



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Ceremonial Economics: A General Review

Aras YOLUSEVER¹ 

ABSTRACT

Ceremonial economics explores how traditional values, myths, and rituals intersect with economic practices and institutions. It differentiates between "ceremonial" practices based on tradition and cultural values and "instrumental" practices based on efficiency and problem-solving capabilities. This field, rooted in institutional economics, emphasizes the tension between preserving established social orders and fostering innovation. Scholars can gain insights into the broader implications of economic systems by understanding how ceremonial practices influence economic behavior and social cohesion. This pluralistic approach comprehensively analyzes how ceremonial and instrumental practices interact within various economic systems. The main goal of this study is to develop a detailed and all-encompassing framework for ceremonial economics. A key aspect of this will involve comparing ceremonial economics principles with institutional economics. Additionally, the study will delve into various aspects of ceremonial economics, specifically focusing on cultural and social aspects. Furthermore, the study conducts four examples to provide practical insights into the application of ceremonial economics.

Keywords: Ceremonial Economics, Institutional Economics, Rituals, Economic Practices

JEL Classification: Z0, P5, B5



DOI: 10.26650/ISTJECON2024-1528805

¹Res. Asst. Dr., Istanbul Kultur University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Economics, Istanbul, Türkiye

ORCID: A.Y. 0000-0001-9810-2571

Corresponding author:

Aras YOLUSEVER,
Istanbul Kultur University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Economics, Istanbul, Türkiye
E-mail: ayolusever@iku.edu.tr

Submitted: 06.08.2024

Revision Requested: 14.11.2024

Last Revision Received: 18.11.2024

Accepted: 10.12.2024

Citation: Yolusever, A. (2024). Ceremonial economics: A general review. *Istanbul İktisat Dergisi - Istanbul Journal of Economics* 74(2), 551-591.

<https://doi.org/10.26650/ISTJECON2024-1528805>

Introduction

Ceremonial economics is a specialized field examining the intersection of traditional cultural norms, myths, and rituals with economic activities and institutions. This area of study distinguishes between "ceremonial" practices, which are rooted in tradition and cultural values, and "instrumental" practices which are justified by their effectiveness and problem-solving capabilities (Ziegler, 2017). Institutional economics examines the delicate balance between maintaining existing social structures and encouraging innovation. By delving into the impact of ceremonial practices on economic behavior and social unity, scholars can obtain valuable insights into the larger consequences of different economic systems.



The field of ceremonial economics is highly interdisciplinary, drawing insights from diverse academic disciplines such as economic sociology, anthropology, political science, and cognitive sciences. Scholars in this field employ various methodologies, including laboratory experiments, formal modelling, and social network analysis, to explore and understand the broader social impacts of economic and ceremonial exchanges. Through their research, they shed light on how these exchanges shape and influence larger social structures and interactions (Smith & Lobo, 2019). This comprehensive approach allows for a detailed analysis of the interconnectedness of ceremonial and instrumental practices within diverse economic frameworks.

Ceremonial economics encompasses various traditional practices that are central to the economic and social structures of many indigenous communities. One prominent example is the potlatch ceremony, which has been integral to the traditions of Indigenous peoples in the Pacific Northwest (Beck, 1993). The potlatch is a complex socio-economic event that involves the redistribution of wealth and resources, often through the hosting of a lavish feast and the gifting of valuable items. It serves as a means of reinforcing social hierarchies, solidifying relationships, and maintaining social cohesion within the community.

Beyond the potlatch, rituals play a vital role in the economic and social fabric of these communities. These rituals are not merely symbolic but are essential for maintaining the balance of power, reaffirming community bonds, and preserving cultural traditions. By examining these ceremonial practices, we gain valuable insight into the intricate interplay between economics, social dynamics, and cultural identity within these indigenous societies (Dimmelmeier & Heussner, 2018).

Polanyi's (1968; 2000) concept of the embedded economy is particularly relevant in this context. He posited that in non-market societies, the notion of pure economic institutions, as defined by formal economic models, does not hold. Instead, economic activities, exemplified by "provisioning," are intricately intertwined with and embedded within non-economic institutions such as kinship,

religion, and political structures. This interdependence highlights the complexity of economic interactions in these societies, which cannot be fully understood through a purely economic lens. The relationship between this idea and the ceremonial economy will be discussed in the first chapter.

Archaeological research and in-depth historical analyses consistently demonstrate the significant impact of large-scale feasting and gift-giving practices on ancient economies. These findings highlight the complex interplay between ritualistic traditions and economic systems across diverse cultural and historical settings.

The field of ceremonial economics addresses a diverse array of current issues, exploring topics such as the impact of government interventions on Indigenous cultural practices and the wider societal effects of market-based transactions. Detailed analyses in this area explore the intricate relationship between economic efficiency and the preservation of cultural values, providing insights into the lasting relevance of ceremonial economics in understanding historical and contemporary economic dynamics.

The primary objective of this study is to create an intricate and comprehensive framework for ceremonial economics. A crucial element of this endeavor will be a thorough comparison of ceremonial economics principles with those of institutional economics. Moreover, the study will explore the diverse facets of ceremonial economics, placing specific emphasis on its cultural and social implications. In addition, the study undertakes three detailed case studies as a means to offer practical insights into the real-world application of ceremonial economics.

The initial segment of this study will delve into the theoretical frameworks underpinning ceremonial economics, exploring its cultural and social dimensions. The subsequent section will concentrate on an analysis of ceremonial practices, incorporating historical examples of these concepts. Additionally, this part will address other fields related to ceremonial economics. Finally, the last section will present a critical evaluation and debates of the field.

1. Theoretical Framework

Ceremonial economics is a field of study that delves into the complex interplay between ceremonial and instrumental practices within economic institutions. Ceremonial practices are rooted in tradition, values, and myths, and they often play a significant role in shaping economic behavior and decision-making. On the other hand, instrumental practices are driven by the need to solve specific economic problems and challenges. This dynamic interaction between tradition-based ceremonial practices and problem-solving instrumental practices shapes the functioning of economic institutions and the broader economic system (Ziegler, 2017).

The works of Thorstein Veblen (1899) and Clarence Ayres (1927 and 1962) within the framework of Original Institutional Economics have highlighted the significant role of science, education, and expertise in shaping social institutions. However, there remains a need for a deeper exploration of how institutionalists contribute to our comprehension of the development of knowledge, the evolution of scientific practices, and the influence of institutional structures on these processes. This section aims to address this gap by focusing on the ceremonial aspects of science, higher education, and expertise offered by institutionalist interpretations. These are considered important pillars within the political economy of knowledge and the formation of truths.

Veblen's *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) marks the inception of original institutionalism. It delves into a thorough analysis of the norms and conduct of the affluent industrial elite of the late nineteenth century, commonly referred to as the "leisure class." Veblen meticulously illustrates how processes of differentiation, elitism, and status unfold within capitalist industrialist societies, shaping the behavior of the leisure class through pecuniary emulation, conspicuous leisure, and consumption, all aimed at maintaining and perpetuating their elevated status. Furthermore, Veblen accentuates the significance of preserving archaic traits to uphold existing hierarchies, discrimination, symbolisms, and rituals, all of which contribute to the power dynamics of the leisure class.

The 19th-century rise of the leisure class was deeply influenced by the societal changes stemming from the industrial revolution. The industrial revolution significantly shaped the behaviors, consumer habits, and mindsets of this emerging social group. Their privileged position in society was maintained through traditional "ceremonial" practices, which played a pivotal role in differentiating and strengthening their elevated social status. According to Veblen, the simultaneous existence of these age-old ceremonial practices and the new values embraced by the leisure class is essential for comprehending the complex transformations within modern institutions (Böck & Almeida, 2018).

As mentioned in the introduction, Polanyi (1968 and 2000) claimed that in non-capitalist, pre-industrial economies, livelihoods are not derived from market exchanges but rather from the principles of redistribution and reciprocity. Reciprocity involves the mutual exchange of goods or services within long-term relationships. Redistribution indicates a strong political, such as kinship-based leadership, which collects and then reallocates subsistence goods according to culturally specific guidelines. In such contexts, economic decision-making is influenced not only by individual choices but also by social relationships, cultural values, moral considerations, politics, religion, and the potential for authoritarian leadership.

The distinction between types of economies can be elucidated through the concept of "embeddedness", which emphasizes the integration of economic activities—specifically provisioning processes—within broader social institutions. In non-market economies, for instance, kinship ties play a crucial role, illustrating that economic activity is not an isolated domain but rather intertwined with various economic and non-economic institutions. Consequently, exchange mechanisms are situated within a societal context, regulated by social norms and structures rather than occurring within a social vacuum. Additionally, institutions such as religion and the government exert influence on economic dynamics, demonstrating that socio-cultural obligations, norms, and values are pivotal in shaping individuals' livelihood strategies (Polanyi, 1968 and 2000).

