This chapter is bifocal. On the one hand, it takes us beyond Development Studies and makes space for ‘praxis’, praxis as the foreclosed of the University Discourse (Lacan, 2007 [1969-70]) obsessed with ‘studies’; praxis as also the foreclosed of a development sector obsessed with ‘intervention’ and ‘implementation’.

On the other, it puts to critical interrogation the extant cartography ‘first world/third world’ and developed/under-developed (Spivak, 1985; Berger, 1994: 269). The interrogation also stems from the “desire to assert a logic of difference and possibility against the homogenizing [and hegemonic] tendencies of globalization and the teleological generalities of political economy” (Gibson-Graham, 2016: 288). The chapter makes space for a new cartography marked by the *overdetermined* (Althusser 1962)\(^1\) and dynamic boundaries between the ‘circuits of global capital’ and ‘world of the third’; where world of the third is marking contingent *outsided-ness* with respect to the circuits of global capital and capital’s language-

---

\(^1\) A version of this paper is forthcoming in *Postdevelopment in Practice*, Ed. Elise Klein and Carlos Morreo Boada, Routledge: New York and London.
logic-experience-ethos; where world of the third is also about a third that is both present and absent – present in terms of “forms of life” but absent in discourse: the discourse of global capitalism and inclusive developmentalism, a discourse marked in turn by “capitalocentrism” (Gibson-Graham, 1996) and “Orientalism” (Said, 1978). It is about a third world (not “third world”): a world beyond what are conventionally known as first worlds and third worlds. It is about a third kind of experience: an experience that is neither capitalist nor pre-capitalist but non-capitalist (which in turn could be the ground for postcapitalist subject formation and “a politics of emplacement”. “Not a politics of identity per se, but a politics of the co-production of subjects and places. A politics of becoming in place” (Gibson-Graham, 2016: 288).

The movement from (i) third world to (ii) world of the third as space and (iii) world of the third as place is a movement from (a) ‘space-as-lacking’ (third world is seen as the pre-capitalist lacking other of a capitalist first world) to (b) space-as-marking-difference to (c) place – place as the “site and spur of [possible] becoming”. Possible becoming, because it is praxis that births world of the third as place. There is however no guarantee that world of the third as (non-capitalist) space (unhooked from the circuits of global capital) shall transform into world of the third as (postcapitalist) place; the transformation is birthed through (postdevelopmental) praxis. World of the third births the necessity of transformative praxis, postcapitalist praxis. Praxis in turn births the possibility of world of the third as place.

The chapter also turns to the know-how in/of the ‘world of the third’; the assumption: world of the third is the space where the “know-how” of what Lacan (2007) calls ‘slave’ and what we call the adivasi and the Dalit reside. “The recovery of the other selves of cultures and communities, selves not defined by the dominant global consciousness” is perhaps “the first task
of social criticism and political activism and the first responsibility of intellectual stock-taking” (Nandy, 1989: 265) in postdevelopment praxis.

The nascent idea of Development Practice (not Development Studies), which at present has taken the form of an ‘immersion’ and ‘action research’-based MPhil programme at Ambedkar University, Delhi, tries to “span the gap between the academy and activism, engaging in place-based action research involving both university and community-based researchers/activists” and inaugurate in the “beehive” of the University (Derrida, 2003) the foreclosed question of praxis and of the “slave’s know-how”. The idea of Development Practice – inspired by the reflection of Tagore’s (2009: 137-160) Sriniketan in the rearview mirror and Gibson-Graham’s (2016: 289) “a politics of becoming in place” in the windscreen view – is an attempt at also ‘breaking the silo’ and at integrating (development) studies and practice (see www.cdp.res.in). Our action research projects have aimed to “recognize and value” the distinctive economic, political, cultural and nature-nurturing “capabilities of localities” or ‘world of the third’ (Chakrabarti and Dhar, 2009), and have tried to build upon the know-how and the ethics of practices within, through nourishing extant communal practices, as also constructing alternative economic, political and cultural institutions.

