# INTRODUCTION

*Elise Klein and Carlos Eduardo Morreo*

Whilst the global development industry emerged from the colonial period in the mid-twentieth century (Kothari 2005), its colonial links continue (Kothari 2005; Mignolo 2011) alongside narratives of freedom and improvement. Though development is an 'amoeba concept' reflecting its high malleability and resilience to adapt (Demaria & Kothari 2017: 2588), it nonetheless continues to promote ideas of improvement for populations in the Global South rehearsed through teleologies of capitalism and liberalism (Escobar 1995, 2015). The array of developmental improvements is based on the lessons of Western modernity and is commonly legitimised through expert knowledge that tends to define peoples and societies around the world as 'less developed' (Ziai 2013). Yet, the failures of development are recognised both in the Global South and increasingly within the Global North. A paradox emerges; the institutions and practices that development has promoted to better the world, have, in fact, contributed to growing inequality and poverty. Perhaps the ultimate failures of development are most starkly seen through the persistence of poverty despite over fifty years of aid and intervention, in the recognition of anthropogenic climate change and biodiversity loss (Sachs 2017) and in the realisation that millions of people continue to find their labour, environments and lives surplus to the requirements of 'variegated capitalism' (Peck & Theodore 2007).

Still, prominent scholars and authorities within development point to the numbers that international technocracies and local bureaucracies regularly produce to highlight the success of their projects – the many who have been 'lifted from poverty', treated for AIDS or malaria, the number of children in schooling, those that have had their life expectancy extended or maternal health improved. Yet, scholarship has shown that there is a perverse politics inherent to the production of these reassuring indices and statistical indicators as relations of power are distorted and the complexity gets obscured (Engle-Merry 2011; Reddy & Lahoti

2016). One only needs to scratch the surface of these measures to uncover a darker side to achieving development (Nandy 2002; Weber 2010).

Over a decade ago, Barbara Harriss-White (2006) showed the links between economic precarity and capitalism in India, not only through ongoing accumulation by dispossession and the pauperising of petty commodity production, but also through climate change and insecurity-producing disaster events. The latter have arisen from the need for greater energy inputs and through the production of waste driving productivity in the so-called formal economy. In his analysis of capitalism in India and China, Anthony D'Costa (2014) illustrates how the dispossession and displacement of rural communities from their land by national and international capital is integral to economic production, forcing these people into what over a century ago Engels had termed 'petty commodity production'. Livelihoods have been ruined through loss of biodiversity, degradation of water and soils and through climate change (Lohmann 2011; Martínez-Alier 2012). Whilst formal employment has been created in these economies, it is nowhere near at a rate high enough to absorb the people being dispossessed (D'Costa 2014). Here we come to see the importance of recognising 'the decisive shift since the 1980s from the "developmental state" to neoliberal "accumulation by dispossession" in the global south' (Wilson 2017: 2688).

The 'inconvenient truth' remains that the development celebrated by North Atlantic institutions and tethered to GDP charts and rates is the same model that continues to subjugate and dispossess. Whilst gains can always be located, the global rise in inequality continues at pace, and race, patriarchy and coloniality endure. Through the homogenising impacts of development, cultural and social relations have been disrupted (Connell 2007), 'gender' and kin unsettled (Walsh 2016; Lugones 2016), and bodies scarred (Kapur 2005). In the name of development and human rights, imperial wars have been staged (Douzinas 2000) and racialised borders have been erected (Bakewell 2008). Indigenous peoples have been pushed off their land, imprisoned or institutionalised for resisting assimilation (Watson 2009; Altman 2010; Coulthard 2014). And precarious lives in 'developed' societies and 'advanced' economies are sustained by punishing pharmacologies, where people are willing to take their own lives because labour cannot be an institution of self-realisation, equality or freedom (Ehrenreich 2010; Mills 2014).[1] Furthermore, the more political economy ills of 'financialisation' and 'neoliberalism', both largely programmes and measures taken to address the ongoing crises or outright failures of 'developed' economies, have recently brought about the events of conservative populism in the USA and European disintegration, while condoning the extraordinary concentration of wealth in the hands of an ever-shrinking global elite. Contemporarily, an undifferentiated humanity is held responsible for climate change's unsalvageable pace, exposing the fundamental flaw of capitalism's and neoliberalism's economic rationalities (Klein 2015; Santelices Spikin & Rojas Hernández 2016).

The development industry has adapted its project of continued improvement and progress through 'participatory regimes', 'empowerment', 'sustainability' and

'inclusive growth' (Cooke & Kothari 2001; Batiwala 2007; Li 2007). The Sus-
tainable Development Goals (SDGs) advance the Millennium Development
Goals (MDGs) through refocusing projects of improvement to include the
Global North. Yet, as Sachs (2017) points out, there are contradictions in these
goals; poverty reduction often comes at the price of increasing inequality and
environmental degradation. Likewise, the SDGs still centre contemporary capit-
alism as a mechanism to deal with persistent poverty, growing inequality and
ecological ruin, yet 'inclusive growth driven by the financial markets is an
impossibility' (Sachs 2017: 2578). Amartya Sen and capability scholars equally
face similar critiques with their view of development as expanding capabilities
(Sen 1999, 2009; Nussbaum 2001). While these ideas have significantly moved
debates away from development as reducible to economic development and
towards a multi-dimensional approach to understanding human flourishing, this
shift takes place within an unacknowledged framework bundling neoclassical
economic science and liberalism's political commitments, the upshot being new
tools for the development industry to keep reproducing itself through deploying
new and improved expertise (Mignolo 2011).