Therefore, any analysis of economics that attempts to treat it as an isolated discipline, separate from its socio-cultural and political contexts, is fundamentally flawed. A comprehensive examination of economics should prioritize the study of the various social institutions that underpin people's livelihoods. The market is merely one of many institutions that influence economic transactions. In this regard, Polanyi's concept of the embedded economy aligns closely with the principles of the ceremonial economy. The ceremonial perspective also emphasizes the importance of rituals, religious beliefs, sociocultural structures, and the dynamics of vertical, horizontal, and diagonal learning processes. Understanding these elements is essential to fully grasping individuals' economic and social behaviors.

It is important to include Bugra's (1995) interpretation of Aristotle and Polanyi in this discussion. When we define economics as the science that studies the distribution of scarce resources among various uses to meet unlimited needs—following the formalist definition of economics as understood today—it becomes clear that Aristotle did not actually contribute to economics in this sense (Bugra, 1995).

Polanyi, who systematically tackled this topic, authored an article titled "Aristotle Discovers Economics" (1957) and established a theoretical framework that could assist in resolving the debate regarding Aristotle's influence on economics. A key component of this framework is the distinction between two definitions of economics: the "substantivist" definition and the "formalist" definition. Polanyi posits that among the various definitions of the economy, the essentialist perspective holds universal applicability. This definition characterizes the economy as a process mediated by human interactions with the environment. In all societal frameworks, barring market-driven contexts, this economic order is intricately woven into the social fabric, allowing for flexibility in alignment with non-economic objectives and values (Bugra, 1995). The basic components of ceremonial economics also confirm Bugra's interpretation.

Ayres (1962) introduced the concept of a ceremonial-instrumental (C-I) dichotomy in the social realm, expanding on Veblen's original theory regarding

the values and patterns maintained by institutions. Ayres conceptualized institutions as functional categories that encompass various forms of social organization and behavior (Waller, 1982). Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the C-I dichotomy is essential for grasping the emergence and development of institutions as integral components of social change, along with the values, norms, and principles they embody throughout this progression.

In conclusion, we can highlight two main points. First, social activities encompass various symbolic, traditional, and ceremonial components that significantly influence and shape our behavior. These elements play a crucial role in normalizing power dynamics and legitimizing the control exercised by specific systems and groups over technological advancements. As noted by Junker (1982), these aspects have a profound impact on our societal structures and interactions. Ceremonial behavior can be seen as a mechanism through which power is exercised and maintained within a given society. It encompasses a range of behaviors and rituals that serve to control, normalize, and manipulate social dynamics, often resulting in unequal power structures. At its core, ceremonial behavior is a collection of ideas and principles that perpetuate inequality, oppression, imperialism, and hierarchies. These concepts materialize through decrees, emotional conditioning, sacred rituals, and the establishment of a status system, ultimately shaping and reinforcing the power dynamics within a given social context (Junker, 1982).

Second, the instrumental aspects of a concept involve technical, rational, and practical processes that entail the use of tools and a scientific approach to reasoning to solve problems (Mayhew, 2010). These processes are focused on utilizing knowledge to address specific social issues. Rather than simply associating instrumentalism with technological determinism and optimism, the instrumental concepts encompass linkages, connections, and patterns among tools, epistemic concepts, and methods that foster democratizing and liberating relationships within institutional settings. According to original institutionalists, these instrumental aspects, particularly technological innovation, drive institutional change (Tool, 2000).

It is important to consider that practical aspects within the C-I division may be transformed or “encapsulated” by ceremonial elements, potentially altering their original meaning and purpose. This encapsulation would involve integrating new technologies, methodologies, and behaviors into established institutions while ensuring that the ceremonial values remain relatively unchanging, possibly even regressive, despite the influence of new technology on processes and efficiency (Papadopoulos, 2015). The presence of both instrumental and ceremonial elements does not necessarily prevent the use of instrumental components to control, influence, or exploit individuals who are involved in or influenced by ceremonial values.

Ayres’s C-I dichotomy offers a valuable analytical framework for examining social institutions and their processes. This framework provides tools for evaluating the potential for institutional change. When applied to universities, we observe that ceremonial values maintain exclusive privileges, hierarchical structures, and unequal treatment in research and education. In contrast, instrumental values support efficient operations that contribute to social progress, promote inclusive academic and teaching practices, and ensure equal access for all. These values also foster epistemic democracy and encourage pluralism.

The modern university has long been pivotal in the creation and spread of knowledge and the development of expertise. It holds significant authority in establishing accepted truths within the scientific community. According to Arnoldi (2007), expertise is the result of a complex social process influenced by changes in public recognition and social dynamics, deeply rooted in hierarchical structures, differentiation, and status. Veblen (1918) emphasizes that even as universities become more commercialized, the ceremonial aspects and prestige associated with academic practices remain essential to university life and activities. In particular, the speed, form and method of dissemination of information continue to be directed by ceremonial practices. This evolution has coincided with the expansion of vocational training, profit-focused pursuits, and administrative changes within academic careers, while upholding the traditional elements of elitism and prestige.

The concept of the C-I dichotomy offers valuable insight into the process of institutional change and the necessary steps to modify the behavior of specific social structures. When we consider the formal higher education system and the role of experts, the theories proposed by Veblen and Ayres underscore the ceremonial aspects evident in practices and power dynamics, which are further reinforced by the incorporation of business values into universities. It is evident that technological advancements will be pivotal in reshaping the hierarchical foundations of higher education and the societal role of intellectuals. However, the specific mechanisms, circumstances, and implications of these changes remain unanswered. A thorough examination of ceremonial practices and cultures is crucial for understanding the institutional factors driving change, but it is equally important to comprehend the “meso” level, specifically how academics are interconnected and situated within disciplinary and university structures.

In short, institutional economics clearly distinguishes between two types of justifications for institutions. The first type, “instrumental practice,” views institutions as mechanisms designed to address specific problems or challenges within a society or an organization. On the other hand, “ceremonial justifications” are based on traditional values, customs, or myths. Relying on ceremonial justifications can result in “ceremonial encapsulation,” a situation in which economic progress is hindered as innovative activities are diverted away from their most socially beneficial uses. In other words, this situation may lead to inefficiency in resource allocation, that is, moving away from the Pareto optimum. This diversion can ultimately impede overall economic growth and development.

Furthermore, institutional economics employs a theoretical framework that incorporates “concessive holism”. This method entails the analysis with one or a few pertinent institutions to elucidate the event and subsequently construct an explanatory framework based on these initial references. This approach diverges from traditional institutionalism, which primarily emphasizes individual behavior and property rights. In contrast, original institutional economists may regard the state, legal systems, or other prominent institutions as the foundational elements for their analysis.

1.1. Cultural and Social Aspects

The practice of rituals and festive events is deeply ingrained in the fabric of human culture. They serve as poignant reminders to a community of its shared beliefs and history, often occurring at specific times and locations. While some rituals are reserved for specific members, such as initiation rites and burial ceremonies, there are also public events that hold significance for the entire society. These include joyful celebrations like carnivals and New Year's festivities, which serve as communal markers for events like the onset of spring and the culmination of the harvest season (Wu, 2018).

Social practices, rituals, and festive events take on various forms such as worship rites, rites of passage, birth, wedding and funeral rituals, oaths of allegiance, traditional legal systems, traditional games and sports, kinship and ritual kinship ceremonies, settlement patterns, culinary traditions, and seasonal ceremonies. In addition, they involve several expressions and physical elements, including special gestures and words, recitations, songs or dances, special clothing, processions, animal sacrifices, and specific foods.

The customs and gatherings referenced are recurring rituals that play a pivotal role in shaping the daily lives of communities and social groups, holding great significance for many of their members. They serve as a powerful means of reinforcing the individual and collective identities of participants, whether enacted within public or private spheres. These rituals are deeply intertwined with momentous occasions such as the changing of seasons, crucial agricultural events, or pivotal milestones in the lives of individuals. They are intricately bound up with a community's traditions, collective memory, and social fabric.

The spectrum of rituals and festive events encompasses a wide variety of small intimate gatherings as well as large-scale social celebrations and commemorations. Each sub-domain displays its own unique diversity, yet there is a significant amount of overlap among them. These traditions are influenced

by contemporary societal changes, including factors such as migration, individualization, formal education, the impact of religions with most followers, and the effects of globalization. These changes can have a profound impact on these practices, as they rely heavily on broad community participation. The phenomenon of migration, especially among young people, can result in practitioners leaving their communities and potentially endangering certain cultural practices. Nonetheless, social practices, rituals, and festive events often serve as opportunities for individuals to return home, celebrate with their families and communities, and reaffirm their identity and connection to their community's traditions.