**Postdevelopment: Beyond Global-local**

In the context of this chapter, the postdevelopmental perspective gestures towards three related moves. One, the ‘post’ of postdevelopment gestures towards ‘critique’; critique of existing paradigms of development. Two, postdevelopment is about rethinking space; rethinking the
‘local’ as against globality-globalisation; rethinking third world. The space-designated world of the third is in that sense in tune with the postdevelopment perspective of rethinking space (Chakrabarti and Dhar, 2009; Chakrabarti et al, 2016). Three, the postdevelopmental perspective is also about thinking praxis beyond statist developmental interventions or mere intervention-implementation programmes. It is to think developmental praxis in terms of local contexts, community participation as also to learn to learn from below. This is where the action research programme in Development Practice becomes relevant in terms of three departures: one, immersion (as against field work) in community contexts, rural and forest societies; two, co-researching with community to arrive at the action research problematic and three, co-authoring with community ‘transformative social praxis’, which is, in turn, informed by social justice and well-being considerations.

To make sense of postdevelopment as also to practise postdevelopment, this chapter brings to dialogue the immanent praxis of the ‘located micro-political’ in Gibson-Graham (2006) and the utopian near-transcendent gesture of an ‘alternative to development’ in Escobar (1995) and Nandy (1989). The former marks differance with respect to capitalocentrism (capitalocentrism is ‘capitalism of thought’; critiques of capitalism are not immune to capitalism of thought) (see Spivak, 1994); the latter marks differance with respect to modernism. Further, if development is the substitute signifier for capitalism, postdevelopment needs to gesture towards postcapitalist politics. Postdevelopment also gestures towards a post-Orientalist perspective; hence the need to rethink topos, rethink cartographies; rethink third wordlism; hence the turn to world of the third.

Five questions thus become important in postdevelopmental praxis: (a) doing, not just knowing (postdevelopment is not just writing about wrongs, but about righting wrongs [Spivak.
(b) doing what: i.e. doing differently, doing postdevelopmentally and not developmentally, marking economic difference (c) doing with and not doing on (hence immersion, hence co-researching, co-authoring transformation as in the action research programme in Development Practice), (d) doing where, not ‘third world’ but ‘world of the third’ and (e) doing with who: not the underdeveloped, but the different; not the appropriate(d), but the inappropriate(d) in subaltern subject positions; not the third worldist subject of lack.

The University Unthought³: from ‘field-work’ to ‘working-in-the-fields’

Two departures create the ground for postdevelopment praxis. One, the movement from third world as the space-of-lack to world of the third as place of difference. Two, the movement beyond (development) ‘studies’. One can turn to Tagore⁴ (1861-1941) – poet, writer, educationist, philosopher and founder of Sriniketan (the ‘abode of the aesthetic’) – an institution of alternative pedagogy and grassroots level transformative social praxis involving the lokavidyas (see Basole, 2015), i.e. the ‘know-how of subaltern bricoleurs’ – to get a sense of such a beyond to mere ‘studies’ as also to the classical university imagination, an imagination steeped in and limited to the teaching of the cognitivist sciences. While the focus on ‘studies’ sharpened largely the intellectual self, Tagore inaugurated in the ‘culture of the self’ in Sriniketan the creative expression and praxis of the affective, the aesthetic, and the ethical; the praxis of being-in-the-world⁵; being-with-nature; the praxis of labouring activities in the “average everydayness” of the ashram; the praxis of self- and social transformation. Tagore’s turn to Sriniketan could thus be seen as a departure from the kind of cognitivist student subject
the University mass-produces; such mass production of cognitivist student subjects in turn creates a culture of *turning away* from the masses.