In the meantime, as these conceptual alterations to development rekindle
development, millions around the world whose lives intersect in all manner of ways
with global capitalism are encouraged to wait patiently, seized by development's
promise that things will get better. Development as catch up and as doubling down
on capitalism has been futile for so many. This is not to overlook the creativity,
politics and forms of resistance populations have mounted amid the forms of subal-
ternity, or to disregard the developmental hybrids that have emerged as people
adapt, survive and persist (Long 2001). Indeed, the thrust behind this volume is to
pay homage to these agencies, to engage them and put them up for discussion. It
is also necessary to acknowledge the work of the many who have hitched their
livelihoods to neoliberal globalisation hoping to benefit, captivated by the shine
of capital's promise, contemporary entrepreneurial philosophies, or the appealing
idea that near enough might just be reasonable. Neither is this engagement with
development necessarily linear; a person or group may reject some development ini-
tiatives while welcoming others (Matthews 2017). Development has not been the
emancipatory project its early manifestos promised it to be. So, what then are the
alternatives? Which cracks and edges are actors already turning to? Within the pages
of this book, we build upon a genealogy of critical scholarship from the North and
South, and across the humanities and social sciences, which has interrogated the
promises of development, pointing beyond its disappointing experience. However,
this project goes further; we will specifically examine already existing practices, or
what we are calling postdevelopment in practice.

## Postdevelopment

Postdevelopment emerged in the 1980s drawing on poststructuralist legacies in order
to destabilise the discourse or apparatus of development as a hegemonic principle

organising social life (Esteva & Escobar 2017). Postdevelopment scholars and activists provided a cutting critique of the global development assemblage. First, development was questioned for measuring diverse socialities by Western models of progress where an individualised subject and capitalism were taken as central. This system classified many populations and non-capitalist practices and ways of being around the world as subordinate and inferior, all the while conveniently overlooking and silencing the darker side of modernity in which colonisation, accumulation by dispossession and exploitation had been integral (Mignolo 2011). Second, postdevelopment scholars identified in development discourse a project strongly privileging European and Anglo-American expertise and technocracy, systematically obscuring or masking coloniality, patriarchy and other relations of power marshalling the 'will to improve' (Escobar 1995; Li 2007; Ziai 2007). Third, development, whilst delivering Western prescriptions, had overlooked and marginalised 'pluriversality', the diverse ontologies and ecologies of knowledge, rendering them 'traditional', regressive and non-credible (Dussel 2002; de Sousa Santos 2009).

Today postdevelopment is not only concerned with the Global South, but equally addresses the North. The work of postdevelopment includes staking out a position about northern theory that is conscious of the intricacies of hegemony in its own perspectives (such as the series of cultural and epistemic hierarchies within institutions of 'global' knowledge production). Postdevelopment has sought to displace the universalisation and globalisation of modernity, insisting instead on the need for what Gustavo Esteva has described by paraphrasing the Zapatista motto, as 'a world in which many worlds can be embraced' (Esteva & Escobar 2017: 4). In the early years of postdevelopment's critique, Rahnema (1997) stated that postdevelopment would not be the end of the search for justice, but rather should only mean that the 'binary, the mechanistic, the reductionist, the inhuman and the ultimately self-destructive approach to change is over' (Rahnema 1997: 391). Similarly, Colombian scholar Arturo Escobar, a major contributor to the debates on postdevelopment, announced over two decades ago that, '[w]e are not looking for development alternatives but alternatives to development' (1995: 215). For Escobar, postdevelopment critically examines a set of key principles: the support of pluralistic grassroots movements while tempering localised relations of power, and upholding a critical stance towards established scientific discourses and development expertise often refracted through the postcolonial state. Postdevelopment also encompasses the promotion of different conceptions of economy, taking into account solidarity, reciprocity and other forms of valuation as opposed to the axioms of *homo oeconomicus*. Therefore, postdevelopment references not only alternatives to development, but by doing so works to overcome the dualisms that have hidden the ongoing and contemporary making of worlds (explained below).

## Postdevelopment and theoretical links

Beyond the well-known link with poststructuralist theory, postdevelopment has cultivated a dialogue with other theoretical discourses. For instance, postcolonial

theory shares many of the critical concerns of postdevelopment, where both are troubled by the 'ongoing relationship between colonial forms of rule and govern-ance and the purpose and practice of development' (Kothari 2005: 118) and 'cap-ital's ability to assimilate all forms of life that oppose its aspirations' (Gidwani 2008: 217). Similarly, like postdevelopment, postcolonial critique has also challenged the construction of the 'Other'; however, it has done so by 'conceptualising the histor-ical and social context of these constructions, revealing the distinct notions of race, ethnicity, gender and class in their constitution, and by replacing them with alterna-tive ones' (Kayatekin 2009: 1114). In essence, postcolonial critique has demanded that scholars rethink the ontological and epistemological positioning of research – the sites of knowledge production and circulation. In addition, if the 'vocation of postcolonial discourse', as Harry Harootunian comments, has been 'to presen[t] the voiceless as capable of enunciating tactics of resistance and negotiation, elevating them as subjects worthy of study and inclusion' (2012, 9), it is postdevelopment rather than the subject of postcolonial critique that would both affirm such a vocation and be transformed by this demand. The encounter between develop-ment's Southern critics and postcolonialism has profoundly shaped the project of postdevelopment.