Social practices are integral elements that significantly influence and shape the fabric of everyday life within a community. These practices are deeply ingrained and are recognized by all members, even if not everyone actively participates in them. They serve as a means to uphold and reinforce the community's identity and link it to its history. Take, for instance, the act of greeting. This can range from simple, informal gestures to elaborate and ritualistic ceremonies, each serving as a unique marker of the community's distinct identity. Similarly, the exchange of gifts within the community spans a spectrum, from casual and spontaneous occasions to meticulously planned and formal events that hold significant political, economic, and social symbolism.

Lastly, anthropologists commonly agree that the essential characteristic of ritual is its symbolic nature. For example, Firth (1968) defines ritual as "a form of organized conduct intended to affect human events, primarily symbolically and with an intangible referent, generally sanctioned by society.

There are also historical examples of the ceremonial economy, of which the theoretical infrastructure and cultural and social aspects are discussed. Analyzing these instances will yield valuable insights into the ceremonial economy and its associated practices from both theoretical and empirical perspectives. Therefore, it is crucial to accurately assess historical examples. The subsequent section delves into a discussion of historical examples and their relevant contexts.

2. Historical Examples and Related Fields

In this section, we'll start with the main historical examples. Then we'll analyze the related fields with ceremonial economics. Thus, the evolution of the ceremonial economy and its application across different historical periods will be explored, revealing the changes and the various areas in which it has been used from the past to the present.

2.1. Historical Examples

The first case study is named the Potlatch Ceremony. The potlatch ceremony is a traditional practice among Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest Coast of Canada and the United States. This is a significant example of ceremonial economics, where a gift-giving feast plays a central role in the community's social, political, and economic structure. Among cultures such as the Heiltsuk, Haida, Nuxalk, Tlingit, Makah, Tsimshian, Nuu-chah-nulth, Kwakwaka'wakw, and Coast Salish, the potlatch ceremony serves as the primary governmental institution and legislative body. This ceremonial event is deeply rooted in the cultural fabric of these Indigenous societies, emphasizing social connections and redistributing wealth within the community (Benson, 2009).

During a potlatch, which was a significant social and ceremonial event among the indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest, wealthy chiefs and other elite members of the community would gather to distribute food, resources, and gifts such as blankets and fish to less fortunate members. This act of generosity was not only a display of wealth and status but also served to strengthen social ties and reaffirm the hierarchical structure within the community. The lavishness of the gifts and the generosity of the hosts during the potlatch were crucial in earning prestige and reinforcing the social status of the hosts and their families (Beck, 1993).

The potlatch ceremony is a deeply meaningful and symbolic event steeped in ritual and tradition. It serves as a profound expression of cultural values, social status, and the deep bonds within the community. These ceremonies hold a

significance that goes beyond simple celebrations; they play a vital role in shaping the social fabric of the community. Through the potlatch, wealth is redistributed, and social hierarchies are reaffirmed, ensuring the maintenance of balance and harmony within the community. Karl Polanyi (1957) articulated this redistribution as a crucial mechanism for economic integration, linking individuals within a group to broader social aggregates, whether that be familial units, local communities, nations, or larger entities. In contemporary welfare states, wealth is primarily redistributed through taxation processes. This redistribution framework typically involves a centralized authority—such as a tribal chief or feudal lord—who oversees the accumulation from trade and production, subsequently reallocating resources to the society's members. Despite legal prohibitions, the potlatch, a ceremonial feast practiced by the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest, has persisted as a meaningful and integral cultural tradition.

The system of ceremonial exchange and redistribution was also prevalent in Melanesia. This ritualistic form of exchange fulfilled various critical functions, which can be broadly categorized as economic, both at the communal and individual levels. At the community level, it operated as a vital mechanism incentivizing migrants to repatriate their resources to Ponam Island, thereby contributing to the overall economic stability of society. On an individual level, the exchange facilitated two primary outcomes (Carrier & Carrier, 1991). Initially, the focus was on how residents could share the wealth sent back to the island by migrants. Additionally, there was a framework through which individuals could establish social credit, settle social debts, and foster the cooperation essential for life on Ponam Island. For migrants, this collaboration allowed them to preserve their social identity and claim their lineage property. Conversely, for residents, it enabled them to rely on their kin for assistance, particularly in terms of labor, when required (Carrier & Carrier, 1991).

The second example is the classic Maya Civilization. The Maya society exhibited a complex hierarchical structure, characterized by a ruling elite whose political authority was frequently reinforced through sophisticated ritual practices. These rituals encompassed a range of activities, including offerings, mortuary

rites, and public ceremonies, which served dual purposes: they not only legitimized the socio-political status of the elite but also functioned as mechanisms of economic exchange that reinforced kinship networks and social obligations within the community. (Saber & Mazouz, 2015).

Ritual offerings were typically performed by the ruling elite in conjunction with monumental architecture, such as pyramids and temples, where these ceremonies were vividly illustrated in art and inscriptions. These ceremonial centers evolved into venues for showcasing wealth and redistributing resources, thereby reinforcing the authority of rulers as intermediaries between the divine and mortal realms (Houston & Stuart, 1996). By orchestrating these rituals in prominent, communal spaces, the ruling elite could publicly assert their divine legitimacy and cultivate support from the populace, fostering a reciprocal relationship of loyalty and protection.

A salient illustration of ceremonial economics in the Maya civilization can be observed in the tradition of ancestor veneration practiced within kin-based units, referred to as "houses." According to Ringle and Bey (2012), these "houses" constituted the foundational elements of social identity and political organization. The deceased were typically buried alongside a range of offerings, including pottery, jade ornaments, and intricately carved stelae that often portrayed the deceased with divine attributes, thereby signifying the family's prestigious lineage. These rituals played a crucial role in reinforcing social hierarchies and status across generations. Through such practices of ancestor veneration, the Maya effectively reaffirmed the link between contemporary ruling elites and their eminent predecessors, thereby ensuring the continuity of political authority and the economic dominion over vital resources (Ringle & Bey, 2012).

Moreover, the economic resources devoted to these rituals were substantial. The creation of jade ornaments, intricate pottery, and large-scale stelae required skilled artisans and a significant investment in materials, which in turn invigorated the local economy. Mary Miller and Karl Taube (1993) emphasize that these items transcended mere offerings to the gods; they represented strategic investments in

social capital. By commissioning artisans and redistributing gifts, the elites could strengthen their social networks, reward loyalty, and showcase their ability to effectively marshal resources.

The ceremonial economy of the Maya also played a crucial role in wealth redistribution, particularly during significant events such as the dedication of new temples or the celebration of important calendar dates. During these occasions, food, beverages, and other goods were distributed to the participants, creating a cycle of wealth and resource exchange that promoted social cohesion. This ritual economy shares similarities with the potlatch ceremonies of the Pacific Northwest, where the act of giving away wealth elevated the prestige of the giver and strengthened community bonds (Marcus, 1992).

In sum, the Classic Maya civilization exemplifies the intricate interplay between ceremonial practices and socio-economic frameworks. Through highly structured rituals and public spectacles of piety, the ruling elite could consolidate authority, regulate the distribution of resources, and foster social cohesion. This case study illustrates that ceremonial acts fulfilled religious imperatives and served critical economic functions; they effectively integrated the spiritual and material realms, reinforcing social hierarchies and kinship affiliations in a complex societal context.

One another is the Kula Ring. The Kula ring is an established ceremonial exchange system practiced by the Trobriand Islanders, who reside in the Milne Bay Province of Papua New Guinea. This intricate trading network involves the exchange of seemingly insignificant items, which are highly valued for their ability to bolster social status, affirm political authority, and carry ceremonial significance, rather than for their practical utility. Initially brought to the attention of the Western world by the renowned anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski (1920), the Kula ring serves as a compelling demonstration of the concept that economies can be built upon reciprocal exchange, in contrast to monetary-based transactions. A striking feature of the Kula ring is the willingness of participants to undertake perilous voyages to deliver these items, underscoring the profound cultural importance of this intricate exchange system (Irwin & Shaw & Mcalister, 2019).

The Kula Ring represents a complex system of ceremonial exchange centered around two distinct categories of shell valuables: *soulava* (red shell necklaces) and *mwali* (white shell armbands). These artefacts are exchanged along a defined network of islands in the Massim Archipelago, traversing distances that encompass hundreds of miles and engaging multiple island communities. The circulation of *soulava* follows a clockwise direction, while *mwali* moves counterclockwise, creating a dynamic flow of these valuables as they are exchanged among partners in a sustained rotational circuit. Crucially, neither type of object has a permanent owner; instead, they are in constant motion, facilitating not only the exchange of goods but also the transmission of cultural narratives and social status. As each item transitions from one individual to another, it accrues historical significance and narrative layers, reinforcing the social fabric of the participating communities (Malinowski, 1922). This ongoing process exemplifies the intricate interplay between material culture and social relationships within these island networks.