Thus Tagore was not only outgrowing the discursive liminalities of enlightened progressivism and state-driven top-down official developmental fantasies, but was also formulating his own theories and practice of integrated and grounded ‘human development’ (Tagore, 2011: 160; Sen, 1984). We argue in this chapter that the experience of an experiment called *Sriniketan* could also be seen as his way of re-creating, re-constructing the rural everyday and the hugely important role education and educational institutions should play in that exercise (Roy, 2010: 679; Tagore, 2017). Sriniketan would, for Tagore, “ultimately bridge the ever-widening gap between the country and the city; a gap, that originated from the unleashing of forces of ‘colonial modernity’ by the imperial rulers” (Roy, 2010: 679). Sriniketan was also the site for projects for rural reconstruction, co-operative movements, agricultural banking, and new methods in agriculture, largely amongst adivasis and Dalits. Tagore states in the prospectus (1925) for “A Viswa-Bharati Institute for Rural Reconstruction at Sriniketan”: The aim of the Institute is the *coordination of brain and hand* (Tagore, 2011: 137-139). The objectives of Sriniketan were (somewhat postdevelopmental): (a) “to bring back life in its completeness into the villages making then self-reliant and self-respectful, acquainted with the cultural tradition of their own country, and competent to make an efficient [and critical] use of the modern resources”, (b) “to win the friendship and affection of the villagers and cultivators by taking real interest in all that concerns their life and [...] by making a lively effort to assist them in solving their most pressing problems”, (c) “to take the problems of the village and field to the classroom”, (d) “to carry the knowledge and experience gained in the classroom and experimental farm [back] to the villages” etc. The coordination between knowing and doing,
thought and action, theory and practice, however remained central in *Sriniketan*. Tagore thus was not just *studi**ng* the village; or gathering data, or conducting surveys; he was trying to *reconstruct* village life.

**Beyond Theoria: Return to Phronesis-Praxis**

Lacan foregrounds the *theft, abduction* and *stealing* of the slave’s ‘know-how’ (not just ‘surplus labor’, as suggested by Marx), through the manoeuvres of the Master in Plato’s dialogues, a know-how that was intimately tied to labouring practices. What we call *episteme* is, as if, premised on the *extraction* of the essence of the know-how embedded in the everyday praxis of the craftsmen, of the serfs, of women working in households. Theoretical knowledge or what Aristotle calls *theoria* in its historical function is *this* extraction, of the slave’s know-how, in order to obtain its transmutation [first] into the ‘Master’s Discourse’ and then into the ‘University Discourse’ (2007 [1969-70]). This would also lead to a historical *hyper-separation* of theory and practice (this hyper-separation is of course not a feature of the slave’s life-world; this is what Lacan would like to argue) – a hyper-separation Marx and Tagore (as also Heidegger and Arendt [2005]) would be worried about. The abduction of the slave’s or subaltern’s know-how thus resulted in, one, a “loss of concepts” (see Lear, 2006) in what we have designated the world of the third. It also led, two, to a distilling out of the ‘know-ing’ component of the register of the ‘know-how’ from the slave or the subaltern’s world to the Master’s grip. The ‘know-ing’ component appropriated by the Master later came to be known as the University’s knowledge repository as also the *function* of the University. The ‘how’ component of the register of the ‘know-how’ (i.e. the “how to” or the “how of doing things”) got relegated to the now denigrated
register of ‘hand’ (of the brain/hand binary), ‘labour’ (of the intellect-labour binary), and practice (of the studies/practice binary). The hand-labour-practice space also became the space of the slave/subaltern; or the space of the slave/subaltern became the space of the use of the hand, of labour and of practice. Thought was on the Master’s side; or inside the secure perimeters of the University. Postdevelopmental praxis inaugurates a relationship not just with the world of the third, but the know-how that resides inside the world of the third. It thus takes us beyond mere theoria or mere knowing and opens space for transformative praxis. It re-integrates, on the one hand, know-how and world of the third and on the other, the register of the know-how and the slave/subaltern.

This chapter on postdevelopment praxis and the action research programme in Development Practice also remains informed by Heidegger’s (1985, 1997; Long, 2002) turn to the Aristotelian concept (invoked in Book IV of the *Nichomachean Ethics*) of phronesis (as distinct from episteme), phronesis as practical reason (as distinct from theoretical reason), phronesis as reasoning based on concrete practical action (as distinct from speculative reason), phronesis as reason based on experience (as distinct from abstract deductions) (see Dhar and Chakrabarti 2016). The action research programme in Development Practice is an attempt at turning to the “lost tradition” of practical philosophy and its forgotten companion concepts: phronesis and praxis, concepts that have been “rendered marginal” and “face something approaching total obliteration” in the dominant culture of modernity (see Carr 2006: 434 and Gadamer 1980).
Beyond Practice: Beyond Poiesis

“Practical” behaviour is not “atheoretical” in the sense of sightlessness [i.e. a lack of seeing]. The way it differs from theoretical behaviour does not lie simply in the fact that in theoretical behaviour one observes, while in practical behaviour one acts [gehandeltwird], and that action must apply theoretical cognition if it is not to remain blind; for the fact that observation is a kind of concern [or taking care] is just as primordial as the fact that action has its own kind of sight [seeing].