Critical feminist approaches have also been crucial to postdevelopment in making visible relations of power linked to modernity/coloniality such as eco-nomic exploitation, race, heterosexuality and gender. For example, María Lugones (2016) has examined the 'coloniality of gender' and how eurocentric, biologised, binary and hierarchical constructions of gender have attempted to write over and write out diverse erotics. For Lugones, simply put, 'gender is a colonial construction' (Walsh 2016: 37). Critical feminist approaches have been crucial in pointing to the plurality of feminisms (and patriarchies) shaping politics in the South and North. This diversity of feminisms, with specific histories and ontologies, matters. Therefore, the question articulated by Catherine Walsh (2016) has much to say to postdevelopment; what might it mean to 'think with and from postures, perspectives and experiences that transgress, interrupt and [that] break with the universalism, dualism and hegemonic pretensions that these categories [of imperial reason] announce and construct?' (Walsh 2016: 44). In this light, the significant work of feminists such as Wendy Harcourt has bought attention to the embodiment of cultural, economic and social relations (Harcourt 2009). Harcourt points to how postdevelopment can contribute to unmaking the ways bodies are shaped and to build on 'multiple resistances and rebellions expressed in feminist and queer struggles for the bodily integrity of the many "Others"' (Harcourt, Chapter 16 in this volume). In addition, if relationality is a central and guiding concept in critical feminist thought, relationality to the human and non-human world has become equally significant for postdevelopment, thereby challenging the extractivist, controlling and exploitative relationship West-ern patriarchal modernity has to other ecologies (Harcourt & Nelson 2015). Indeed, as Harding states, 'modernization and its development theories, policies, and prac-tices, […] have always been masculinized' (Harding 2016: 1072). The possibility for

diverse ways of being in the world that respond to and value the affects, connectedness, sacredness and the complex and ongoing collaborations between humans and nonhumans represents a significant challenge (Escobar 2018).

The turn to an ontological politics in contemporary scholarship is yet another concern shaped by debates with postdevelopment (Blaser 2009, 2013; Escobar 2018). Political ontology here refers to

> the power-laden practices involved in bringing into being a particular world or ontology; [and] to a field of study that focuses on the interrelations among worlds, including the conflicts that ensue as different ontologies strive to sustain their own existence in their interaction with other worlds.
>
> *(Escobar 2018: 66)*

The aim of detailing ontology results from a concern with everyday practices and the worlds they sustain, and the discordant or conflicting relations between these coeval worlds. A key aim here is to make visible those 'heterogeneous assemblages of life that enable non-dualist, relational worlds' (Escobar 2018: 66). An important theoretical resource, animating the ontological turn has been the earlier and prominent work of Bruno Latour and others associated with actor-network theory (ANT) and the interdisciplinary field of science and technology studies (STS). Scholars engaging with ANT and the work of Latour or John Law, among others, have sought to examine the plurality of practice at the level of ontology, challenging the anthropocentrism of the modern, and the possibility of setting 'society' apart from 'nature'. In documenting a multiplicity of practices enrolling humans and non-humans, ANT has shifted the focus of development, opening up a plurality of conceptions of change, but also a plurality of ways of being 'modern' (Donovan 2014).

More broadly, a key STS insight in its actor-network theory variant has been to alert us to the ongoing and necessary work in the making of realities. 'Reality' is an achievement, an effect of sanctioned or unofficial ontological practices, not a space-box within which different epistemological perspectives battle it out (Latour 2005; Law & Singleton 2013; Law 2015). Therefore, as John Law puts it, 'in a multiple world of different enactments, if we participate in a *fractiverse*, then there will be, there can be, no overarching logic or liberal institutions, diplomatic or otherwise, to mediate between the different realities' (Law 2015: 127; our emphasis). Nevertheless, as postcolonial STS scholar Katayoun Shafiee has argued, the field of STS has generally been marked by a preference or 'bias toward the investigation of small-scale economic and scientific experiments, technical systems and laboratories', such as eye-catching electric cars or northern financial products, and has not often traced 'other connections to politics by moving from the laboratory or the market to think of the broader socio-technical processes at work in […] large-scale political project [s]' such as development interventions (Shafiee 2012: 588). It has been critical development scholarship and postdevelopment critique rather than STS that has

firmly focused on 'relations between countries of the Global North and Global South' (Shafiee 2012: 588). Still, the turn to ontology in STS, which is taken further in Escobar's own recent scholarship, has highlighted the need to attend to both 'pluriversality' and 'ontological design'. With the latter what is at stake is an 'ethics of deep coalitions, rather than modern/colonial agonistics' (Tlostanova 2017: 58). This shift within postdevelopment approaches hails the pluriversal as the need to recognise and work with different ways of imagining, embracing and enacting ontological diversity as other modes of existence (Escobar 2011).

