit of light on the origins of many current practices. However, I suggest merely that histories of the university, statistics on academic labor, and anecdotal academic news and blogs need to be supplemented with ethnographies of modern academic practice. It is high time we apply our anthropological theories to our anthropological practices, and there are some good examples of scholars doing just this. For example, Vered Amit's work, the "University as Panopticon" in Marilyn Strathern's edited collection, *Audit Cultures* (2000), is an important contribution about academic cultures, which succeeds admirably along these lines. While doing final edits to this article, an editor recommended that I read Tony Crook's epilogue on textual personhood (2007), which I found to be an absolutely excellent example of what I am advocating for here. Crook masterfully contrasts the personhood established by his Bolivip informants with the personhood enacted by publishing scholars: "the textual person intends to characterize both the person-like relationships of texts, and the textual-like relationships of anthropological persons" (219). I would argue that reflexive and thoughtful engagements with our habitus, such as those demonstrated by Amit and Crook, are critical to our growth as a discipline.

7. For an excellent ethnographic exposition of theory exchange in the classroom see Thorkelson (2010). Kathryn Graber's contribution to the same volume on graduate socialization in anthropology engages admirably with the ways that graduate students are socialized into citational practices in the classroom, as well as over beers with fellow students and through the replication of textual exemplars (2010).

8. Michael Chibnik's review essay explicates the new norm of "postFordist" academic labor—contingent faculty with little job security, low pay, and no benefits (2010). Adjuncts are expected to give theory to students in class but little else is usually expected. During my own short and painful stint as an adjunct lecturer, I made the mistake of applying to the college for funding for conference travel; my naiveté at the time is laughable in retrospect. I was summarily told that adjuncts were not eligible for these funds nor any research funds. As far as the institution was concerned, I was there only to teach not to produce my own scholarship. Many adjuncts resent this institutionalized exclusion, for while some feel that the exchanges in local spaces are satisfying enough, the lack of opportunity and implicit denigration can be vexing.

9. In fact, each AAA section has discretion over the sessions under their purview, and therefore the internal cultures and personalities of each section come to bear. Invited sessions generally have more recognized names on their session roster, and I have been told that a "graduate student panel" is unlikely to be accepted as an Invited Session in most sections. Also, some panel organizers look for participants and discussants with recognizable names to enhance the value of their panel. For more on name recognition, see later section of this paper.

10. Here I am including theory as an object as objects have been framed by "social life of things" by Appadurai and company (1986).

11. I invite the extension and application of David Graeber's theory of value (2001) to our theories writ large.

12. *Taonga* are valued Maori objects.

13. This volume has since been published (Boyer and Sangren 2006).

14. Reciprocity and citations are just one part of this realization—a careful study of "Acknowledgements" holds the key to a deeper understanding of academic generosity and gratitude. The debt that theory givers repay is not just expressed in their citations of previous theory givers, as it also emerges in the "Acknowledgements." For example, in the acknowledgements section of her book, *Discourses of the Vanishing*, Marilyn Ivy perceptively confronts the reciprocity inherent in publication: "Books incur debts, both for bibliophiles and for authors. That truism is even truer for books as long in the making as this one. The debts my book and I have incurred are owed not only to my family, but

to friends, colleagues, and teachers I have encountered. . . If indebtedness is the inevitable state of authorship, however, so is gratitude" (1995, ix). Nancy Munn's acknowledgements for *The Fame of Gawa* are similarly punctuated with exclamations of incurred debts (1986). While authors are quick to thanks predecessors, informants, and mentors, in the end, authors are usually careful to state that they alone are responsible for their work. By making that final gesture of responsible, authors position themselves as the sole receiver of citation *hau* comes later.

15. To what extent do subfields in anthropology fundamentally alter the equation? Are various disciplines so really so vastly different, or would exchangers of queer theory or STEM theories recognize the patterns that hold sway for most cultural anthropologists? Is kinship and social affiliation more important than I've acknowledged here (that is do we make a concerted effort to cite our mentors and friends)? (Perhaps I ought to have drawn on kinship theory to trace how academic lineages and genealogies affect the histories of theory exchanges.)

16. According to a French scholar who knew Pierre Bourdieu personally, even Bourdieu, though he was one of the most famous, oft-cited scholars of his generation, vocalized his anxiety to friends (especially as he faced the end of his life) that in some essential way he had failed to communicate his theories fully to others. During our interview this French colleague of Bourdieu's told me that toward the end of his life Bourdieu was vocally anxious that his theoretical contributions would not have the longevity (or produce the effects) that he had hoped for.

References Cited

Amit, Vered.
2000 The University as Panopticon. *In* Audit Cultures. Marilyn Strathern, ed. New York: Routledge.

Appadurai, Arjun, ed.
1986 The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun
1996 Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions on Globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baudrillard, Jean
1994 Simulacra and Simulation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

BBC News
2004 Deconstruction Icon Derrida Dies. www.bbc.com, accessed October 9.

Becker, Ernst
1973 The Denial of Death. New York: The Free Press.

Berger, Anne
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida. Ithaca, NY.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1988 Homo Academicus. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Boyer, Dominic
2001 Foucault in the Bush: The Social Life of Post-Structuralist Theory in East Berlin's Prenzlauer Berg. Ethnos 66:207–236.
2003 The Medium of Foucault in Anthropology. The Minnesota Review Fall: 265–272.

Boyer, Dominic, and Steven Sangren, ed.
2006 Special Issue: For a Critique of Pure Culture: In Honour of Terry Turner. Critique of Anthropology March: 26(1).