The Kula exchange is significant because it does not rely on the traditional concepts of economic value or the accumulation of material wealth. Instead, the Kula is based on the symbolic and relational significance of the objects that are exchanged. Each participant in the Kula Ring gains prestige not from permanently owning these objects but from temporarily holding them and then passing them on. This process of exchange fosters complex social bonds and alliances among participants. As Malinowski noted, the Kula Ring is a system that “links men in lasting partnership, based on mutual duties of help and hospitality, loyalty, and respect” (Malinowski, 1922).

One of the distinctive features of the Kula Ring is that the exchange of *soulava* and *mwali* is not conducted in isolation; it is accompanied by acts of hospitality, feasting, and the exchange of various other goods. Although the Kula items themselves are not “used” for practical purposes, the act of exchange fosters a network of obligations and reciprocity. When an individual receives an item within the Kula Ring, there is an implicit expectation to reciprocate with a similar item later. This establishes a continuous cycle of exchange that can persist across generations. Such mutual obligations enhance inter-island relations, as the Kula

partners depend on each other for trade, support, and even military alliances during times of conflict (Malinowski, 1922).

Malinowski's research elucidates that the Kula Ring operates not merely as a system of economic exchange but also as a vital mechanism for establishing social stratification and status within the Trobriand society. Prominent figures, such as village chiefs and elders, typically exert control over the more prestigious Kula items, thereby solidifying their elevated social standing. Participation in the Kula Ring is predominantly restricted to men, with the acquisition, exhibition, and exchange of Kula artifacts serving as indicators of prestige and expertise. Successful Kula transactions are reflective of the individual's reputation, adherence to established protocols, and adeptness in managing the intricate relational dynamics characteristic of this exchange system. Furthermore, the valuation of Kula objects is profoundly linked to their ceremonial origin and the social prestige of the parties engaged in their exchange (Weiner, 1983).

Moreover, The Kula Ring exemplifies what anthropologists classify as "reciprocal economics," or Ceremonial Economics, highlighting the role of economic exchanges in fulfilling social and symbolic functions that transcend mere material gain. Engagement in the Kula facilitates the reaffirmation of social bonds and the creation of extensive networks of influence that reach beyond local confines. Malinowski characterized this system as "an institution sui generis," encapsulating a complex interplay of economic, social, and spiritual elements. This challenges the conventional Western economic paradigms, which prioritize market-driven exchange and profit maximization (Malinowski, 1922).

This institution exemplifies how non-material exchanges can foster social cohesion and stability. For instance, the Trobriand Islanders' engagement in the Kula Ring helps to alleviate conflicts between different islands, as participants are bound by mutual respect and obligations of reciprocity. Through these ceremonial exchanges, the Kula Ring not only maintains peaceful relations but also serves as a form of social insurance and conflict resolution, becoming deeply embedded in the cultural fabric of their society (Sahlins, 1972).

In summary, The Kula Ring exemplifies how ceremonial and symbolic systems of exchange can underpin social and economic relationships with equal effectiveness as monetary systems. Malinowski's observations have significantly shaped subsequent anthropological and economic discourse, encouraging an in-depth exploration of exchange mechanisms that emphasize social and cultural capital rather than merely material wealth. This framework challenges conventional economic paradigms and highlights the importance of relational dynamics in the understanding of exchange processes.

The Sikret Fren ritual is another significant example of a gift exchange tradition practiced by members of the Anglican Church of Gilbert Camp, an unauthorized settlement located on the fringes of Honiara in the Solomon Islands. The ritual involves the exchange of identical gifts between ritual friends and holds great cultural and socio-economic significance within the community. This practice is examined through the lens of Gregory's analytical differentiation between Gift and Commodity and is contextualized within the region's rich cultural, historical, geographical, and socio-economic framework. The Sikret Fren tradition highlights how urban and peri-urban settlers leverage their cultural innovations to navigate the ethical and economic hurdles stemming from the disparities between their values and material circumstances (Carlà & Gori, 2014).

In the Sikret Fren ritual, participants partake in a sophisticated system of reciprocal exchange, where the ceremonial significance of giving and receiving goods is meticulously regulated by cultural tradition. This practice mirrors other Melanesian societies that prioritize gift exchanges, serving as an ostensible demonstration of loyalty, respect, and allegiance among individuals and groups. Anthropologist Nancy Munn (1992), who has extensively examined similar Melanesian exchange systems, posits that rituals like Sikret Fren are fundamentally aimed at the creation and renewal of social alliances. Each participant is anticipated to reciprocate with a gift of equivalent or greater value later. This reciprocal act transcends mere economic transactions; it embodies a profound statement of honor and social interconnectedness.

The ritual encompasses a structured sequence of actions: goods are displayed, presented, and received, accompanied by traditional speeches and gestures that highlight the significance of social protocol. The practice of gift-giving within the Sikret Fren binds individuals and groups in relationships that are anticipated to endure over time, as each gift carries an obligation for eventual reciprocation. This engenders a cycle of exchange that reinforces communal bonds and fosters interdependence among participants, a phenomenon noted by Maurice Godelier (1999) in his studies of Melanesian exchange systems. Through this cyclical exchange, the Sikret Fren established a social safety net, weaving families and communities into a fabric of mutual support.

In Sikret Fren, the incorporation of objects imbued with ceremonial significance and distinct to the ritual landscape is pivotal. These artifacts, meticulously crafted with symbolic intricacies, accrue value through their repeated invocation in ritualistic contexts. As Strathern elucidates, these items are “ineluctably tied to the reputations and identities” of their exchangers, thereby reinforcing the social prestige of both the donor and recipient (Strathern, 1990). This phenomenon constitutes a symbolic economy that fosters a communal historical consciousness, as the trajectories of these objects—transitioning between individuals and groups—integrate into the collective memory of the community. This process mirrors the dynamics observed in the Kula Ring, as articulated by Malinowski (1922), where the exchange of storied items serves to enhance social connectivity and cultural continuity.

In this context, the Sikret Fren ritual embodies the fundamental principles of ceremonial economics, where the true “value” of objects lies not in their material characteristics but in the social relationships and obligations they represent. The process of exchange serves as a mechanism for sustaining societal cohesion and nurturing mutual obligations that extend across generations. Economic anthropologists argue that systems like Sikret Fren challenge Western conceptions of economics by highlighting economies that fundamentally revolve around relational ties, reciprocity, and symbolic wealth, rather than mere monetary or material gain (Sahlins, 1972).

In conclusion, the Sikret Fren ritual demonstrates how ceremonial exchanges play a crucial role in shaping social structure and identity. By understanding Sikret Fren through the lens of ceremonial economics, we can see that the rituals of gift-giving and reciprocity function as a means to establish alliances, assert prestige, and reinforce the interconnectedness of Melanesian organization. This perspective reveals that ceremonial economics transforms exchanges from simple transactions into meaningful traditions, embedding social values, historical continuity, and collective memory into the everyday lives of the community.

Although a historical concept, ceremonial economics and mercantilism, despite originating from distinct historical and cultural settings, both underscore the intricate relationship between economic practices and the prevailing social power dynamics, political ambitions, and symbolic manifestations of wealth. Ceremonial economics primarily examines how rituals and modes of exchange contribute to reinforcing hierarchies within smaller, often community-oriented societies. Conversely, mercantilism delineates a comparable paradigm at the macro level, where state-directed economic strategies are employed to enhance national power and prestige on both domestic and international fronts. The interplay between these economic systems illustrates the fundamental role of economic activity as a medium for articulating and solidifying power relations and status within various societal frameworks (Das, n. d.).

In ceremonial economics, economic exchanges play a vital role in consolidating social status, establishing alliances, and reinforcing hierarchical relationships. A prime example of this is the Kula Ring in Melanesian societies, which illustrates how economic activities can be inherently ceremonial. In such systems, wealth circulates through structured, reciprocal exchanges that embody power, respect, and social cohesion, rather than merely focusing on material accumulation (Malinowski, 1922). These transactions signify wealth as a means of strengthening social bonds and political alliances, where the symbolic value of the exchanged items often surpasses their practical utility. Likewise, mercantilism can be understood as a systematic approach that intertwines wealth with state power and national prestige. Advocates of mercantilism posited that the accumulation of wealth—particularly in the form of

bullion like gold and silver—was paramount to national strength. This philosophical framework led to the establishment of policies that prioritized export promotion, curtailed imports, and aimed to enhance a nation's resource base (Heckscher, 1937). Within this paradigm, wealth transcended mere accumulation; it served as a crucial indicator of a nation's status and influence on the global stage, akin to the role that ceremonial artifacts play in non-Western societies, where they symbolize authority and social capital within their respective contexts.