## Postdevelopment apart from post-neoliberalism

While there are some links with postdevelopment and other theoretical projects, it is important to also map out projects that sit apart from postdevelopment, although often mistaken as co-constitutive. Within Latin America and over the last decade-and-a-half, what came to be known as 'post-neoliberalism' is one such example. The establishment of 'left-turn' governments starting in 1998 with the electoral victory of president Hugo Chávez in Venezuela paved the way for post-neoliberal approaches, or what were originally conceived as development alternatives for the region. If for close to two decades the '10-point' Washington Consensus had defined the parameters of mainstream development and its economic imaginary, by the mid-2000s, with the shift in the political and economic landscape of Latin America, an ongoing transformation had taken place rendering neoliberalism politically and economically defunct. Aided by social movements and the irruption of Indigenous mobilisation in national politics, the left turn's post-neoliberalism would encompass the return of statist political economies, a renationalisation of 'the economy', new regional and South–South trade initiatives and the rebranding of social spending as 'social investment' (Ruckert, Macdonald & Proulx 2017). The series of political events, policies and programmes encompassed by the left turn raise important questions. After the Latin American experience of the left turn, whose hopes may have come to an end as the demise of the Washington Consensus settled on what Argentinean sociologist Maristella Svampa has termed the 'commodities consensus' (Svampa 2015), what can be said regarding the relations between the post-neoliberal programme and postdevelopment?

Svampa has argued that 'developmentalist neo-extractivism', characterised by large-scale export-oriented monocultures and the deepening of resource extraction, has come to fully represent the darker side of a post-neoliberal present in the region. In this regard, Svampa concurs with the work of Uruguayan political ecologist Eduardo Gudynas and Ecuadorean environmentalist and political economist Alberto Acosta. Svampa argues that 'the commodities consensus [has] deepen[ed] the dynamic of dispossession'; 'the dispossession and accumulation of land, resources, and territories, principally by large corporations, in multiscalar alliances with different governments' (Svampa 2015: 66). Unexpectedly, the promises of cornucopianism are common to both the Left's post-neoliberalism

and the earlier Washington-focused neoliberal project (Holst 2016: 201). In turn, post-neoliberal 'progressive' social policies have been bundled through left governance with regressive economic policies. In parallel, the recent mobilisations of previously disenfranchised populations and late-twentieth-century forms of Latin American subalternity – Indigenous political parties and '*sin techo*' urban dwellers among others – have found repressive rejoinders when questioning the paradoxical policy assemblage. That a sharp divide between economic and environmental policy is seen as tenable should be questioned. That such a splitting of postcolonial realities into 'environmental' and 'economic' policy is seen as defensible is something that postdevelopment indeed does challenge. Postdevelopment would interrogate the ease within which the 'post-neoliberal' programme and governmental discourse has become an enabling condition for a regressive economic orientation summed up in Svampa's 'commodities consensus' and its export-oriented thrust. There are specific discontinuities between the experience of post-neoliberalism and the practice of postdevelopment.

## Postdevelopment in practice

It is the aim of this volume to critically engage with postdevelopment ideas. Though it is not a project of theoretical works *per se*, instead we seek to offer a review of postdevelopment practice already underway. There are many such initiatives with which to begin. For instance, the recovery of Indigenous and hybrid economies (Altman 2010, 2016), the reclaiming of radical subjectivities against capitalism and patriarchy (Hook 2012) and the meticulous documenting of diverse and community economies by researchers following the work of Katherine Gibson and Julie Graham (2006, 2008, 2013, 2014) all point to sites where postdevelopment is in practice. Likewise, the recent work of Kelly Dombroski (2015), investigating 'hygiene assemblages' in northwestern China, takes up postdevelopment to guard the health of families, challenging prevalent notions of sanitation and health. The de-commodification of nature and wellbeing mobilised through *sumak kawsay* in the Andean region has also offered possibilities for postdevelopment in practice, often accompanied by intricate and contested negotiations with the post-neoliberal state (Gudynas & Acosta 2011; Caria & Domínguez 2016).[2] Postdevelopment in practice begins with the insistence that an enduring diversity of socialities, a multiplicity of southern knowledges and nature/culture assemblages and postcolonial political economies reveals already existing alternatives.

Our claim is that there have been ongoing and diverse forms of doing postdevelopment, yet paradoxically little acknowledgement of postdevelopment in practice. We are thus motivated by the need to render visible this diversity, to consider its futures and to offer some hope-full pathways. Our own preference for 'postdevelopment' without the hyphen (rather than 'post-development') is meant to purposefully denote the ongoing tension in demanding a temporal break with development, an 'after' development. In contrast, the alternatives in practice are occurring alongside, interspersed with and counter

to development and not awaiting some complete break with development in order to begin. This difference between 'post-development' and 'postdevelopment' has not been explicitly theorised in our reading of the literature. In contrast, in the allied field of postcolonial studies and critique, the 'hyphen' has been explicitly theorised. 'Postcolonialism' there refers to a 'condition, to a project and form of critique, while the hyphen is used primarily as a temporal marker, and thus to emphasise an after of official colonialism' (Mishra & Hodge 1991: 407). To speak of 'postcolonialism' is then to reject that there is a clear after; indeed, we are still marked by the 'coloniality of power' (Quijano 2000). Similarly, Venezuelan anthropologist Fernando Coronil has stated that 'the apparently simple grammatical juxtaposition […] serves as a sign to address the murky entanglement of knowledge and power' (Coronil 2013). The 'post' as suffix, Coronil argues, 'functions both as a temporal marker to refer to the problem of classifying societies in historical time and as an epistemological sign to evoke the problem of producing knowledge of history and society in the context of imperial relations' (Coronil 2013). Postdevelopment in practice is therefore marked by the diversity and complications of a postcolonial present where other contemporaneous worlds may be remade.