(Heidegger 1985: 99)

If one side of the problem is theoria or observation without concern/care, the other side of the problem is practice or action that is blind. Practice is also normalised through repetition. One hence needs to re-conceptualise practice beyond poiesis and techne. Poiesis refers to a form of ‘making’ whose end is known prior to the practical means taken to achieve it, poiesis is guided by the form of reasoning that the Greeks called techne and that we would today call instrumental ‘means-end’ reasoning. Poiesis is thus a form of instrumental action that requires a prior mastery of the knowledge, methods and skills that together constitute technical expertise. Developmental practices often take the form of ‘applied science’, which provide the principles, procedures and operational methods which together constitute the most effective means for achieving some pre-determined end (see Carr 2006, p. 426; Chakrabarti and Dhar 2013). Development could be thought from the perspective of poiesis; it could also be thought from the perspective of praxis. Praxis is to progressively realise the idea of the ‘‘good’’ that is constitutive of a morally worthwhile form and quality of life. The ‘‘end’’ of praxis hence is not to make or produce some object or artefact. The good of praxis, however, cannot be ‘‘made’’: it can only be ‘‘done’’ or
realized. Praxis is thus a form of “‘doing’” action precisely because its “‘end’” – to arrive at good life – “only exists, and can only be realized, in and through praxis itself” (Carr 2006, p. 426).

Praxis also differs from poiesis in that knowledge of its end cannot be theoretically specified in advance and can only be acquired on the basis of an understanding of how, in a particular concrete situation, this knowledge is being interpreted and applied. Praxis is thus nothing other than a practical manifestation of how the idea of the good is being progressively understood, just as knowledge of the good is nothing other than an abstract way of specifying the mode of human conduct through which this idea is given practical expression. In praxis, acquiring knowledge of what the good is and knowing how to apply it in particular situations are thus not two separate processes but two mutually constitutive elements within a single dialectical process of practical reasoning (see Carr, 2006: 426; also see Dunne, 1993)

This chapter hence tries to replace poiesis in development with praxis. It also connects praxis to phronesis. The chapter presents development as not just a technique but as a question of praxis – where theories of development and practices of development are in a mutually constitutive relationship – as also phronesis. By turning to the concept of phronesis the chapter puts to question universalist theories and practices of development and makes development a particularized endeavour, an endeavour intimately and inalienably tied to what Heidegger calls the with-which – the with-which of the community context or what Haraway (1992) designates as a “series of ‘situated knowledges,’ part fact and part fiction, which are ‘artifactual’” (Watts in Crush 2005: 55).

We thus highlight the need to move, in contexts of development, first, from theoria to practice; second from mere repetitive practice to praxis, thus bringing theoria and practice to dialogue; third, from poiesis to praxis, i.e. from repetitive making/production to reflective doing,
from instrumental action to reflexive processes; fourth, relate to and engage with the particularities of the community with which the praxis of development is attempted. We also highlight the need to move, in contexts of development, from material development to human development; and from human development to community initiated ‘new social movements’ – new social movements as the medium through which alternative discourses to (rather than of) development are being articulated – new social movements as ground for ‘a more radical imagining of alternative futures’ – new social movements as polyvalent, local, dispersed and fragmented (Porter in Crush, 2005: 61-84; Escobar in Crush, 2005: 205-222).