Both ceremonial economics and mercantilism underscore the ritualized use of wealth as a means of showcasing power. In ceremonial contexts, economic activities such as the potlatch ceremonies among the Indigenous communities of the Pacific Northwest involved the strategic giving and destruction of wealth to elevate social status and prestige within the community (Mauss, 1950). This approach to wealth, particularly through ceremonial display and redistribution, parallels mercantilist practices where European states accumulated and exhibited wealth through formidable navies, colonial acquisitions, and monopolistic trade networks. For instance, monopolistic entities like the British East India Company served as instruments of mercantilist policy, exemplifying the state's wealth and influence through ceremonial displays of economic power in colonized territories (Stern, 2012).

Ceremonial economics frequently employs redistribution as a strategy to enhance social cohesion. Systems of reciprocity and mutual obligation, evident in practices such as the potlatch or the Kula Ring, serve to bind communities together through gift-giving (Sahlins, 1972). This concept parallels the efforts of mercantilist states to establish economic dependencies and alliances via trade monopolies and colonial relationships, redistributing resources in ways that reinforced loyalty and dependence on the mother country. For instance, British mercantilist policies mandated that colonies trade exclusively with England, ensuring a steady flow of resources that contributed to British wealth while maintaining colonial reliance (Irwin, 1991).

In summary, ceremonial economics and mercantilism exemplify the interplay between economic systems and power dynamics, social stratification, and

communal integration, transcending mere individualistic profit motives. In these frameworks, wealth functions as a critical instrument for sustaining both social and political order at various levels, whether local or global. They underscore the dual symbolic and structural dimensions of wealth, illustrating how economic practices are pivotal in reinforcing social and national prestige. This is often achieved through organized, and at times ritualistic, exchanges that enhance both collective identity and cohesion within societies or states.

New Institutional Economics, the general framework developed in 1972 by American economists Harold Demsetz and Armen Alchian, is another example. It builds upon the ideas of Ronald Coase and incorporates them into mainstream economic thought. This school of thought places a strong emphasis on the practical application of economic theories to understand and influence real-world phenomena through the design of institutions, regulations, and policy interventions (Schneider, 2020).

One of the key distinguishing features of is its departure from the more traditional, mainstream approach to economic reforms. Rather than advocating for broad, sweeping changes, institutionalists argue for a case-by-case reform approach. They believe that this approach is more effective in promoting social and political intervention in the economy, ultimately leading to more broadly distributed social provisioning.

The influence of ceremonial economics can also be seen in the development of New Keynesian economics. In 1987, a British economist, Dixon, demonstrated that the fiscal multiplier, which measures the effects of government spending on the economy, could rise due to imperfect competition in the output market. Dixon's research highlighted the influence of government expenditure on consumer behavior and free time, indicating that economic policies should consider the practical consequences of market imperfections (Dixon, 1987).

In ceremonial economics, transactions are primarily motivated by social and cultural imperatives rather than purely economic rationality. For instance, in the

Kula Ring of the Trobriand Islanders, the exchanged goods fulfill significant symbolic roles, enhancing participants' social status and prestige rather than addressing basic material requirements (Malinowski, 1922). These items often accrue additional value rooted in their ceremonial relevance and the reputations of former possessors, which disrupt conventional market dynamics and alter "demand" in ways that diverge from standard economic competition (Weiner, 1983). This phenomenon of socially constructed value reinforces a framework where the exchange value of goods is predominantly informed by symbolic factors rather than conforming solely to the supply and demand principles characteristic of perfectly competitive markets.

Imperfect competition in output markets occurs when factors other than pure market forces influence price and output. These factors include brand loyalty, market power, and unique product attributes. For instance, monopolistic competition features firms that differentiate their products to minimize the substitutability of their goods, allowing them to exert some control over pricing (Chamberlin, 1933). This process of differentiation is similar to the ceremonial context in which goods are assigned a unique social and symbolic value, effectively limiting competition among them. In both scenarios, products are not completely interchangeable; they possess distinct attributes related to their reputation, history, or brand, making them more desirable and thereby reducing the competitive pressure to lower prices.

Ceremonial economics often encompasses the selective exchange of goods that serve to reinforce social hierarchies and confer status. A prime example of this is the potlatch ceremonies conducted by Indigenous groups in the Pacific Northwest, where the accumulation and distribution of wealth are strategic actions that assert social rank and establish a hierarchical structure among participants (Mauss, 1950). This ritualistic economic framework not only creates exclusivity but also mirrors the dynamics of monopolistic competition, where entities differentiate themselves through unique selling propositions to enhance their market position. In markets characterized by monopolistic competition, firms leverage brand identity, strategic advertising, and product quality

differentiation to cultivate customer loyalty, thereby mitigating direct substitutability and effectively limiting competitive pressures (Krugman, 1979). The symbolic and status-driven elements of ceremonial economics are similar to how companies in imperfectly competitive markets develop brand loyalty and exclusivity. By offering products or exchanges with distinct symbolic value, both ceremonial exchanges and firms in monopolistic competition establish exclusive niches that allow them to exert market power while avoiding complete competitive pressures.

In the realm of ceremonial economics, the valuation of exchanged goods is typically predetermined and influenced more by tradition and social constructs than by dynamic market-driven price fluctuations. This phenomenon mirrors the price rigidity observed in contexts of imperfect competition, where firms often maintain stable prices due to factors such as brand loyalty or the perceived intrinsic value of their offerings, notwithstanding changes in market conditions (Bain, 1956).

Within imperfect competition, price rigidity emerges primarily from consumers' allegiance to specific brands or firms, resulting in a scenario where prices do not necessarily fluctuate in direct response to alterations in supply or demand. Similarly, the ceremonial valuation of goods, which is fundamentally a socially constructed framework, enables a level of price stability contextually anchored in cultural significance. In a monopolistically competitive market, products can uphold consistent pricing as their perceived value is intrinsically linked to brand identity rather than purely to cost considerations or production variances.

In summary, both ceremonial economics and imperfect competition in output markets illustrate how non-material factors, such as social status, exclusivity, and symbolic value, influence economic interactions in ways that differ from pure competitive models. In both cases, economic exchanges involve more than just material utility; they serve as vehicles for social identity, prestige, and exclusivity. This dynamic diminishes the competitive pressures that typically drive prices

down in a perfectly competitive market. This perspective highlights the complex and socially embedded nature of both ceremonial exchanges and imperfectly competitive markets, where value is shaped as much by symbolic meaning and relational dynamics as by market forces.

2.2. Related Fields

Ceremonial economics intersects with several related fields, each contributing unique perspectives and methodologies. We will explore four of them: economic anthropology, cultural economics, public anthropology, and political economy.

Economic anthropology explores how economic activities are influenced by social and cultural contexts. This field transformed from a specialized area in the early 20th century into a distinct sub-discipline within social and cultural anthropology. N. S. B. Gras first used the term "economic anthropology" to describe a combination of anthropological and economic studies with a primary focus on how "primitive people obtained a living." (Gras, 1927).

Economic anthropology focuses on the economic processes of allocating resources to specific social environments. It frequently involves collaboration between economists and anthropologists. A core concept in economic anthropology is the idea of spheres of exchange, as introduced by Paul and Laura Bohannan. This concept categorizes exchange objects into separate, non-interchangeable spheres, such as subsistence, wealth, and prestige, and is related to ceremonial exchange (Bohannan & Bohannan, 1968).

Ceremonial exchange, as defined by anthropologists, refers to intricate systems in which valuable items are publicly shown and then given to partners on a reciprocal basis over a period of time. This practice often involves a carefully orchestrated exchange of goods or services to establish and maintain social relationships within a community or between different groups. Typically, these occasions involve dancing and festivities, with participation from men, women, and children. This community involvement highlights the social significance of

these complex events. These events also help to establish and uphold forms of political alliance between the partners, whether they are individuals or groups (Strathern & Stewart, 2005).

It is important to understand that exchanges often happen because of delayed reciprocity. Instead of both sides immediately exchanging items of value, one side typically gives first, which then obligates the recipients to reciprocate on a later occasion. This delay reflects the trust or obligation between the parties: relationships can become strained or hostile if the commitments are not honored. While there may be instances of immediate reciprocity, it usually happens over time in a series of incremental exchanges. The key point is that delayed exchanges of wealth help to maintain relationships. Knowing about these processes can provide insight into the social interactions of the people involved in these events (Sahlins, 1972).

Cultural economics is also a closely related field focusing on cultural phenomena, drawing from cultural studies and the humanities. Unlike broader institutional approaches, cultural economics places significant emphasis on the role of emotions, experience, and creativity in social actions. This subfield scrutinizes the participant-observer link more radically and tends towards strong notions of constructivism, highlighting the role of interpretation and subjectivity in empirical research. Cultural economists often explore various forms of representation and corporal practices, thereby diverging from traditional institutionalist economics in terms of epistemology and methodology (Dimmelmeier & Heussner, 2018).

Public anthropology draws on anthropological research to confront significant societal challenges, offering understandable and actionable perspectives on topics such as disaster response and worldwide economic disparities. Through simplifying anthropological discoveries, public anthropology encourages valuable discussions among the public and enhances the overall comprehension of economic systems and operations within society. This discipline emphasizes the significance of diverse forms of economic production and exchange, shedding light on their influence on everyday lives and interpersonal connections (Borofsky, 2011).