These collected works on postdevelopment in practice do not ignore what Gidwani (2008) has called 'capital's hegemonising operations' (217), referring to capital's ability to assimilate forms of life opposing its aspirations. The resiliency of capitalism is real, and in part due to its alluring qualities – what Marx identified as commodity fetishism, what Lordon (2014), drawing on Spinoza, has identified as our willingness to be slaves of capitalism, or what Kapoor (2017) identifies as unconscious libidinal attachments such as desire and enjoyment (*jouissance*) whose nature is reshaped through capitalism. Yet at the same time, one cannot overlook the ways peoples around the world are already living through and beyond the confines of 'development'. Following Dhar and Chakrabarti (2012), there is a *world of the third* – lives that are neither capitalist nor pre-capitalist, but non-capitalist, peoples that are neither within the circuits of global capital nor at the margins of global capitalism. To deny a third space outside, fully contemporaneous and exterior to 'empire-nation exchange' (Spivak 1990: 90), by reductively defining such realities as 'postmodern' or without material foundation, is indeed an imperial project in itself. Further, J.K. Gibson-Graham (2006) have meticulously documented the diverse nature of economy, beyond one of capitalist productivity, accumulation of capital and surplus labour, outlining a necessary rupture in critical discourses' commitment to 'capitalocentrism'. In advancing both a critique and an ethnographically oriented research programme, they have identified three sets of often ignored but common economic relations for sustaining and generating life. First, transactions of goods and services, which can include fair trade markets, co-op exchange, gleaning, Indigenous exchange, gift giving, informal markets and alternative credits. Second, the performance and modes of remuneration of labour such as in-kind, family-care, neighbourhood work, reproductive labour and volunteering. Third, the

production, appropriation and distribution of surplus within different kinds of enterprise, such as nonprofit enterprises, communal, feudal, green capitalism and state enterprise (Gibson-Graham 2006).

Whilst postdevelopment in practice is about holding space for alternative assemblages, at the same time, it cannot overlook the pervasive nature of capital. There is a need for a kind of transition scholarship to go beyond the conventional remit of 'modern' research and rationality. Esteva and Escobar call for a serious exploration of the hypothesis.

> that we will not have modern solutions to modern problems because modernity itself already collapsed. We are in the transition to another era (which is not postmodernism), with the uncertainty created by the fact that old rationalities and sensibilities are obsolete and the new ones are not yet clearly identified.
>
> *(2017: 7)*

Within the Latin American context, such an exploration had led political philosopher Enrique Dussel, whose writings have been central to the work carried out by Escobar and others collected in the modernity/coloniality critique, to speak of 'trans-modernity' as both an epoch and practice (2000).

Postdevelopment in practice is not a matter of 'dreaming up alternatives'; this collection of essays entails examinations of events, lives, practices and knowledges that are different to development. Contributions mark out this third space and the efforts to construct these realities. The authors of this volume have launched their analyses from actually existing postdevelopment, cases that may address in all manner of ways the complex challenges of alternative futures and the diversity of postdevelopment. Therefore, these chapters engage with a range of literatures and theoretical approaches traversing what we have termed 'postdevelopment in practice'.

## The chapters

The first section of this volume outlines theoretical contributions to postdevelopment in practice. We begin with the exchange between Gustavo Esteva and Arturo Escobar reflecting on the continuities and ruptures, but also the continued possibilities and practice of postdevelopment twenty-five years on from the publication of the *Development Dictionary*. S. Charusheela shows that whilst J.K. Gibson Graham's diverse economies is important to loosen the grip of orientalism and modernism, there is a need for a postcolonial feminist lens to explore how vocabularies of race, modernity and gender are built into – and thus performatively express – our organisation of the different modes of production and relations of power within economy. Yoshihiro Nakano illustrates how Yoshirou Tamanoi's theory of regionalism is a precursor to the Japanese school of postdevelopment. Similarly, Sara Caria and Rafael Domínguez draw on Chilean economists Sampedro and

Max Neef to further illuminate Ecuador's *buen vivir* and explore the Latin American genealogies of postdevelopment. Anup Dhar and Anjan Chakrabarti outline their world of the third approach. They argue that postdevelopmental understanding of the 'third world' and the 'local' as a world of the third creates conditions for a reconstructive praxis that is not developmental. The first section of the collection concludes with the exploration of the pluriversal illustrated within the recent *Post-development Dictionary* published by Ashish Kothari, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta.

The second section then focuses in on siting postdevelopment – outlining the ways people negotiate and resist development at the fringes and within, but also how they refuse development and already live alternatives. Bhavya Chitranshi describes shifts in 'single women' subjectivities as an important feminist and postcapitalist project for Adivasi women. Chitranshi documents the becoming of a collective of single women farmers who worked towards a radical postcapitalist and feminist future, a future beyond dictated developmental agendas. Daniel Bendix, Franziska Müller and Aram Ziai illustrate how postdevelopment is not a Global South project, but is also located in the Global North. Their work is a vital reminder of the importance of Northern ruptures and alternatives. Samantha Balaton-Chrimes and Sandeep Pattnaik explore ways in which community aspirations and agencies in the Indian state of Odisha align and depart from a postdevelopment vision. While Katherine Curchin reflects on Altman's notion of hybridity in Indigenous communities in Northern Australia. She traces how the conceptualisation of the hybrid economy includes livelihoods of the informal, non-market or customary and the potential advantages of plural or hybrid economies over the market-dependent and ecologically unsustainable status quo.