Praxis also “concerns the transition from what Althusser (see Dhar and Chakrabarti, 2015: 225) designated “practical truth” (which is practiced or experienced) to the “theory of that truth or to its concept”; as also the inundating of theory, truth or concept in the “dirty” immanence of practice (see Marx, 2016 [1845]). Althusser credits Lacan for having shown that the problems of psychoanalytic technique cannot be resolved at the level of technique, that “a leap” and “recourse to theory” was needed; the problems of theory may also not get resolved at the level of theory, a “dip” into practice and polis (see Arendt, 2005) was needed. This however does not mean that there is, on the one hand, pure and simple technique, which would be practiced by people without any idea of theory and to whom that theory must be taught so that they can then nuance or reform their technique. The conflict is not between a pure technique without theory and pure theory. There is no pure technique. Any technique that wants to be pure technique is, in fact, according to Althusser, an “ideology of technique”, that is, a “false theory”. Such “ideology” or “false theory” is most often the “obligatory mate” of one’s “false innocence as pure technicians”. How would one, in the turning away from ‘pure Studies’ and the turn to practice, not become pure “technicians” of development? How would one reach the “truth” of
one’s developmental practice(s)? How would one refine, temper and re-form truth in practice? Praxis – postdevelopmental praxis – attempts to bring the ‘practice of truth’ and the ‘truth of practice’ to dialogue.

**Beyond Development**

Development can be disaggregated into hegemonic forms of development (i.e. growth, industrialisation, progressive journey from a ‘third world-ish’ traditional economy to a modern capitalist economy so as to get rid of mass poverty), ‘alternative forms of development’ (i.e. the human development approach, growth with redistribution, means to better quality of life and well-being etc.) and ‘alternatives to development’\(^7\) (i.e. postdevelopmentalist positions). While the first two share a somewhat unexamined commitment to modernisation and capitalism, the third problematises modernism. One can also argue for a fourth position that problematises both modernism and capitalism. Not just modernism and capitalism, but Orientalism (i.e. the hierarchical division of the world into the [developed] West and the [under-developed] ‘rest’) and capitalo-centrism (i.e. the description of world and experience from the standpoint of capital and the consequent division of the world into the capitalist/developed and the pre-capitalist/not-yet-capitalist/under-developed remainder). The fourth position problematises ‘socio-economic dualism’; which is the process of representing and interpellating an otherwise complex, decentred, disaggregated and heterogeneous socio-economic reality into the logic of the two, ‘p’ and ‘~p’, where the former (p) is valued and the other (~p) is seen as ‘lacking p’ and is hence devalued, where developed is valued, underdeveloped is devalued; capital is valued, non-capital is devalued and represented in turn as pre-capital; modern is valued, pre-modern is devalued.
Resultantly, asserting “a logic of difference and possibility against the homogenizing [and hegemonic] tendencies of globalization and the teleological generalities of political economy” (Gibson-Graham, 2016: 288) nurturing ‘what are not capitalist’ class existences into postcapitalist futures becomes impossible.

We argue that the experience of developmental is not structured on the logic of the two, but, instead, on the logic of the three: (i) modernism/capitalism as ‘p’, (ii) the lacking other/third world as ‘~p’ which is however foregrounded and (iii) the foreclosed Other/world of the third. If third world is the constitutive inside, or the ‘appropriate(d) other’ of development then world of the third is the constitutive outside, the ‘inappropriate(d) Other’. Development’s object of control and regulation is not third world, but instead world of the third. World of the third as the harbinger of a non-capitalist language-logic-lived experience-ethic outside of and beyond the circuits of (global) capitalist modernity; and that puts under erasure capitalist ethic and language. However, in developmental logic world of the third is displaced into ‘third world’ – third world as pre-capitalist – as a lower step in the ladder of linear time. World of the third as also the critique of the capitalist present and future is thus reduced to a third wordlist past. Building on Gibson-Graham (2006) and the work of the Community Economies collective, we, in the action research programme in Development Practice have tried to work through world of the third as non-capitalist space to world of the third as postcapitalist place; Bhavya Chitranshi’s (2018) chapter in this volume is a narrative of this difficult, uncertain and incomplete ‘working through’ from space to place.
Beyond Third Worldism: Rethinking Development as *Reconstruction*

The *essential difference between the various economic forms of society*, between, for instance, a society based on slave labour, and one based on wage-labour, *lies only in the mode in which this surplus labour is in each case extracted from the actual producer*, the labourer.