The perspective of the political economy provides an analysis of instances of global economic inequality and structural violence. This approach highlights the significance of cultural processes in influencing economic behavior, including individual preferences, tastes, and attitudes toward fairness. The anthropological concept of rational behavior within a cultural framework offers a deeper and more intricate comprehension of economic behavior compared to the traditional neoclassical economics concept of the rational economic man. This viewpoint helps us understand the reasons behind cultural differences in economic behavior (Schneider, 2020).

Ceremonial and institutional economics converge through their common emphasis on the ways in which social norms, power dynamics, and cultural practices influence economic behavior. Both frameworks posited that economic systems are embedded within social contexts, which not only affect economic decision-making but can, in certain instances, supersede traditional economic rationality. In conjunction with ceremonial economics, institutional economics—particularly as articulated by Thorstein Veblen and further advanced by Douglass North—examines economic behavior through the lens of social institutions. These institutions encompass both formal and informal “rules of the game” that include customs, norms, and legal frameworks (North, 1990). Veblen’s notion of “conspicuous consumption,” delineated in *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899), underscores this perspective by suggesting that economic choices are frequently driven by social signaling and status pursuit rather than pure utility maximization. Institutional economics posits that these socially embedded preferences prompt individuals to make choices that reinforce established societal structures and hierarchies. This dynamic parallelly mirrors the function of ceremonial exchanges, which serve to maintain and affirm social bonds and relationships (Veblen, 1899).

Ceremonial and institutional economics highlight that economic actions are often motivated by non-material factors, including social approval, respect, and the nurturing of relationships. Marcel Mauss’s seminal work, *The Gift* (1950), offers valuable insights into the nature of gift-giving as a form of ceremonial exchange that forges bonds among individuals and communities through

obligations related to giving, receiving, and reciprocating. The potlatch ceremonies among Indigenous groups in the Pacific Northwest serve as a further illustration of how such ceremonial exchanges are used to redistribute wealth, thereby asserting social status and reinforcing community ties. In potlatch, the act of giving—even the destruction of wealth—becomes a conduit for gaining prestige and respect (Mauss, 1950).

Institutional economics supports the idea that institutions significantly influence preferences and restrict choices, leading individuals to prioritize social harmony or status over purely economic incentives. Geoffrey Hodgson (2006) posits that institutions are enduring structures that direct behavior by embedding specific values and norms within society, thereby affecting economic interactions by shaping individuals' motivations and aspirations. Consequently, the value of economic exchanges is often determined more by the cultural context in which they occur than by market forces alone. This perspective in institutional economics offers a framework for understanding how ceremonial exchanges can establish and perpetuate values that extend beyond mere utility.

In both ceremonial and institutional economics, economic transactions serve as mechanisms for articulating and reinforcing social hierarchies and power dynamics. The Kula Ring exemplifies this through its intricate system of exchange, where participants accumulate social capital by trading esteemed items, thus enhancing their social standing within the community (Weiner, 1983). This network of exchanges is heavily contingent upon established relationships, and the value ascribed to these items is significantly shaped by the reputation of past holders and their historical narratives.

Institutional economics parallels this by acknowledging that economic transactions are intricately organized around power relations and institutional frameworks. Douglass North's institutional theory posits that economic interactions mirror the underlying power structures within a society, where institutional norms and rules delineate the distribution of advantages in the marketplace (North, 1990). In this regard, institutional mechanisms not only

facilitate economic activities but also perpetuate social order, akin to how ceremonial exchanges embed and uphold social status and relational networks. In markets with strong institutional rules, dominant firms can take advantage of brand loyalty and social influence, leading to a concentration of market power. Institutional economists argue that these “rules of the game” often hinder perfect competition and create inequalities by favoring established players over new entrants (Hodgson, 2006). Similarly, in ceremonial exchanges, exclusive and socially structured networks restrict participation, giving preference to those with established status, which reinforces their positions within the social hierarchy.

Ceremonial economics illustrates that the value of goods is often fixed and determined by tradition rather than by market fluctuations. For instance, in the Kula Ring, the value of shell necklaces is based on their ceremonial history and previous ownership rather than supply and demand. This stability in value, which is governed by social norms and traditions, resembles price rigidity in institutional economics. In this context, prices and values can remain steady due to factors such as brand loyalty, institutional rules, or consumer expectations.

Institutional economics explains that price rigidity often occurs because of established brand identities or consumer loyalty, which means that prices do not necessarily change with varying demand (Bain, 1956). Similar to ceremonial exchanges, where symbolic and relational values determine the worth of goods, institutional rules and consumer perceptions affect the stability of prices and values in modern markets. In both scenarios, economic value is not solely a function of market conditions; rather, it is socially constructed and maintained by established norms and institutions.

In summary, both ceremonial and institutional economics elucidate the profound impact of social norms, cultural significances, and institutional frameworks on economic behavior. These perspectives foreground the idea that economic exchanges frequently play a role in reinforcing social order, preserving relationships, and expressing power dynamics. This challenges traditional economic paradigms that emphasize rationality and utility maximization. Within

these frameworks, economic actions are not solely viewed as profit-maximizing endeavors; rather, they are conceptualized as vital to the maintenance and continuity of social and cultural systems.

3. Criticisms and Debates

Ceremonial economics focuses on the relationship between institutional structures and economic processes, and it has sparked various debates and criticisms within the academic community. One key criticism revolves around the tension between practical innovations and traditional ceremonial aspects, especially within the university system and the field of economics. This tension suggests two potential outcomes: either new technologies will be absorbed by existing structures, worsening existing inequalities, or a rise of new and inclusive cultures that foster epistemic democratization and pluralism (Guizzo, 2024). Many critics contend that if the former scenario were to occur, it could potentially strengthen monopolies in specific areas of expertise, leading to further marginalization of less dominant voices within those fields.

One critique of ceremonial economics is its emphasis on traditional, pre-industrial, or non-market societies, which some argue constrain its relevance in contemporary, globalized economies characterized by market-driven transactions. Detractors contend that ceremonial economics may not adequately address the complexities inherent in global trade, financial markets, and capitalist frameworks, where considerations of utility and profit maximization frequently overshadow symbolic value. Polanyi (1944) argued that market-based economies are embedded within specific institutional frameworks, making ceremonial interpretations less relevant in situations where material gains often outweigh social and symbolic concerns. Similarly, North (1990) claimed that although institutions influence behavior, the formal rules that underpin contemporary economies frequently function autonomously from the symbolic practices highlighted in ceremonial economics.

Critics contend that the framework of ceremonial economics may disproportionately highlight the symbolic and ritualistic dimensions of economic

interactions, potentially neglecting practical and material considerations. The Kula Ring serves as a prominent illustration of this phenomenon; however, some anthropologists argue that participants simultaneously engage in pragmatic trade while undertaking their ceremonial exchanges. This suggests a coalescence of utilitarian and ceremonial motivations that is often underestimated in analyses that focus solely on the ceremonial aspects (Dalton, 1961). Such a perspective invites a more nuanced understanding of the dual economic functions inherent in these practices.

Another criticism pertains to the methodology employed in the study of ceremonial economics. This field often relies on ethnographic methods, which can be subjective and highly context dependent. Critics argue that such methodologies may lead to overgeneralization or anachronistic interpretations of economic behaviors. Goody (1977) cautioned against romanticizing "primitive" economies, warning that it is essential to interpret ceremonial practices within the broader socioeconomic context. Furthermore, the symbolic meanings associated with ceremonial exchanges can be challenging to quantify or measure, complicating comparisons across different societies and economies.

Some scholars critique ceremonial economics for its tendency to idealize the egalitarian and community-oriented dimensions of ceremonial practices while overlooking the entrenched power dynamics and disparities they frequently perpetuate. For example, the potlatch ceremonies observed in the Pacific Northwest are often viewed as mechanisms of redistribution; however, they simultaneously function to reinforce existing hierarchies and consolidate elite power (Wolf, 2010). Graeber (2001) posits that although ceremonial exchanges are designed to strengthen social bonds, they can inadvertently sustain systems of exploitation, as the obligations to give and reciprocate may impose substantial burdens on participants with less social capital.

Neoclassical economists have criticized ceremonial economics for dismissing rational-choice models and emphasizing cultural and social factors. They contend that ceremonial economics fails to explain how individuals make choices under

constraints or how markets allocate resources efficiently. Becker (1976) challenged approaches that stray from utility maximization, suggesting that symbolic and cultural behaviors could be integrated into rational-choice frameworks instead of being treated as separate phenomena.