Postdevelopment in practice and the state are also considered by several authors in the collection. Miriam Lang shows that whilst integration of the concept of *buen vivir* into governance has been bridled by the modern development paradigm, there continue to be localised zones of depatriarchalisation, decolonialisation and redefinition of social relations with nature. Katharine McKinnon, Stephen Healy and Kelly Dombroski outline a feminist postdevelopment research practice to move beyond a monoculture of knowledge and practice. They outline examples of strategies to recognise multiple ontologies involving gender in Melanesia, breastfeeding practices in China and the politics of postdevelopment scholarship more broadly. Michaela Spencer explores points of rupture in settler-colonial policy making through cosmopolitical diplomacy, reflecting on her experience of working with Indigenous communities in Australia's Northern Territory. Lyn Ossome traces Ugandan women's land struggles and resistance to land dispossession and how their practices of resistance function both as a feminist critique of development and as a praxis *beyond* capitalism. Christopher Shepherd further explores resistance to the Green Revolution in both Peru and East Timor, contrasting twentieth-century agro-biotechnology projects and local and Indigenous knowledges in both experiences. Shepherd's analysis also highlights the tensions and challenges faced by researchers challenging the status quo.

Wendy Harcourt reveals body politics as a critical site of postdevelopment; bodies are considered sites of cultural and political resistance to dominant under-standings of the 'normal' body as White, male, Western and heterosexual. Harcourt shows how body politics have been central not only to the politics of collective action in its queer and feminist iterations but have been key to postdevelopment itself. Julia Schöneberg examines examples of solidarity groups and social move-ments in Haiti to explore spaces for alternatives to development. She specifically observes possible shifts in North-South relationships from apolitical development projects towards interactions as a form of 'development-as-politics', in which local social movements and international NGOs jointly engage in resistance struggles. Anyely Marín Cisneros and Rebecca Close, decolonial curators working in Barce-lona and Guayaquil, examine the role of art practice as a space of experimentation and invention capable of interrupting narratives of financial capitalism and its logic of 'progress' through context-specific tactics of critique. Tony Fry outlines how design is ontologically prefigurative of futuring worlds, and as such has specific links to postdevelopment and decoloniality. Verónica Tello explores the tensions and complementarities of postdevelopment in artistic practice. Postdevelopment as art can offer a promising site for the practice of postdevelopment, although Tello reminds us the risks of not getting it right and becoming the usual *modus operandi* of art history and practice.

Our book seeks to engage with these invigorating approaches and to canvas alternative horizons. We are concerned, specifically, with the already existing approaches that are up to the challenge of retrieving and appraising the know-ledges and practices underway in these diverse sites of postdevelopment. To put forward postdevelopment in practice is a rejoinder to the ongoing disavowal of theoretical critique via appeals to empirical applicability and further intervention. Our book may thus serve as a collection of contemporary approaches, under-scoring the theoretical and political moves undertaken to encompass the diver-sity of alternatives already underway.

## Notes

1 Nikolas Rose (2003) examines the sharp increase in the sales of psychiatric drugs around the world. Between the period of 1990–2000, sales increased in Europe by 125% and 600% in the USA.
2 As discussed earlier, post-neoliberalism is both an attempt to do away with neoliberal-ism in the early and mid-2000s together with the paradoxical turn to expanding extractive industries, greater foreign investment and the reliance on the 'commodities boom'. Whilst some have seen *buen vivir* or 'good living' as part of the post-neoliberal moment, and part of the post-neoliberal project insofar as it became official discourse in Ecuador and Bolivia, and briefly though to a lesser extent in Venezuela, we do not see *buen vivir* and its more strongly Indigenous appellations in Quechua *sumak kawsay* and Aymara *sumaq qamaña* as reducible to the post-neoliberal policies of these govern-ments' executive branches. The point is that *buen vivir*, and not its being coupled with extractivism by left-turn governments, represents a novel postdevelopment discourse and resource for practice.

# References

Altman, J. (2010) 'What future for remote Indigenous Australia?: Economic Hybridity and the neoliberal turn'. In Altman, J. & Hinkson, M. (eds.), *Culture Crisis: Anthropology and Politics in Aboriginal Australia*. Sydney: UNSW Press, pp 259–280.

Altman, J. (2016) 'Basic income for remote Indigenous Australia: Prospects for a livelihoods approach in neoliberal times'. In Mays, J., Marston, G. & Tomlinson, J. (eds.), *Basic Income in Australia and New Zealand: Perspectives from Neoliberal Frontiers*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson, W. (2009) 'From subjugated knowledge to conjugated subjects: Science and globalisation, or postcolonial studies of science?' *Postcolonial Studies*, vol 12, no 4, pp 389–400.

Bakewell, O. (2008) '"Keeping Them in Their Place": The Ambivalent Relationship between Development and Migration in Africa'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 29, no. 7, pp 1341–1358.

Batiwala, S. (2007) 'Taking the power out of empowerment – Experiential account'. *Development in Practice*, vol 17, no 4, pp 557–565.

Blaser, M. (2009) 'The political ontology of a sustainable hunting program'. *American Anthropologist*, vol 111, no 1, pp 12–20.

Blaser, M. (2013) 'Ontological conflicts and the stories of peoples in spite of Europe: Towards a conversation on political ontology'. *Current Anthropology*, vol 54, no 5, pp 547–568.

Caria, S. & Domínguez, R. (2016) 'Ecuador's buen vivir: A new ideology for development'. *Latin American Perspectives*, vol 43, no 1, pp 18–33.

Chakrabarti, A. & Dhar, A. (2012) 'Gravel in the shoe: Nationalism and world of the third'. *Rethinking Marxism*, vol 24, no 1, pp 106–123.