Development has been the primary mechanism through which the third world has been imagined and has imagined itself, thus precluding other ways of seeing and doing (Escobar in Crush 2005, p. 206-7). This section argues that world of the third as space is another way of *seeing* what has hitherto been designated ‘third world’ and engendering world of the third as place is another way of *doing* what has hitherto been designated as developmental practices. This section generates the angle of such seeing and the axis of such doing through a remapping of what the discourse of development has designated as third world. It remaps through the deployment of the ‘entry point’ of economic qua class as processes of surplus labour (Resnick and Wolff, 1987) in an otherwise overdetermined reality. Through class as processes of surplus labour this section revisits the capitalist/pre-capitalist divide that has become paradigmatic for much of our description of the third world. This section critiques this description of the third world as *lacking/lagging* other and as *pre*-capitalist or *under*-developed. Through a close study of class as processes of surplus labour we arrive at a new cartography of ‘circuits of global capital’-‘world of the third’ in a hyphenated (*not* slash) relation of mutual, dynamic and ever-shifting constitutivity. The cartography of the circuits of global capital and world of the third is important because what was hitherto known as first world and third world is now seen to be split and splintered in many directions; or perhaps it was always already split in an infinite multiplicity of possibilities; it was
we who had rendered the real infinity and the multiplicity hostage to a homogeneously pre-
capitalist, underdeveloped, backward and superstitious bloc: the third world. This is an attempt to
not lapse into the either/or that is currently dominating us: either the third world is a
homogeneous presence, somewhat eternal, pure and pristine; or the third world is slowly getting
annihilated and erased from existence – representative of unthinking modernist positions. This
section shows that what was known as first world and third world could be re-written as the
unresolved and unfinished dialectic between the circuits of global capital and world of the third.
The redrawing of the cartography of the third world creates conditions or ground for the political
or more precisely, the politics of place. Third world has hitherto been seen as our past; a past to
be transcended. The redrawing of the cartography helps us see the world of the third as the
future; not the whole of the world of the third; not the world of the third as a homogeneous
entity; but a fragment of the world of the third (Chakrabarti, Dhar and Cullenberg, 2012); a
fragment that is cocooned in the world of the third as space, but which, however, is also crypted
(see Abraham and Torok, 1986). Cocooned designates presence; that which is cocooned (is)
inside. Crypted points to absence; that which is crypted is hidden, veiled, occulted from view,
from consideration. We contend that that which is cocooned yet crypted in the world of the third
as space constitutes the postdevelopmental or postcapitalist future/politics of place. The study of
economic qua class as processes of surplus labour takes us to the doorstep of that which is
‘cocooned yet crypted’.

This section of the chapter looks at ‘economic reality’ in terms of a multiplicity of
mutually constitutive and even contradictory subject positions/forms of life or praxis (in this case
practices of labouring) – contradictory because the same subject may occupy non-exploitative
and exploitative class positions – and not in terms of the paradigmatic framework ‘p/~p’
(developed/underdeveloped, modern/traditional, capitalist/feudal, progressive/backward, scientific/superstitious). Table 1 gives us a sense of the class positions one could possibly occupy with respect to performance and appropriation of surplus (Chaudhury and Chakrabarti, 2000). The first and second alphabet in Table 1 stands for performance and appropriation of surplus respectively. For example, AA signifies performance and appropriation by the same ‘undivided’ self. AB signifies performance by an individual ‘A’ and appropriation by another non-performing individual ‘B’. C signifies a collective of performers/appropriators:

**Table 1: Class Process and Modes of Appropriation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation of surplus labour</th>
<th>Performance of Surplus Labour</th>
<th>Individual Labour (A)</th>
<th>Non-labour (B)</th>
<th>Collective Labour (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>(surplus produced by individual performer [A] appropriated by same individual performer [A] – hence non-exploitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>(surplus produced by multiple individual performers [A] appropriated by the collective of the same individuals [C] – hence non-exploitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>(surplus produced by the collective [C] is appropriated by one of the performers [A] – hence exploitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>(surplus produced by collective [C] appropriated by non-performer [B] – hence exploitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>(surplus appropriated by the collective [C] that produces [C] the surplus – hence non-exploitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 1, the disaggregation was in terms of *exploitative* and *non-exploitative*. One can see through Table 1 how what the development sector calls the third world is not all exploitative, not all ‘victim-hood’ in need of rescue/development, not all ‘evil’ in need of annihilation or dystopian (with no futurity), but a space of also non-exploitative praxis. For example, it is indeed a space of AA class process – a single woman peasant [A] working on her own land and appropriating the surplus alone [A]; AC class process – number of single woman peasants [A] working on their respective lands and coming together to appropriate the surplus [C]; and CC class process – a collective of woman peasants working together [C] and appropriating the surplus together [C], as in the *Eka Nari Sanghathan* (see Chitranshi’s chapter [2018] in this volume).

We shall now add to the institutional configuration of performance and appropriation of surplus labour (as in Table 1 above) the dimensions of (i) output distribution – whether in commodity (“com.”) or non-commodity (“non-com.”) form and (ii) labour remuneration – whether in wage and non-wage to make sense of which class processes are hooked to the circuits of global capital and which are outside. The six class processes (in Table 1 above) thus get disaggregated further into 24 class sets (see Chakrabarti, Dhar, and Cullenberg, 2012: 138–42).
## Table 2: Class sets and World of the Third

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Worker’s Remuneration</th>
<th>Local-Global Markets</th>
<th>Local Markets</th>
<th>World of the Third (WOT)</th>
<th>Modes of Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NON-COM</td>
<td>NON-WAGE</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Non-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Produce Sold in Local-Global Markets – Hence Class Set Hooked to Circuits of Global Capital
Final Produce Sold in Local Markets – Hence class set is outside Circuits of Global Capital
Final Produce Not Sold in Market – Hence Class Sets is outside Circuits of Global Capital

A = individual, B = none, C = shared,
com: market commodity, non-com: non-market commodity and non-commodity
E: Exploitation; Non-E: Non exploitation
In Table 2, class sets 5 and 17 designate the capitalist class sets (both are exploitative; and in both labour power and output distribution are in the commodity-form). The rest (i.e., the twenty-two class sets from 1–4, 6–16, and 18–24) are non-capitalist class sets.

Of the 22 “what are not capitalist class sets,” at least twelve (i.e., class sets 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24) are outside the circuits of global capital by virtue of their output distribution being in the non-commodity form.

The other ten non-capitalist class sets—even if they are non-capitalist, could be either inside (i.e., hooked to) or outside the circuits of global capital, depending on whether their produce is exchanged in the local-global market (see Column 6 above), local market (see Column 7 above) or non-market (see Column 8 above) sites. Interestingly, class sets 5 and 17, if they are not global capitalist enterprises, could also be inside (i.e., hooked to) or outside the circuits of global capital.

Thus depending on a host of mutually constitutive and contradictory contexts, the odd-numbered class sets in the above matrix can be inside or outside the circuits of global capital. The even-numbered ones are, however, outside. Thus, an outside to the circuits of global capital, marked by the even-numbered class sets and a few of the odd-numbered class sets, including (interestingly) even capitalist class sets, can be conceptualized as ‘world of the third as space’. No kind of a priori value can be imputed to world of the third as space.

However, of the 12 non-capitalist class sets that are outside the circuits of global capital six (i.e. class sets 2, 4, 14, 16, 22, and 24) are non-exploitative in addition to being non-capitalist. Those six could be the ground and condition for a postcapitalist future.

Also, of the 12 class sets (i.e. the odd-numbered ones) that could be hooked to the circuits of global capital, once again, six (class sets 1, 3, 13, 15, 21 and 23) are non-exploitative.

Thus class sets 2, 4, 14, 16, 22 and 24 constitute (and class sets 1, 3, 13, 15, 21 and 23 could also constitute) the cocooned fragment of the (a) non-capitalist and (b) non-exploitative sets in world of the third as space.