Brenneis, Donald
1999 New Lexicon, Old Language: Negotiating the "Global" at the National Science Foundation. *In* Critical Anthropology Now: Unexpected Contexts, Shifting Constituencies, Changing Agendas. George Marcus, ed. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Brent, T. David
1999 Merchants in the Temple of Scholarship: American University Press Publishing at Century's End. *In* Critical Anthropology Now: Unexpected Contexts, Shifting Constituencies, Changing Agendas. George Marcus, ed. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
Butler, Judith
1993 Bodies the Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex." London: Routledge.
Chibnik, Michael
2010 Flexible Labor in Academia and Testing Companies. Anthropology of Work Review 31(2):94–99.
Clark, William
2006 Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Crook, Tony
2007 Anthropological Knowledge, Secrecy, and Bolivip, Papua New Guinea: Exchanging Skin. New York: Oxford University Press.
Culler, Jonathan
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida. Ithaca, NY.
Derrida, Jacques
1993 Given Time I: Counterfeit Money. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1995 The Gift of Death. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2002 Acts of Religion. New York: Routledge.
Falcone, Jessica
2010 A Meditation on Meditation: The Horizons of Meditative Thinking in Tibetan Monasticism and American Anthropology. Michigan Discussions in Anthropology. 18(1):402–441.
Faubion, James and George Marcus, ed.
2009 Fieldwork is not what it used to be: learning anthropology's method in a time of transition. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Faure, Bernard
2004 Double Exposure: Cutting Across Buddhist and Western Discourses. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Fordham, Signithia
2009 Write-ous Indignation: Black Girls, Dilemmas of Cultural Domination and the Struggle to Speak the Skin We Are In. *In* Anthropology off the Shelf: Anthropologists on Writing. Alisse Waterston and Maria Vesperi, ed. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
Foucault, Michel
1978 The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction. New York: Pantheon.
Geertz, Clifford
2000 Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gilgen, Peter
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida. Ithaca, NY.
Godelier, Maurice
1999 The Enigma of the Gift. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Graber, Kathryn
2010 "Personal Communication, 2006": Authorship and Ownership in Anthropology. Michigan Developments in Anthropology 18(1):174–208.
Graeber, David
2001 Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: the False Coin of our Own Dreams. New York, NY: Palgrave.
Grim Feinberg, Joseph
2010 Academic Grants Foster Waste and Antagonism, Not Scholarship. Chronicle of Higher Education. www.chronicle.com, accessed on January 25, 2013.

Hutson, Scott R.
2002 Gendered Citation Practices in American Antiquity and Other Archaeology Journals. American Antiquity 67(2):331–342.
Ivy, Marilyn
1995 Discourses of the Vanishing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Kandell, J.
2004 Jacques Derrida, Abstruse Theorist, Dies in Paris at 74. The New York Times, October 10.
Laidlaw, James
2000 A Free Gift Makes No Friends. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 6:617–634.
Larson, Magali S.
1977 The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lewis, Philip
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida, Ithaca, NY.
Lutz, Catherine
1990 The Erasure of Women's Writing in Sociocultural Anthropology. American Ethnologist 17(4):611–627.
Malinowski, Bronislaw
1984 Argonauts of the Western Pacific. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
1989 A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Marcus, George, ed.
1999 Critical Anthropology Now: Unexpected Contexts, Shifting Constituencies, Changing Agendas. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
Mauss, Marcel
2000 The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies. New York: W.W.Norton.
McClaurin, Irma
2009 Walking in Zora's Soes or "Seek[ing] Out de Inside Meanin' of Words": the Intersections of Anthropology, Ethnography, Identity and Writing, *in* Anthropology off the Shelf: Anthropologists on Writing. Alisse Waterston and Maria Vesperi, ed. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
McElhinny, Bonnie, et al.
2003 Gender, Publication and Citation in Sociolinguistics and Linguistic Anthropology: The Construction of a scholarly Canon. Language in Society 32(3):299–328.
Munn, Nancy
1986 The Fame of Gawa: A Symbolic Study of Value in a Massim Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1990a Gawan Kula: Spatio-Temporal Control and Symbolism of Influence. *In* The Kula: New Perspectives on Massim Exchange. J. W. Leach and E. R. Leach, eds. Pp. 277–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1990b Constructing Regional Worlds in Experience: Kula Exchange, Witchcraft and Gawan Local Events. Man 25:1–17.
Onion, *The*
2004 Jacques Derrida "Dies." www.theonion.com, accessed October 20.
Saccamano, Neil
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida. Ithaca, NY.
Sahlins, Marshall
1963 Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia. Comparative Studies in Society and History 5(3):285–303.
Sahlins, Marshall
1972 Stone Age Economics. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
Sangren, Steven
2004 Fraught with Implications: Turner's Back Burner. Unpublished Conference Proceedings: Critique of Pure Culture, Ithaca, NY.

Schneider, David M
1968 American Kinship: A Cultural Account. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
Siegel, James T.
2004 Derrida Memorial: Remembering Jacques Derrida. Ithaca, NY.
Thorkelson, Eli
2010 The Limits of Theory: Idealism, Distinction, and Critical Pedagogy in Chicago Anthropology. Michigan Discussions in Anthropology 18(1):324–377.
Turner, Terence
2004 Final Remarks. Unpublished Conference Proceedings: Critique of Pure Culture, Ithaca, NY.
Wagner, Roy
1967 The Curse of Souw: Principles of the Daribi Clan Definition and Alliance in New Guinea. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Weiner, Annette
1985 Inalienable Wealth. American Ethnologist 12:210–227.
1992 Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping while Giving. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Williams, Jeffrey J.
2001 Name Recognition. Minnesota Review 52(4):185–208.