Ciccariello-Maher, G. (2014) 'Building the commune: Insurgent government, communal state'. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol 113, no 4, pp 791–806.

Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Cooke, B. & Kothari, U. (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London and New York: Zed Books.

Coronil, F. (2013) 'Latin American postcolonial studies and global decolonisation'. *Worlds & Knowledges Otherwise*, vol 3, dossier 3, Spring.

Coulthard, G. (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

D'Costa, A.P. (2014) 'Compressed capitalism and development'. *Critical Asian Studies*, vol 46, no 2, pp 317–344.

Demaria, F. & Kothari, A. (2017) 'The post-development dictionary agenda: Paths to the pluriverse'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, no 12, pp 2588–2599.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2009). 'A non-Occidentalist West?: Learned ignorance and ecology of knowledge'. *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol 26, no 7–8, pp 103–125.

Dhar, A. & Chakrabarti, A. (2013) 'The world of the third', conference paper, pp 1–18.

Dombroski, K. (2015) 'Multiplying possibilities: A postdevelopment approach to hygiene and sanitation in Northwest China'. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, vol 56, no 3, pp 321–334.

Donovan, K.P. (2014) '"Development" as if we have never been modern: Fragments of a Latourian development studies'. *Development and Change*, vol 45, no 5, pp 869–894.

Douzinas, C. (2000) *The End of Human Rights: Critical Legal Thought at the Turn of the Century*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

**14**   Elise Klein and Carlos Eduardo Morreo

Dussel, E. (2002). 'World-System and "trans"-modernity'. *Nepantla: Views from South*, vol 3, no 2, pp 221–244.

Ehrenreich, B. (2010) *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Engle-Merry, S. (2011) 'Measuring the world indicators, human rights, and global governance'. *Current Anthropology*, vol 52, Supplement 3, pp S83–S95.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (2011) 'Sustainability: Design for the pluriverse'. *Development*, vol 54, no 2, pp 137–140.

Escobar, A. (2015) 'Degrowth, postdevelopment, and transitions: A preliminary conversation'. *Sustainability Science*, vol 10, no 3, pp 451–462.

Escobar, A. (2018) *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependecne, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Esteva, G. & Escobar, A. (2017) 'Post-development @ 25: On "being stuck" and moving forward, sideways, backward and otherwise'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, pp. 2559–2572.

Ferguson, J. (1994) *The Anti-politics Machine: Development, Depoliticisation, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2008) 'Diverse economies: Performative practices for other worlds'. *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 32, no 5, pp 613–632.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2013) 'Being the revolution, or, how to live in a "more-than-capitalist" world threatened with extinction'. *Rethinking Marxism*, vol 26, no 1, pp 76–94.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2014) 'Rethinking the economy with thick description and weak theory'. *Current Anthropology*, vol 55, Supplement 9, pp S147–S153.

Gidwani, V. (2008) *Captial Interrupted: Agrarian Development and the Politics of Work in India*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gudynas, E. & Acosta, A. (2011) 'La renovación de la crítica al desarrollo y el buen vivir como alternativa'. *Utopía Y Praxis Latinoamericana*, vol 16, no 53, pp 71–83.

Harcourt, W. (2009) *Body Politics in Development: Critical Debates in Gender and Development*. London: Zed Books.

Harcourt, W. & Nelson, I. (2015) *Practising Feminist Political Ecologies: Moving Beyond the Green Economy*. London: Zed Books.

Harding, S. (2011) *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harding, S. (2016) 'Latin American decolonial social studies of scientific knowledge'. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, vol 41, no 6, pp 1063–1087.

Harootunian, H. (2012) '"Memories of underdevelopment" after area studies'. *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*, vol 20, no 1, pp 7–35.

Harriss-White, B. (2006) 'Poverty and capitalism'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol 41, no 13, pp 1–14.

Holst, J. (2016). 'Colonial histories and decolonial dreams in the Ecuadorean Amazon: Natural resources and the politics of post-neoliberalism'. *Latin American Perspectives*, vol 43, no 1, pp 200–220.

Hook, D. (2012) *A Critical Psychology of the Post-colonial: The Mind of Apartheid*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kapoor, I. (2017) 'Cold critique, faint passion, bleak future: Post development's surrender to global capitalism'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, pp 2664–2683.

Kapur, R. (2005) *Erotic Justice: Law and the New Politics of Postcolonialism*. London: The Glass House Press.

Kaul, N. (2007) *Imagining Economics Otherwise: Encounters with Identity/Difference*. London: Routledge.

Kayatekin, S.A. (2009) 'Between political economy and postcolonial theory: First encounters'. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol 33, no 6, pp 1113–1118.

Klein, N. (2015) *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kothari, U. (2005) *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*. London: Zed Books.

Latouche, S. (1993) *In the Wake of an Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-development*, trans. Arnoux, M.O.C.a.R. London: Zed Books.

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. (2015) 'What's wrong with a one-world world?' *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, vol 16, no 1, pp 126–139.

Law, J. & Singleton, V. (2013) 'ANT and politics: Working in and on the world'. *Qualitative Sociology*, vol 36, no 4, pp 485–502.

Li, T. (2007) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development and the Practice of Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lie, J.H.S. (2007) 'Post-development and discourse–agency interface'. In Ziai, A. (ed.), *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*, pp 47–62. Abington: Routledge.

Lohmann, L. (2011) 'Capital and climate change'. *Development and Change*, vol 42, no 2, pp 649–668.