Ceremonial economics has also faced criticism for its inclination to essentialize cultures by concentrating on ceremonial practices and exchanges. This focus can result in static and reductionist representations of societies, neglecting the fluid and evolving character of cultural and economic practices. Clifford (1988) cautioned against the perception of cultural practices as immutable, underscoring the importance of contextualizing ceremonial exchanges within their historical and political frameworks to achieve a more nuanced analysis.

The role of values in scientific practice is a topic that generates debate within the academic community. While Max Weber advocated for a value-free approach to social science, most institutionalists argued against a strict division between scientific and normative factors (Martyn, 2018). This divergence in views has led to ongoing discussions and differing perspectives on the relationship between values and scientific inquiry. There has been a discussion and disagreement regarding the inclusion of values in economic analysis.

Moreover, the formal inclusion of economic advancements within existing structures has consequences for the reputation of academic institutions and the regulation of knowledge generation in universities. Institutionalists emphasize how these formal values can obstruct the acceptance of new approaches and viewpoints, thereby maintaining a hierarchical prestige system that is resistant to change.

The Community Economy approach emphasizes the importance of ethical considerations and collective survival over individualist or universal prescriptions, adding another layer to the debate on economic approaches. Proponents argue that ethical questions are best negotiated through relationships in specific contexts, while critics caution that this approach may lack the consistency needed for broader

application and policy formulation. This approach prioritizes the well-being of the community and encourages a nuanced, context-specific understanding of ethical considerations, raising important questions about its broader applicability and potential impact on policy formulation (Hill & Diprose, 2019).

For individuals interested in gaining a thorough understanding of ceremonial economics, there are various significant publications that offer valuable perspectives and in-depth analyses. One such notable work is "Ceremonial Economics: A Social-Institutional Analysis of Universities, Disciplines, and Academic Positioning" by Danielle Guizzo (2024), which presents a comprehensive exploration of how institutional ceremonial values and the hierarchical structure of prestige impact the economics discipline and the generation of knowledge within academic institutions. Additionally, the *Journal of Economic Issues*' 2024 volume, which includes Guizzo's article, provides a broader context on the evolving debates and perspectives within the field.

To gain a better understanding of related topics, readers could explore historical and recent analyses of ceremonial institutions and their impact on economic and social instability, unequal distribution, and crises related to race, ethnicity, and gender. The following works highlight the intricate and varied nature of institutionalist scholarships. They present several research topics that extend beyond pure economic theory to encompass broader social implications, thus offering a rich and multifaceted perspective on the subject.

Conclusion

In this article, we present a comprehensive exploration of an interdisciplinary approach that delves into the impact of social institutions and cultural practices on economic behaviors and outcomes. Our aim is to present a challenge to the conventional economic model, which frequently emphasizes individual rationality and property rights to the exclusion of other factors. We advocate for a more holistic analysis that incorporates cultural and historical contexts to provide a more nuanced understanding of economic phenomena.

The discussion delves into the distinction between ceremonial and instrumental economics. Ceremonial practices are rooted in traditional values and social duties and are often associated with rituals and symbolic significance. On the other hand, instrumental practices prioritize effectiveness, problem-solving, and efficiency. This dichotomy is particularly significant as it highlights how adherence to tradition can at times impede innovation and economic advancement, a concept referred to as "ceremonial encapsulation." This article underscores that this encapsulation can intensify social disparities by favoring established norms over forward-thinking solutions.

The Kula Ring among the Trobriand Islanders, the Potlatch among Pacific Northwest tribes, and various aspects of the Classic Maya civilization serve as key case studies that demonstrate the intricate connection between economic activities and their profound embeddedness within social and cultural contexts. These examples underscore the idea that economic behaviors carry substantial social meanings that go beyond mere utility, often being influenced by a complex interplay of social, cultural, and historical factors.

This article explores the intricate economic ramifications of ceremonial economics, shedding light on how cultural norms impact the distribution and exchange systems within communities. It delves into the intricacies of market dynamics through empirical studies, acknowledging the diverse range of prices and outputs, thus questioning the concept of a perfectly competitive market. Moreover, it investigates the infusion of currency into traditional economies, which adds layers of complexity to resource allocation and economic interactions. This underscores that in ceremonial economics, the concept of wealth encompasses more than just the accumulation of assets.

However, critics of ceremonial economics express concerns about the possibility of reinforcing inequalities within current institutional frameworks and discuss the impact on academic knowledge production. The article delves into how the conflict between traditional values and modern economic practices shapes a dynamic environment in which innovation may be hindered or reshaped through traditional perspectives.

Moreover, modern economic theories like New Institutional Economics and New Keynesian Economics deeply explore the importance of ceremonial economics, recognizing the impact of institutional environments on economic behavior. This conversation underscores the need to consider a range of interconnected disciplines, such as economic anthropology and cultural economics, to obtain diverse analytical viewpoints on the intricate relationship between culture and the economy.

Future studies on the ceremonial economy could be exciting. As social structures advance, ceremonial economics may enhance its relevance by examining the continuity of ritualized practices within modern economic frameworks, the increasing importance of digital symbolism in transactions, and the complex interactions between traditional economic rituals and contemporary practices. This approach can provide deeper insights into the resilience of cultural and economic behaviors in the middle of rapid change.

For instance, the rise of digital economies is transforming ceremonial practices and creating new forms of symbolic value. Cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), and online reputation systems can be analyzed through the concept of ceremonial economics. For instance, NFTs often derive their value from cultural significance, social prestige, and uniqueness rather than from practical utility (Haskel & Westlake, 2018). Their exchange reflects the principles of ceremonial economics, where value is connected to symbolic meaning and social recognition. As digital platforms play an increasingly prominent role in economic interactions, ceremonial economics offers valuable insights into how symbolic exchanges impact behavior within these spaces. The rituals associated with social media "likes," influencer endorsements and digital tipping systems exemplify the integration of ceremonial elements into digital economies, ultimately reinforcing status and social connections.

Sustainability can be another field of work. Ceremonial practices frequently underscore the principles of reciprocity and equilibrium, which closely align with contemporary sustainability objectives. Indigenous ceremonial economies,

exemplified by the potlatch of the Pacific Northwest and the Andean concept (reciprocal exchange), offer critical frameworks for examining sustainable, community-oriented economic systems (Mauss, 1950). As global discourse increasingly gravitates towards sustainable development, the insights derived from ceremonial economics can inform innovative economic paradigms that prioritize relational dynamics, community resilience, and ecological integrity, in contrast to the conventional focus on profit maximization. Elinor Ostrom's (1990) research on community-managed resources highlights how traditional collective governance practices often resonate with ceremonial economic principles, underscoring the importance of cooperation and shared stewardship. These findings can inform the development of policies aimed at fostering sustainable and inclusive economic practices.

As ceremonial practices become commodified within the global economy, the authenticity and cultural integrity of these rituals encounter significant challenges. Tourism, for instance, often transforms traditional ceremonies into spectacles for consumption, thereby stripping them of their original meanings (Greenwood, 1989). Similarly, cultural artefacts utilized in ceremonial exchanges are increasingly being commercialized for international markets, prompting ethical questions surrounding ownership, representation, and value. Future research in ceremonial economics should focus on addressing the tensions between commercialization and the symbolic and social significance of rituals. It is also important to explore how communities can maintain control over their ceremonial practices during external pressures.

The future of ceremonial economics is also increasingly dependent on its capacity to integrate traditional and contemporary economic frameworks. As markets grow more interconnected globally, ceremonial exchanges play a pivotal role in influencing relationships across both informal and formal economic systems. For example, migrant communities often uphold traditional ceremonial practices while simultaneously adapting these rituals to align with new cultural and economic landscapes (Levitt, 2001). This dual engagement underscores the persistent significance of ceremonial economics within hybrid economic environments.

Lastly, ceremonial economics can offer significant insights into behavioral economics by emphasizing the influence of psychological factors, cultural contexts, and social norms on economic decision-making processes (Thaler, 2014). Practices such as vacation shopping, corporate gifting, and tipping exemplify the ritualized behaviors that infuse contemporary economies with ceremonial significance. Policymakers can leverage the principles of ceremonial economics to craft interventions that resonate with existing cultural norms, thereby enhancing trust, promoting cooperation, and fostering community engagement.

In summary, the field of ceremonial economics demonstrates significant potential as a robust framework for analyzing the symbolic and sociocultural dimensions of economic behavior in both historical and contemporary settings. By investigating the ways in which rituals evolve in response to technological advancements, cultural shifts, and ecological transformations, this discipline can provide critical insights into the persistent influence of symbolic exchanges on economic structures. Moreover, the integration of ceremonial economics with behavioral and institutional economics paves the way for the development of innovative policies and practices that prioritize sustainability. These insights underscore the continued relevance of ceremonial economics in deciphering and addressing the complexities inherent in economic systems within an increasingly dynamic global context.