What is crypted however is that class sets 2, 4, 14, 16, 22, and 24 ... even class sets 6, 8, 18, and 20, for example (which are exploitative but outside the circuits of global capital) ... as
also class sets 1, 3, 13, 15, 21 and 23 (which are within the circuits of global capital but are non-exploitative) are also the condition and ground for possible postcapitalist futures; ‘possible’ postcapitalist futures; and it is the appreciation of this possibility that is cryted; cryted even to classical Marxian praxis. It is postdevelopment praxis that takes us to an appreciation of that which is cocooned yet cryted within world of the third as space. Postdevelopmental praxis inaugurates world of the third as place.

To conclude, postdevelopment and postcapitalist praxis require a shift from conventional development studies and standard forms of developmental practices, which in turn needs to move beyond the axis local/global. This entails putting to question the extant idea of local as mere space and as a given ground of self, social and political transformation. For that one needs a concomitant interrogation of capitalocentrism, modernism and Orientalism. One hence needs to distinguish the concept of local from the third world ‘local’; the mere invocation of the local without an interrogation of third worldism will not extricate us from local as space. The un(der)theorized local will emerge as the substitute signifier of the unspoken/uncited world of the third; this will keep us complicit with ‘global capitalist hegemony’. Working through capitalocentrism-modernism-Orientalism and local-global, we hence arrive at the circuits of global capital and world of the third as space-place via a class-focused analysis. This in turn shows how the local qua would of the third as space is replete with repositories of exploitation (non-capitalist class sets 6, 8, 10, 12, 18, 20) and require struggle (from) within. The problem is not just that of the universalising global but also that of an under-examined local. The re-writing of the local initially as world of the third as space and then world of the third as place (Gibson-Graham, 2016), opens the process of cultivating subjects (ourselves and others). Such subjects who inhabit non-capitalist economic spaces and non-Orientalist cultural spaces could move in the direction of postcapitalist or post-Orientalist place, birthing in the process postdevelopmental praxis.
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“Place signifies the possibility of understanding local economies as places with highly specific economic identities and capacities rather than simply as nodes in a global capitalist system. In more broadly philosophical terms, place is that which is not fully yoked into a system of meaning, not entirely subsumed to a (global) order; it is that aspect of every site that exists as potentiality. Place is the ‘event in space’, operating as a ‘dislocation’ with respect to familiar structures and narratives. It is the unmapped and unmoored that allows for new moorings and mappings” (Gibson-Graham 2016, p. 288).
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6 An ontology directed by phronesis rather than sophia would not seek refuge in the realm of ‘universal knowledge’ or ‘eternal certainty’ (i.e. what cannot be otherwise) but would recognize its own inherent embeddedness in the world of praxis (i.e. what can be otherwise) and being-related to the with-which (see Long 2002, p. 36-37; Bowler 2008).

7 “Development, to paraphrase David Harvey (1993), and alternative development are dialectically organized oppositions within the history of modernity, to be seen less as mutually exclusive but as ‘oppositions that contain the other’ (Harvey 1993:15)” (see Watts in Crush, 2005, p. 59). Escobar has a different take on alternatives: “to think about ‘alternatives to development’ … [marked by] a critical stance with respect to established scientific knowledge, an interest in local autonomy, culture and knowledge, and the defence of localized, pluralistic grassroots movements … requires a theoretical and practical transformation in existing notions of development, modernity and the economy. This can best be achieved by building upon the practices of the social movements, especially those in the Third World. These movements are essential to the creation of alternative visions of democracy, economy and society” (Escobar in Crush, 2005, p. 206). Some social movements are concerned with “resource mobilization”; some others “emphasize struggles to constitute new identities as a means to open democratic spaces for more autonomous action” (Cohen, 1985 as quoted by Escobar in Crush, 2005, p. 215).

8 When we refer to the local–global market with reference to a commodity, we mean the chain of local–local and global–global exchanges that make up the entire value chain of that commodity, via processes of outsourcing, subcontracting, off-shoring, body shopping and so on. Generalizing the structure, we can say that local markets and global markets are part of the same market chain as long as they connect to the circuits of global capital. Markets that connect to the circuits of global capital are, thus, a component of local–global markets. In contrast, there are local markets that do not form part of the circuits of global capital in the sense that none of the concerned enterprises there are connected to the circuits of global capital. We define such markets as world of the third markets.