Long, N. (2001) *Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Lordon, F. (2014) *Willing Slaves of Capital: Spinoza and Marx on Desire*. London: Verso Books.

Lugones, M. (2016) 'The coloniality of gender'. In Harcourt, W. (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Development Critical Engagements in Feminist Theory and Practice*, pp 13–33. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007) 'On the coloniality of being'. *Cultural Studies*, vol 21, no 2, pp 240–270.

Martínez-Alier, J. (2012) 'Environmental justice and economic degrowth: An alliance between two movements'. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, vol 23, no 1, pp 51–73.

Matthews, S. (2017) 'Colonised minds? Post-development theory and the desirability of development in Africa'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, no 12, pp 2650–2663.

McFarlane, C. (2006) 'Transnational development networks: Bringing development and postcolonial approaches into dialogue'. *Geographical Journal*, vol 172, no 1, pp 35–49.

Mezzadra, S., Reid, J. & Samaddar, R. (2013) *The Biopolitics of Development: Reading Michel Foucault in the Postcolonial Present*. New Delhi: Springer.

Mignolo, W. (2011) *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mills, C. (2014) *Decolonizing Global Mental Health: The Psychiatrization of the Majority World*. New York: Routledge.

Mishra, V. & Hodge, B. (1991) 'What is post(-)colonialism?' *Textual Practice*, vol 5, no 3, pp 399–414.

Mitchell, T. (2002) *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mohanty, C. (2003) '"Under Western eyes" revisited: Feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles'. *Signs*, vol 28, no 2, pp 499–535.

Mosse, D. (2013) 'The anthropology of international development'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol 42, no 1, pp 227–246.

Nakano, Y. (2007) 'On the singular name of post-development: Serge Latouche's Destrucktion of development and the possiblity of emancipation'. In Ziai, A. (ed.), *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*, pp 63–80. Abington: Routledge.

Nandy, A. (2002) 'The beautiful, expanding future of poverty: Popular economics as a psychological defense'. *International Studies Review*, vol 4, no 2, pp 107–121.

Nussbaum, M. (2001) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peck, J. & Theodore, N. (2007) 'Variegated capitalism'. *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 31, no 6, pp 731–772.

Quijano, A. (2000) 'Coloniality of power and eurocentrism in Latin America'. *International Sociology*, vol 15, no 2, pp 215–232.

Rahnema, M. (1997) 'Towards post-development: Searching for signposts, a new language and new paradigm'. In Rahnema, M. & Bawtree, V. (eds.), *The Post-development Reader*, pp 377–404. London: Zed Books.

Rajão, R. & Duque, R.B. (2014) 'Between purity and hybridity: Technoscientific and ethnic myths of Brazil'. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, vol 39, no 6, pp 844–874.

Reddy, S. & Lahoti, R. (2016) '$1.90 a day: What does it say? The new international poverty line'. *New Left Review*, 97. https://newleftreview.org/II/97/sanjay-reddy-rahul-lahoti-1-90-a-day-what-does-it-say.

Rose, N. (2003) 'Neurochemical selves'. *Society*, vol 41, no 4, pp 46–59.

Ruckert, A., Macdonald, L. & Proulx, K.R. (2017) 'Post-neoliberalism in Latin America: A conceptual review'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, no 7, pp 1583–1602.

Sachs, W. (2017) 'The sustainable development goals and Laudato si': Varieties of post-development?'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, no 12, pp 2573–2587.

Santelices Spikin, A. & Rojas Hernández, J. (2016) 'Climate change in Latin America: Inequality, conflict, and social movements of adaptation'. *Latin American Perspectives*, vol 43, no 4, pp 4–11.

Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (2009) *The Idea of Justice*. New York: Penguin Books.

Shafiee, K. (2012) 'A petro-formula and its world: Calculating profits, labour and production in the assembling of Anglo-Iranian oil'. *Economy and Society*, vol 41, no 4, pp 585–614.

Spivak, G. (1990) 'Gayatri Spivak on the politics of the subaltern'. *Socialist Review*, vol 3, pp 81–97.

Svampa, M. (2015) 'Commodities consensus: Neoextractivism and enclosure of the commons in Latin America'. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol 114, no 1, pp 65–82.

Tlostanova, M. (2017) 'On decolonizing design'. *Design Philosophy Papers*, vol 15, no 1, pp 51–61.

Walsh, C. (2016) 'On gedner and its "otherwise"'. In Harcourt, W. (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Development: Critical Engagements in Feminist Theory and Practice*, pp 34–47. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watson, I. (2009) 'Aboriginality and the violence of colonialism'. *Borderlands*, vol 8, no 1, pp 1–8.

Weber, H. (2010) 'Politics of global social relations: Organising "everyday lived experiences" of development and destitution'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol 64, no 1, pp 105–122.

Wilson, K. (2017) 'Worlds beyond the political? Post-development approaches in practices of transnational solidarity activism'. *Third World Quarterly*, vol 38, no 12, pp 2684–2702.

Zein-Elabdin, E.O. (2009) 'Economics, postcolonial theory and the problem of culture: Institutional analysis and hybridity'. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol 33, no 6, pp 1153–1167.

Zein-Elabdin, E.O. & Charusheela, S. (2004) *Postcolonialism Meets Economics* (Vol. 24). London: Routledge.

Ziai, A. (2007) *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ziai, A. (2013) 'The discourse of "development" and why the concept should be abandoned'. *Development in Practice*, vol 23, no 1, pp 123–136.