The conclusion drawn from this work underscores the critical importance of adopting a holistic and integrated approach to economic analysis—one that deeply acknowledges and respects the complex and multifaceted nature of human social behavior, as well as the cultural foundations that underpin various economic practices. This article posits that by situating economic activities within their specific social and cultural contexts, we can achieve a more nuanced and profound understanding of the mechanisms that drive economic systems.

Moreover, it highlights the imperative of incorporating ceremonial dimensions into economic discussions. These dimensions often reflect the values, traditions, and social norms that shape the way communities engage in economic activities.

By recognizing and integrating these ceremonial aspects, we not only enrich our comprehension of economic interactions but also enhance the relevance and applicability of economic theories to real-world situations. This broader, more comprehensive perspective has significant implications for policymaking. By considering the cultural and social values that underpin economic transactions, policymakers can develop strategies that are not only economically sound but also culturally sensitive and socially inclusive. Such policies can better promote equitable and sustainable economic development, as they would respect the diverse values and practices of different communities, ultimately leading to more effective and resonant economic solutions.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

References

- Alchian, A. A., & Demsetz, H. (1972). Production, Information Costs, and Economic Organization. *The American Economic Review*, 62(5), 777–795.
- Arnoldi, J. (2007). Informational Ideas. *Thesis Eleven*, 89(1), 58–73.
- Ayres, C.. (1927). *Science: The False Messiah*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Ayres, C. (1962). *The Theory of Economic Progress*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bain, J. S. (1956). *Barriers to New Competition: Their Character and Consequences in Manufacturing Industries*. Harvard University Press.
- Beck, M. G. (1993). *Potlatch: Native Ceremony and Myth on the Northwest Coast*. Alaska Northwest Books.
- Becker, G. S. (1976). *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. University of Chicago Press.
- Benson, S. (2009). *Encyclopedia of U.S. History*. USA : U-X-L
- Bohannon, P., & L., Bohannon. (1968). *Tiv Economy*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Borofsky, R. (2011). *Why a Public Anthropology?* University of Hawaii Press.
- Böck, R., & Almeida, F. (2018). Clarence Ayres, Ayresianos e a evolução do institucionalismo Vebleniano. *Economia E Sociedade*, 27 (2), 381–407.
- Bugra, A. (1995). *İktisatçılar ve İnsanlar*. İletişim Publications.
- Carlà, F., & Gori, M. (2014). *Gift Giving and the 'Embedded' Economy in the Ancient World*. Akademiekonferenzen, 17. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014. 437. ISBN 9783825363314.
- Carrier, A. H., & Carrier, J. G. (1991). *Structure and Process in Melanesian Society: Ponam's progress in the Twentieth Century*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
-

- Chamberlin, E. H. (1933). *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition*. Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Harvard University Press.
- Dalton, G. (1961). Economic Theory and Primitive Society. *American Anthropologist*, 63(1), 1–25.
- Das, A. (n.d.). *Economic Exchange*. Retrieved from <https://ebooks.inflibnet.ac.in/antp02/chapter/economic-exchange/>
- Dimmelmeier, A., & Heussner, F. (2018, July 30). The Perspectives of Pluralist Economics. Exploring Economics. Retrieved from <https://www.exploring-economics.org/en/orientation/institutionalist-economics/>
- Dixon, H. (1987). A Simple Model of Imperfect Competition with Walrasian Features. *Oxford Economics Papers*, 39(1), 134-160.
- Firth, R. (1968). *Tikopia Ritual and Belief*. Beacon Press.
- Godelier, M. (1999). *The Enigma of the Gift*. University of Chicago Press.
- Goody, J. (1977). *Production and Reproduction: A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gras, N.S.B. (1927). Anthropology and Economics. Ogburn, W. F. and A. A. Goldenweiser (Ed.), *The Social Science and Their Inter-relation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Graeber, D. (2001). *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Greenwood, D. J. (1989). Culture by the pound: An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. In V. J. Smith (Ed.), *Host and guests: The anthropology of tourism* (pp. 171–185). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Guizzo, D. (2024). Ceremonial Economics: A Social-Institutional Analysis of Universities, Disciplines, and Academic Positioning. *Journal of Economic Issues, Taylor & Francis Journals*, 58(2), 397-423.
- Haskel, J., & Westlake, S. (2018). *Capitalism Without Capital: The Rise of the Intangible Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Heckscher, E. F. (1937). *Mercantilism*. Allen & Unwin.
- Hill, A., & Diprose, G. (2019). A community economies perspective for ethical community development. S. Banks and P. Westoby (Ed.), *Ethics, equity and community development*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2006). What Are Institutions?. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40(1), 1–25.
- Houston, S., & Stuart, D. (1996). *Of gods, glyphs, and kings: Divinity and rulership among the Classic Maya*. Antiquity.
- Irwin, G., Shaw, B., & Mcalister, A. (2019). The origins of the Kula Ring: Archaeological and maritime perspectives from the southern Massim and Mailu areas of Papua New Guinea. *Archeology in Oceania*, 54, 1-16.
- Irwin, D. A. (1991). Mercantilism as Strategic Trade Policy: The Anglo-Dutch Rivalry for the East India Trade. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 99(6), 1296-1314.

- Junker, L. (1982). The Ceremonial-Instrumental Dichotomy in Institutional Analysis: The Nature, Scope and Radical Implications of the Conflicting Systems. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 41 (2), 141–150.
- Krugman, P. R. (1979). Increasing Returns, Monopolistic Competition, and International Trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 9(4), 469-479.
- Levitt, P. (2001). *The Transnational Villagers*. University of California Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1920). Kula: The Circulating Exchange of Valuables in the Archipelagoes of Eastern New Guinea. *Man* 20, 97-105.
- Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marcus, J. (1992). *Dynamic cycles of Mesoamerican states*. National Geographic Research & Exploration.
- Martyn, H. (2018). *Value-Free Sociology*. In: Ritzer, George ed. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Mauss, M. (1950). *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France.
- Mayhew, A. (2010). Clarence Ayres, Technology, Pragmatism and Progress. *Cambridge Journal of Economic*, 34 (1) 213–222.
- Miller, M., & Taube, K. (1993). *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Mexico and the Maya*. Thames and Hudson.
- Munn, N. D. (1992). *The Fame of Gawa: A Symbolic Study of Value Transformation in a Massim) Society*. Cambridge University Press.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papadopoulos, G. (2015). Expanding on Ceremonial Encapsulation: The Case of Financial Innovation. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 49 (1), 127–142.
- Polanyi, K. (1968). *The Economy as Instituted Process*. in *Economic Anthropology* E LeClair, H Schneider (eds) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press.
- Polanyi, K. (2000). *The Great Transformation*. AMEREON LTD.
- Polanyi, K. (1957). *Aristotle discovers the economy*. In Polanyi, Arensberg & Pearson (Eds.). *Trade and market in the early empires: economies in history and theory*. The Free Press.
- Ringle, W. M., & Bey, G. J. (2012). The Late Classic to Postclassic Transition Among The Maya of Northern Yucatan. In D. L. Nichols & C. A. Pool (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Mesoamerican Archeology*.

- Saber, H., & Mazouz, N. (2015). *Maya Civilization*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/27677895/Maya_Civilization_pdf
- Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Routledge.
- Stern, P. J. (2012). *The Company-State: Corporate Sovereignty and the Early Modern Foundations of the British Empire in India*. Oxford University Press.
- Strathern, M. (1990). *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. University of California Press.
- Strathern, A., & Stewart, P. (2005). *Ceremonial Exchange*. In *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, G. Carrier (Ed.), USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, ISBN: 1 84376 175 0.
- Schneider, G. E. (2020). Contemporary Original Institutional Economics. *American Review of Political Economy*, 11(2).
- Smith, M.E., & Lobo, J. (2019). Cities Through the Ages: One Thing or Many? *Front. Digit. Humanit*, 6(12).
- Thaler, R. H. (2014). *The Winner's Curse: Paradoxes and Anomalies of Economic Life*. Princeton University Press.
- Tool, M. R. (2000). *Value Theory and Economic Progress: The Institutional Economics of J. F. Foster*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Veblen, T. (1899). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Veblen, T. (1918). *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.
- Ziegler, R. (2017). *The Kula Ring of Bronislaw Malinowski: Simulating the Co-Evolution of an Economic and Ceremonial Exchange System*. B., & W. Przepiorka (Ed.), *Social dilemmas, institutions, and the evolution of cooperation* (pp. 39-60). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Oldenbourg. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110472974-003>
- Waller, W. T. (1982). The Evolution of the Veblenian Dichotomy: Veblen, Hamilton, Ayres, and Foster. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 16 (3),757–771.
- Weiner, A. B. (1983). *Women of Value, Men of Renown: New Perspectives in Trobriand Exchange*. University of Texas Press.
- Wolf, E. R. (2010). *Europe and the People Without History*. University of California Press.
- Wu, Q. (2018). The structure of ritual and the epistemological approach to ritual study. *J. Chin. Sociol.* 5, 11.

